1

**PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT**

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

THE C. R. MYERS' ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION:
INVESTIGATION OF THE UTILITY OF MYERS' ORAL HISTORY
COLLECTION
TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY IN CANADA

by

JUDITH D. KALIN, B. A.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
Department of Psychology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
August 28, 1996

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395, Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

For a full reference

For a full reference

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-19434-5

Canada

Name _____

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided

--	--	--	--

U·M·I

SUBJECT TERM

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture	0729
Art History	0377
Cinema	0900
Dance	0378
Fine Arts	0357
Information Science	0723
Journalism	0391
Library Science	0399
Mass Communications	0708
Music	0413
Speech Communication	0459
Theater	0465

EDUCATION

General	0515
Administration	0514
Adult and Continuing	0516
Agricultural	0517
Art	0273
Bilingual and Multicultural	0282
Business	0688
Community College	0275
Curriculum and Instruction	0727
Early Childhood	0518
Elementary	0524
Finance	0277
Guidance and Counseling	0519
Health	0680
Higher	0745
History of	0520
Home Economics	0278
Industrial	0521
Language and Literature	0279
Mathematics	0280
Music	0522
Philosophy of	0998
Physical	0523

Psychology	0525
Reading	0535
Religious	0527
Sciences	0714
Secondary	0533
Social Sciences	0534
Sociology of	0340
Special	0529
Teacher Training	0530
Technology	0710
Tests and Measurements	0288
Vocational	0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language	0679
General	0289
Ancient	0290
Linguistics	0291
Modern	0291
Literature	0401
General	0294
Classical	0295
Comparative	0297
Medieval	0298
Modern	0316
African	0591
American	0305
Asian	0352
Canadian (English)	0355
Canadian (French)	0593
English	0311
Germanic	0312
Latin American	0315
Middle Eastern	0313
Romance	0314
Slavic and East European	0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy	0422
Religion	0318
General	0321
Biblical Studies	0319
Clergy	0320
History of	0322
Philosophy of	0469
Theology	0323

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies	0323
Anthropology	0324
Archaeology	0326
Cultural	0327
Physical	0327
Business Administration	0310
General	0272
Accounting	0770
Banking	0454
Management	0338
Marketing	0385
Canadian Studies	0385
Economics	0501
General	0503
Agricultural	0505
Commerce-Business	0508
Finance	0509
History	0510
Labor	0511
Theory	0358
Folklore	0366
Geography	0351
Gerontology	0351
History	0578
General	0578

Ancient	0579
Medieval	0581
Modern	0582
Black	0328
African	0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania	0332
Canadian	0334
European	0335
Latin American	0336
Middle Eastern	0333
United States	0337
History of Science	0585
Law	0398
Political Science	0615
General	0615
International Law and	0616
Relations	0617
Public Administration	0614
Recreation	0452
Social Work	0626
Sociology	0627
General	0938
Criminology and Penology	0631
Demography	0628
Ethnic and Racial Studies	0629
Individual and Family	0630
Studies	0629
Industrial and Labor	0630
Relations	0700
Public and Social Welfare	0344
Social Structure and	0709
Development	0999
Theory and Methods	0453
Transportation	
Urban and Regional Planning	
Women's Studies	

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture	
General	0473
Agronomy	0285
Animal Culture and	
Nutrition	0475
Animal Pathology	0476
Food Science and	
Technology	0359
Forestry and Wildlife	0478
Plant Culture	0479
Plant Pathology	0480
Plant Physiology	0817
Range Management	0777
Wood Technology	0746
Biology	
General	0306
Anatomy	0287
Botanics	0308
Botany	0309
Cell	0379
Ecology	0329
Entomology	0353
Genetics	0369
Limnology	0793
Microbiology	0410
Molecular	0307
Neuroscience	0317
Oceanography	0416
Physiology	0433
Radiation	0821
Veterinary Science	0778
Zoology	0472
Biophysics	
General	0786
Medical	0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry	0425
Geochemistry	0996

Geodesy	0370
Geology	0372
Geophysics	0373
Hydrology	0388
Mineralogy	0411
Paleobotany	0345
Paleocology	0426
Paleontology	0418
Paleozoology	0985
Polymology	0427
Physical Geography	0368
Physical Oceanography	0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences	0768
Health Sciences	
General	0566
Audiology	0300
Chemotherapy	0992
Dentistry	0567
Education	0350
Hospital Management	0769
Human Development	0758
Immunology	0982
Medicine and Surgery	0564
Mental Health	0347
Nursing	0569
Nutrition	0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology	0380
Occupational Health and	
Therapy	0354
Ophthalmology	0381
Pathology	0571
Pharmacology	0419
Pharmacy	0572
Physical Therapy	0382
Public Health	0573
Radiology	0574
Recreation	0575

Speech Pathology	0460
Toxicology	0383
Home Economics	0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences	
Chemistry	
General	0485
Agricultural	0749
Analytical	0486
Biochemistry	0487
Inorganic	0488
Nuclear	0738
Organic	0490
Pharmaceutical	0491
Physical	0494
Polymer	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathematics	0405
Physics	
General	0605
Acoustics	0986
Astronomy and	
Astrophysics	0606
Atmospheric Science	0608
Atomic	0748
Electronics and Electricity	0607
Elementary Particles and	
High Energy	0798
Fluid and Plasma	0759
Molecular	0609
Nuclear	0610
Optics	0752
Radiation	0756
Solid State	0611
Statistics	0463
Applied Sciences	
Applied Mechanics	0346
Computer Science	0984

Engineering	
General	0537
Aerospace	0538
Agricultural	0539
Automotive	0540
Biomedical	0541
Chemical	0542
Civil	0543
Electronics and Electrical	0544
Heat and Thermodynamics	0548
Hydraulic	0545
Industrial	0546
Marine	0547
Materials Science	0794
Mechanical	0548
Metallurgy	0743
Mining	0551
Nuclear	0552
Packaging	0549
Petroleum	0765
Sanitary and Municipal	0554
System Science	0790
Geotechnical	0428
Operations Research	0796
Plastics Technology	0795
Textile Technology	0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General	0621
Behavioral	0384
Clinical	0622
Developmental	0620
Experimental	0623
Industrial	0624
Personality	0625
Physiological	0989
Psychobiology	0349
Psychometrics	0632
Social	0451

The undersigned hereby recommend to
The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis,

"The C.R. Myers' Oral History Collection:
Investigation of the utility of Myers' Oral History Collection
to the Development of the History of Psychology in Canada"

submitted by

Judith D. Kalin, B.A.

in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

Chair, Department of Psychology

Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University

August 28, 1996

Abstract

The C. Roger Myers' Oral History Collection is comprised of 108 interviews with Canadian psychologists conducted between 1962 and 1977. The subject of this thesis is to examine the utility and significance of the Oral History Collection both to its creator, C. R. Myers, and to contemporary historians of psychology. This will involve two separate analyses: First, I examine his work in psychology, especially that part of his life from 1956 to 1970 when he turned to an interest in professional eminence and to the building of Canadian psychology at the University of Toronto. Next, I explore the Oral History Collection and its usefulness to contemporary historians of psychology. Myers did fulfill his goal to collect the impressions of the people who were active in the early days of Canadian psychology. For Myers, the history of psychology in Canada was the history of academic psychology and the "Great Men" who shaped it. Myers has left historians, psychologists and students with a set of illuminating accounts of the lives of psychologists of a particular era.

Acknowledgements

For me, the Master's thesis was a process of both an academic and personal growth. Many people assisted me in this process and deserve mention. First, sincere thanks are extended to the staff at the National Archives, especially to Sylvie Robitaille, and the staff at the University of Toronto Library for their assistance in locating the necessary materials for this thesis. I appreciate the time and co-operation of John Adair and Ray Berry who so willingly participated in the interviews and the editing process. Their personal stories were interesting and illuminating. In addition, I thank Rolf Kroger, John Mills, David Bernhardt and Bryan Little for their personal insights on Myers. My thesis advisor, Fran Cherry, has been a continual source of inspiration and guidance to me throughout all the years that I have worked with her and I truly appreciate her patience, especially during the editing process. I thank committee member, Roger Wells, for demonstrating and teaching me excellent listening skills. Thanks to my good friend, Cathy Borshuk, who has set the "standard" to which I aspire and to Michelle Gordon who so cheerfully and willingly assisted with data entry until 9999 looked more like gggg. A very special thank-you to Dr. Norman Levine and Dr. Jonathan Pulman who convinced me that I could complete this thesis. Finally, thank-you to my husband, David, the sandwich maker, map reader, baseball game companion but most of all, for providing me with a sense of balance and for keeping me company in the library, even when he slept, as I read through the interviews.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	vii
 Introduction	 1
Overview of Department of Psychology at University of Toronto and C. R. Myers' Role in the Department	 4
Myers' View of Eminence in the building of the Department	 18
Oral History Collection	22
Selection of Interviewees	23
A Demographic Analysis - General Characteristics	30
Educational Background	31
Personal Characteristics	32
Professional Lives	32
Gender and Area of Psychology	33
Thematic Analysis	33
Narrative Process	49
Summary	70
 References	 71
 Appendix A	 76
 Appendix B	 87
 Appendix C	 93
 Appendix D	 98
 Appendix E	 168
 Appendix F	 199
 Appendix G	 201

List of Tables

TABLE	DESCRIPTION	
1	Canadian Departments of Psychology: Staff Visibility Trends	77
2	Canadian Departments of Psychology: Staff Visibility -- 1964-65	78
3	Psychologists in Canada: Visibility	79
4	The Most "Visible" Scientists in Canadian Departments of Psychology (1965)	84
5	General Demographics: Categories and their Coding Schemes	86

List of Figures

FIGURE	DESCRIPTION	
1	Visibility of Canadian Psychology Departments (1965 Staff) Journal Literature	88
2	Visibility of Canadian Psychology Departments Number of University Psychology Departments at different citation levels	89
3	Birthplace	90
4	Father's Occupation	91
5	Education	92

The C. R. Myers' Oral History Collection.

Investigation of the utility of Myers' Oral History Collection
to the development of the history of psychology in Canada

The C. Roger Myers' Oral History Collection is comprised of 108 interviews with Canadian psychologists. Between 1962 and 1977, Myers compiled the Oral History Collection with the idea of collecting a data base for the use of "scholars doing historical research in psychology" (Canadian Psychological Association Archives, National Archives, MG 29, I 161, Volume 75, herein after referred to as C.P.A. Archives). The interview tapes were transcribed, verified and authorized by the interviewees and then the tape and transcript were placed in the National Archives of Canada where they are now accessible to historians (C.P.A. Archives, MG 29, I 161, Volumes 24-27).

Myers himself used the material on several occasions. Once during a Chetron conference in Calgary, Alberta in June 1972, he played portions of the interview with the late John MacEachran, a veteran psychologist at the University of Alberta. Again, in June 1973 at a C.P.A. Meeting in Victoria, British Columbia, in a memorial session honouring the late Robert B. MacLeod, Myers read from his interview with MacLeod, who reminisced about what it was like being a student in the Department of Psychology at McGill University in the late 1920s and then as Chair of the Department twenty years later. Again, in February 1974, at the funeral of Professor E. A. Bott, Myers read from interviews with Bott's former students some retrospective impressions of Bott as a teacher (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). Myers saw innumerable ways in which the interviews

and transcript material could be used. He mentioned in his personal writings that they could be useful in cross-indexing historical information from other sources, or that excerpts from many different tapes could be of aid in producing pieces on such topics as: "When and how I decided to become a psychologist" or, 'A Worm's Eye-View' by graduate students in psychology at Harvard in the early 1930s; or in Edinburgh in the late 1930s; or Toronto in the late 1940s; or Leipzig at the turn of the century" (C. R. Myers Papers, University of Toronto Archives: B88-0048, Boxes /001 to /052 herein after referred to as U. of T. Archives).

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the utility and significance of the Oral History Collection both to its creator, C. R. Myers and to contemporary historians of psychology. Historiographic debates since the 1970s caution against an exclusively internal, linear and progressive approach to any historical account. The historiographic debates center on different types of historical accounts that are possible. The main principles underlying the construction of historical accounts are frequently set in oppositional terms. Hilgard, Leary & McGuire (1991) in The History of Psychology have described these as the five criteria for evaluating historical accounts. In the first criterion, continuous versus discontinuous (p. 90), continuous history is recorded as an uninterrupted flow of thoughts in which the history of psychology has evolved in a continuous manner over time, while discontinuous histories stress disruption. As an example of the latter, Thomas Kuhn speaks of revolutions in which, the story of psychology is told as psychology's abrupt break with or continuous emergence out of philosophy

(Leary, 1992, p. 308). Hilgard, Leary & McGuire (1991) suggest that there is not one continuous historical account but rather multiple histories (p. 90). It may depend on who is telling the story.

Historical accounts vary on the dimension of presentism versus historicism (p. 91). The past is constructed using the present context in presentism, while in historicism, the past is portrayed in its own terms, that is, in its own context. We understand the past in its own perspective, not our present day perspective. The internal versus external dimension contrasts accounts written from within the discipline by psychologists as opposed to considering the social, cultural, economic and political forces which affect accounts of psychology's history.

Earlier accounts were composed using the "Great Man" perspective. Accounts of the "Great Man" focused on the contribution of the individuals to the history of psychology. The question which must be asked is how a "Great Man" was chosen? According to Hilgard, Leary & McGuire, "... eminence is a concept to be ascribed and understood with care" (p. 92). To counter this problem, historiographers advocate a *Zeitgeist* or the 'spirit of the time' approach which is to look at the trend of thought and feeling in a particular period of history (pp. 92-93).

The final dimensions for writing the history of psychology centers on ceremonial versus critical history (p. 93). Ceremonial history follows the current development of psychology back to an early root and tries to construct accounts that legitimize some part of contemporary psychology (p. 93). Critical history asks questions that challenge the taken-for-granted aspects of the history of psychology.

Because of these debates, this will involve two very separate analyses. First, I will examine Myers' work in psychology, especially that part of his life from 1956 to 1970 when he turned to an interest in professional eminence and to the building of Canadian psychology at the University of Toronto. It is during this period that he began his work on the Oral History Collection and his History of Academic Psychology in Canada which he co-authored with Mary Wright (Wright & Myers, 1982). Following this analysis, I will explore the Oral History Collection and its usefulness to contemporary historians of psychology. I will discuss problems of narrative, oral history and historiography and then examine the collection as a series of life histories. This will include a demographic and thematic study of the 108 interviews. I will draw on several sources: the Canadian Psychological Association Archives at the National Archives in Ottawa, C. R. Myers' papers at the University of Toronto Library, University Archives in Toronto, extensive interviews with John Adair and Ray Berry and Personal Communications with Rolf Kroger of University of Toronto, John Mills of University of Saskatchewan, David Bernhardt and Bryan Little of Carleton University.

I will begin with an overview of the early history of the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto up to the point at which C. R. Myers became Chair and then during the years when he led the Department. I will trace Myers' career, which he began as an applied psychologist and war researcher, looking at the Oral History Collection in the context of Myers' tenure as Chair at the University of Toronto and as an outgrowth of his preoccupation with professional eminence. Creating a 'visible' Department of Psychology

was Myers' goal and he planned to accomplish this by hiring "visible" prominent psychologists. Myers' leadership had a tremendous impact in the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto, and the Oral History Collection and his relationship to the oral history interviewees benefited from his position. Finally, I will examine briefly the latter part of his career when Myers turned to history, producing an internal history of psychology in Canada through its academic institutions (Wright & Myers, 1982) as well as the Oral History Collection.

The history of psychology at the University of Toronto is outlined in detail in two sources: in Wright & Myers' (1982) History of Academic Psychology in Canada, and in Hans Pols' (1991) Master's thesis, The School as Laboratory: The Development of Psychology as a Discipline in Toronto, 1915-1955, which traced the early history of psychology at the University of Toronto. What is important to note from these historical accounts is that psychology, from 1850 to 1957, moved from a pre-scientific, to scientific, and finally to an applied state.

Between 1850 and 1889, Psychology was a part of the Philosophy Department at the University of Toronto, first under Reverend James Beaven who was Chair of Metaphysics and Ethics. Since Beaven was trained as a theologian, incorporating the ideas of the Scottish "common sense" view of psychology was most likely difficult for him (Wright & Myers, 1982, p. 69). Upon his resignation in 1871, Beaven was replaced by Reverend George Paxton Young who continued as Chair of this Department until his death in 1889. Although, Young was more adaptable than his predecessor,

psychology still remained pre-scientific.

This state of affairs at Toronto was about to change with the arrival in 1889 of James Mark Baldwin. He was the first "modern" psychologist in Canada to arrive in Toronto after having studied at Leipzig. As Professor of Logic, Metaphysics and Ethics at the University of Toronto, he proceeded to set up a laboratory modeled on the Leipzig prototype. It was at this time that the Department shifted from pre-scientific psychology to the "new" psychology from Germany, the Wundtian tradition. Baldwin left Toronto in 1893 and the laboratory continued to develop, analyzing the sensory and motor components of experience, under Kishchmann's supervision until he departed for Germany in 1909. Kishchmann did not return, but the Department continued to function as a scientific laboratory in his absence (Wright & Myers, 1982).

Again, a transition was about to occur guided by the events of World War I which changed the direction of psychology at the University of Toronto and throughout North America (Wright & Myers, 1982, p. 81). Psychology shifted from the scientific realm to the applied between 1916 and 1956. Edward Alexander Bott, not only created an independent Department of Psychology, which was officially recognized by the University in 1926, but was also responsible for this shift to applied psychology. World War I had necessitated that psychology become practical and Bott saw a way of taking the science of psychology to the people. The Toronto laboratory was transformed into a rehabilitation clinic in which Bott devoted himself to the muscular re-education of wounded soldiers.

The movement of the academic laboratory into the public

domain was inspired by the psychiatrists of the mental hygiene movement. The Psychology Laboratory and Medical Faculty were now closely connected; in fact, funding for the laboratory's activities came from the mental hygiene movement under the direction of C. M. Hincks. However, medicine alone was not enough to attack "the microbe" (Pols, 1991, p. 7). The public had to be educated regarding hygiene in such areas as the implementation of new sewage systems and fresh drinking water to be provided by the government. Under the mental hygiene movement, the link between psychology and medicine was strengthened.

As psychology at the University of Toronto shifted from the scientific to the applied realm, it was no longer modeled after physics but was now fashioned after the medical model. The goal of psychology was to improve the quality of life. Education became a key factor in the achievement of that goal. In the interwar years, books and articles were published about human behaviour; counselling and parent-education courses took place in the newly created nursery school of The Institute of Child Study at Toronto, established by Blatz, in which mothers and children were observed, especially through longitudinal studies of the children.

At the end of World War I, the Department of Psychology remained applied under the leadership of Bott. Psychologists were lured from the laboratory to the classroom, school, clinic, hospital and community (Bernhardt, 1947, p. 51). According to Karl S. Bernhardt in his C.P.A. presidential address, "Canadian Psychology Past, Present and Future", delivered on April 11, 1947, "The world became the psychologist's lab (p. 51).

Just as World War I had necessitated that psychologists become involved in the community, World War II reinforced the applied interests of psychology. It required that psychologists be experts in personnel selection, placement and training. Psychology remained relevant at Toronto as an applied science. According to MacLeod (1955), "Canadian psychologists were fairly successful in convincing the public that the methods of science [were] relevant to the solution of practical human problems" (p.14).

With the resignation of Bott in 1956 and the appointment of Myers as Chair, psychology at the University of Toronto was about to undergo another transformation. Several factors contributed to this change, one of the most significant was the MacLeod Report (1955).

The Social Science Research Council of Canada agreed to fund a survey of the state of psychology in Canada, and a committee of psychologists on Council, including C. R. Myers, recommended that the survey be carried out under the leadership of Robert B. MacLeod, "a distinguished psychologist whose report would command general attention and respect" (Ketchum, 1955, p. 3). This resulted in the MacLeod Report, Psychology in Canadian Universities and Colleges. According to MacLeod,

[t]he terms of reference of this survey were stated as follows: 'To survey the present status of psychology in Canadian institutions of higher learning with special reference to its relationships with the other social sciences, the aims of psychologists in their training at various levels, and the degree to which these are being achieved or frustrated' (1955, p. 8).

MacLeod investigated the undergraduate curricula, graduate training, the characteristics of the students and staff, and the facilities. While investigating these areas, the following five questions predominated his research: was psychology accepted as part of a liberal education; was psychology accepted as a legitimate science or was it still associated with philosophy; how was psychology financially supported compared to other departments; was the content of psychology overly emphasized in the applied areas due to the success of psychology in the clinical, industrial, educational and governmental spheres; and finally, how had the United States affected Canadian Psychology? (1955, p. 9)

MacLeod reported that only one-third of Canadian psychologists were in universities or colleges; the majority of psychologists during this period were in applied settings. Psychology was rapidly expanding professionally, but MacLeod warned that "[a] good profession must have a science behind it". MacLeod observed that due to this rapid professional expansion of psychology, which lacked a strong scientific base, psychologists were seen as technicians rather than as scientists. The Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto was to be profoundly affected by this Report. It was clear that MacLeod believed that psychology had professionalized prematurely to the detriment of psychology as a science; he claimed that the future of psychology resided "almost exclusively in the development of research" (Belanger, 1992, p. 711).

Following the publication of the Report in 1955, the National Research Council and the Canadian Social Sciences Research Council funded the Opinions Conference in May 1960 at which the details of

the Report were discussed (Bernhardt, 1961). Forty-one Canadian psychologists, including C. Roger Myers, attended. The funding sources stated that the agenda must "bear exclusively 'on the teaching of psychology as a science and the development of research training'" (Belanger, 1992, p. 711, underlining added). The general belief of the psychologists at the Opinicon Conference was that a psychologist was "first and foremost a scientist involved in research ..." (Belanger, 1992, p. 711, underlining added). The applied psychologists objected and thus another conference was scheduled five years later for this group.

Having been involved in the selection of MacLeod as researcher and author of the Report and as an active member of the Opinicon Conference, Myers was strongly affected by the recommendations of the Report. These two events contributed to the changes that were about to occur in the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto, and the person responsible for leading these changes was C. R. Myers.

Myers was born in Calgary on February 12, 1906. The family moved to Toronto when Myers was seven. He was deeply attached to and inspired by his father, a clergyman. Myers attended the University of Toronto School, associated with the University of Toronto, which was regarded as a progressive experimental school. His father was willing to pay for private school despite his low wages. Education and attending a good school were valued. It was believed that Myers would follow his father into theology and he attended University College with this intention. However, in his first year Myers took an Introductory Psychology course which sparked

an interest in psychology and he no longer wanted to study theology. This was not an uncommon career path in the background of several psychologists at this time (Nicholson, 1994).

Myers felt that he could better help people through psychology. He was educated at the University of Toronto and then joined the staff at Toronto as a faculty member in the late 1920s. He was trained as a Rogerian therapist and worked for the Ontario Mental Hospital system as a consultant from 1930 to 1963. As the salary of a university academic was insufficient, it was not uncommon for professors to hold double positions in order to supplement their income. According to Myers, the rationale for two careers was economic:

... I think that one supposes that it was because the staff were interested in being involved in the community and that is what they thought psychology was. In my view, that wasn't it at all; it was economic pressures that forced them, whether they wanted to or not, and I am sure that they ... didn't really want to, [but] had to (Interview with C. R. Myers done by Glenn MacDonald, C.P.A. Archives, Volume 26).

Myers was well-liked by his students who remembered him as an interesting lecturer, especially when teaching interviewing techniques. Glenn Mac Donald noted that Myers,

... work[ed] you hard, kn[e]w his stuff, [and was] prepared. I took all clinical courses that year and the only one that I have any real recollection of ... was the

second half of the Myers' therapeutic techniques which included such things as playing an interview and then he would stop the machine and turn to one of us and say now what would you say as therapists. Most of it was Rogerian (Interview with Glenn MacDonald, C.P.A. Archives Volume 25).

In the oral interviews, Myers was described as a very approachable and likable person by several of the interviewees (C.P.A. Archives).

During World War II, Edward Bott and C. Roger Myers were involved in personnel selection in England, especially in pilot selection and crew training in the Royal Air Force. When Bott and Myers were absent from the Department of Psychology during the War years, Karl Bernhardt acted as Chair.

According to Myers, in his own oral interview (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 26), in 1956, Edward Bott at 69 years, was asked by the administration to retire. He was reluctant to leave his position as Chair of the Department but with his departure, the Psychology Department of the University of Toronto entered a new phase of development, this time transforming from the applied realm to the experimental.

Since Karl Bernhardt had been acting Chair of the Department during the War years, it was expected that he would be the logical choice for Bott's successor. But, the logical and expected did not occur. Instead, Karl Bernhardt's close friend and colleague, C. Roger Myers was appointed Chair. Not only was Bernhardt stunned, but the entire Psychology Department was shocked by this appointment, including Myers himself. While interviewing Carl Williams on

January 4, 1969, Myers stated that his first reaction was "one of chagrin about Karl ... I felt very badly that he hadn't been chosen ...". Alf Sheppard reported to Myers that when Bott stepped down as Chair, everyone expected Karl Bernhardt to take over.

I think as far as staff were concerned, they had expected that he would be the individual. I think it came as quite a shock. I don't think it was a judgment as to the desirability or undesirability ... It was just taken for granted. And I guess what was saddest about the thing was that he [Bernhardt] probably took it for granted. ... [was] quite shattered by all this (Interview with Alf Sheppard, C.P.A. Archives, Volume 26).

According to David Bernhardt (Personal Communication, April 29, 1996), his father had expected to be appointed Dean and when he failed to be appointed, he assumed that he would become the new Chair of the Department. According to Myers, Bott had also expected Bernhardt to be his successor (C.P.A. Archives). The rationale given to Bernhardt by the Dean at the time was that he was "too old" at 56. Myers was 54.¹ Obviously, there were other forces at work. The appointment of Myers as Chair of the Department of Psychology rather than Bernhardt was likely due to a combination of factors: Myers' likable personality, strong administrative skills, and competitive nature, but most importantly, in 1956-57 a

¹It is interesting to note that when Blatz resigned as Director of the Institute of Child Study, and Dale Harris declined the position, Bernhardt was appointed as its Director in 1960. He had been involved in the Institute since the 1930s and assumed the title of Assistant Director during the War years when he was involved in parent education. When Bernhardt assumed the Directorship of the Institute, age was no longer considered a problem.

comprehension of the current issues challenging psychology. In Canada, this meant movement from psychology as an applied to an experimental science.

As noted earlier, Myers was well liked by his students. In addition, he was recognized as a good administrator. During Bott's tenure as Chair of the Department of Psychology, Myers demonstrated his administrative skills as head of the graduate committee. During his interview with Myers, Charles Preston summarized Myers' organizational skill when he stated, "...he was well organized. [I] [t]hought Myers would make a better businessman than professor. He was well groomed, efficient, well organized compared to others in the department" (Interview with Charles Preston, C.P.A. Archives, Volume 26). In an interview which I conducted with Rolf Kroger (November, 1995), a member of the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto since the early 1960s, he confirmed that Myers may have well been appointed Chair because of his association with Bott during the War years where Myers proved himself to be an efficient worker and administrator.

Myers was eager to achieve professional recognition, a fact supported by his tremendous involvement in the organization of the Ontario Psychology Association and in the Canadian Psychological Association. He seemed to be on every committee! Mary J. Wright commented in an article she wrote about Myers, Psychologists in Profile: Charles Roger Myers for The Ontario Psychologist.

Everybody who is anybody in psychology in Ontario,
Canada or just about anywhere else in the world knows

Roger. ... Myers has been running things psychological in this country for years - ... In Ontario he has not only run everything, but has played a major part in starting things to run, such as the Ontario Psychological Association, of which he was the first President (1947-1948) and the Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology of which he was the first Chairman (1960-65). ... When Roger takes on a job he does it well. The early success of OBEP was, in large part, his doing. He learned the pitfalls of running such a Board by joining the American Association of State Psychology Boards and was the Editor of a "Manual of Legal Issues for Members of State Psychology Boards (University of Toronto Press, 1964). He was elected President of that Association in 1966 (1977, p. 55).

His professional aspirations for psychology in Canada, and at University of Toronto in particular, were sometimes competitive. According to David Bernhardt (Personal Communication, April 29, 1996), there was an "undercurrent of a battle between Myers and Hebb". The Psychology Department at McGill University, with Hebb as Chair, was ranked first in the "Canadian Departments of Psychology", according to Myers' own Staff Visibility list (1964-65) and the University of Toronto was ranked second (U. of T. Archives). Hebb, himself, was ranked highest in "The most "visible" scientists in Canadian Departments of Psychology" category. When Myers was appointed Chair of the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto, he set out to build what D. Ketchum, a member of the faculty, called, "the largest invisible Department of Psychology in the

World!" (Wright & Myers, 1982, p. 91). Myers' competitiveness and desire for recognition were sparked by the challenge of building the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto. In his history of the University of Toronto, Myers stated, "The Department was scientifically "invisible", so the new Chairman, made it his primary goal to recruit scientists who would make the Department visible" (p. 91).

In addition to being competitive, Myers was also flexible. Although he worked in the applied area, his goals for the future of psychology at the University of Toronto were consistent with those of the MacLeod Report (1955) which favoured a more scientifically based psychology. He was able to transcend the limits of his training and preferences for applied work. While interviewing Carl Williams, Myers stated:

... and yet it isn't that I have become a capital S Scientist, it is that I have been able ... to say, 'Well, this is where we are going. This is where things are going. This is where the discipline is going. So, by G-d, if we are going to go there let's go there and let's do it'. But that doesn't mean that I did it personally ... If I can't do it then, by G-d, I am going to make it possible for other people to do it (Interview with Carl Williams, C.P.A. Archives, Volume 27).

Myers had the right combination of skill and determination needed to effect change within the Department. He was sensitive to the economic concerns expressed in the MacLeod Report. In addition, he was keenly aware of Hebb's growing dominance in post-World

War II Canadian Psychology particularly, when Hebb influenced the Opinicon Conference, for it was Hebb who insisted that only academics be invited to attend the Conference (Pols, 1991). Fuelled by the subtle competition with Hebb and challenge set by Ketchum, Myers possessed the skills and ambition needed to take psychology in the scientific direction although he, himself, did not change his own research orientation.

Myers assumed the Chair of the Psychology Department in 1957. In order to achieve his goal of building a visible Department, he first needed to secure funding for the Department. The President of the University of Toronto, Sidney Smith, introduced a new salary scale which made Toronto competitive with American Universities and Myers was determined that the Department of Psychology receive its share. While interviewing Wally Lambert, Myers commented that the "turn" came in 1956 when Smith increased funds for salaries despite strong opposition from the other University Presidents. They said, "It's all very well for you wealthy people up there in Toronto to push salary scales up, but look what you do to the rest of us" (Interview with Wally Lambert, C.P.A. Archives, Volume 25). Sidney Smith argued that it was the best thing and that if it didn't happen now, it never would. The new salaries meant that now psychologists would be able to devote themselves entirely to the University and no longer need to support themselves by working as applied psychologists. Increasing professors' salaries was consistent with the MacLeod Report.

Hence, with the future direction of Psychology in Canada clearly defined by the MacLeod Report and the Opinicon Conference,

Myers' mandate to build an "eminent, visible, scientific department" was set. Now, with the newly allocated funds released by the President of the University, Myers began building his department with eminent psychologists. Since there was a shortage of new PhDs in Canada, and Myers was desperate to build his department, he turned to the United States importing Abraham Amsel, George Mandler and Daniel Berlyne.

In the process of building a visible and eminent Department, Myers sought ways in which he could measure eminence. In fact, I would argue that he was consumed with the notion of visibility and eminence. Myers' papers at the University of Toronto Archives, are replete with material relating to "eminence", which he operationally defined in a 1970 American Psychologist article, "Journal citations and scientific eminence in contemporary psychology", as the following: "scientific eminence" "... as the esteem in which a scientist's work is held by his scientific peers". Myers did acknowledge however, that one's peers could be wrong and that the passage of time may bring a different evaluation of a scientist's contribution.

According to Myers, scientific eminence could be measured in two ways. One could ask professors to rate the quality of the research of a person on an independent rating scale of "good", "fair" or "poor". The problem with this rating system, however, was that there was no consistent agreement among the evaluators as to the quality of research. Myers sought a more reliable measure of scientific eminence which led him to the second method. He devised a study in which the frequency with which a psychologist's

publications were cited in the journal literature was deemed as a more reliable and valid measure. Myers believed that the frequency of citation provided "an index that is quantitative, objective, and readily available". Thus, this method became Myers' measure of "visibility" and scientific eminence.

In Myers' papers, a large number of yearly lists were compiled entitled, including "Canadian Departments of Psychology, Staff Visibility Trends" and "Canadian Departments of Psychology, Staff Visibility". Looking first at "Canadian Departments of Psychology, Staff Visibility Trends, one can see that for each school a modal citation score was compiled for the years 1956, 1957 and 1960 (see Table A-1). These were summed to yield a total "visibility score" as reflected in Table A-2. In this Table, "Canadian Departments of Psychology, Staff Visibility", one can see that these lists included the name of the University, total "visibility" score, number of "visible" staff, total number of staff, percent of total staff "visible", and "visibility" score per staff member. For example, in the 1964-65 list, McGill ranked number one. Its total "visibility" score was 2,123, which was comprised of the sum of the modal publications cited in Table A-1 for 1956 (654), 1957 (867) and 1960 (602); the number of "visible" staff was 11; the total number of staff was 21 resulting in the 52 percent of total staff "visible" and the "visibility" score per staff member 101. In comparison, the University of Toronto, in second place, had a total "visibility" score of 1,591, the sum of the modal publications cited for 1956 (499), 1957 (476) and 1960 (616); the number of "visible" staff was 11; the total number of staff was 24; percent of total staff "visible" was 46 and "visibility" score per

staff member was 66. The list included a total of 19 Universities.

In Myers' papers, one also finds lists of "Psychologists in Canada" and their "Visibility", and many lists position psychologists and their affiliated university according to which quartile they belong, with a final category, labelled "invisible but imminent?" (see A-3, pp. 79-83). For the year 1965, in the first quartile, the first four people were listed as follows: A. Amsel - Toronto; D. Berlyne - Toronto; D. Bindra - McGill; Dodwell - Queen's. In the second quartile, the first two people listed were: W. E. Bacon - McGill and C. T. Baker - UBC. In the third quartile, Dugal Campbell - Queen's and Rodney Cooper - Manitoba and in the fourth quartile, M. H. Appley - York and C. J. Brimer - Dalhousie were listed. On the "Invisible but Imminent?" list were David Abbey - Toronto and John Arrowood - Toronto, two psychologists expected to become visible.

Another list, entitled "The Most "Visible" Scientists in Canadian Departments of Psychology", reported "visible" scientists according to percentile ranges starting with the 99.9 percentile to the 92.0 percentile (see Table A-4). For example, at the 99.8 percentile was D. Hebb (McGill), at the 99.6 percentile were A. Amsel (Toronto), D. Berlyne (Toronto) and Malmo (McGill), and at the 92.7 percentile were Appley (York), G. Ferguson (McGill), Belanger (Montreal) and Weckowitz (Alberta). Myers summarized the material in graphs and bar charts indicating, for example, the number of citations over a three year period for the most visible Psychology Departments in Canada (see Figure B-1) and the number of Psychology Departments at different citation levels (see Figure B-2). According to number of citations listed in this bar chart, the highest number of citations for

three years was at McGill, Toronto and McMaster, in that order. Such compilations were part of the archival data in Myers' files for other years (U. of T. Archives: B88-0048, boxes/012, /026, /028).

In a memo dated November 17, 1969, to Daniel Berlyne regarding staff recruiting, Myers discussed how best to identify those likely to grow in prominence in the next few years. He devised a strategy to estimate the potential of these people based on the assumptions that "... those who have shown a sharp rise in visibility during [a] six-year period are more likely than others to continue up" and "... those who become visible at a relatively early age are more likely than others to become still more visible later". Myers calculated the difference in citations in the first three years (1962-1964) and in the second three years (1965-1967) of a person's career. Those who showed an increase in citations were then divided into age groups (under 35, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49), and area of specialization, namely, general-experimental or personality-social. Those showing an increase he called the "zoomers", but mentioned that some of those people would likely "fizzle out". Myers wrote of this group: "But it may be among them that we could find the sort of person who is headed for high visibility in the next few years but who has not yet been widely recognized as a 'comer'" (U. of T. Archives). The idea was to attempt to directly contact those people with promise. For example, Tony Doob at Toronto was a close personal friend of J. M. Carlsmith and therefore might be able to persuade him to join the University of Toronto, Department of Psychology. Carlsmith of Stanford University was listed first in the under 35, personality-social category (U. of T. Archives).

According to Myers, being "scientifically eminent" or "visible" was an important factor when selecting members for the Psychology Department. Myers was building the Psychology Department from 1956 to 1968. He published his article on eminence in 1970 after building the Department and having used his lists in a very applied way. They also facilitated the Oral History Interviews between 1962-1977, the bulk being in 1969 and the early 1970s. Myers' position as Chair of the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto placed him in a good position to pursue interviewees from a broad range of psychologists. All quartiles, including the "invisible but imminent?", were included in the Oral History Collection, although the greatest number were from the first quartile.

The Oral History Collection reflects C. R. Myers' preoccupation with eminence, a concept he used to help build the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto. The collection also reflects Myers' own personal history as Chair of a Department which shifted from the applied to the experimental realm. After Chairing the Department, Myers' applied his own knowledge and experience, his own personal history of how he saw Canadian psychology develop to the production of the Oral History Collection. In this regard, the collection is indistinguishable from Myers' own personal and professional life.

I want to turn now to the Oral History Collection in the context of writing the history of psychology. It seems relevant to ask to what use the Oral History Collection gathered by Myers could be put considering first, his own distinction between "facts" and "impressions" and secondly, considering the current of debates in

historiography, narrative psychology and literary theory concerning the approach to texts.

According to Myers,

these oral histories were not done so much to collect facts about the history of psychology, which could be determined more reliably from archival documents, but rather to collect the impressions of the people who played important roles in the early development of the science and profession of psychology, in Canada (underlining added) (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75).

Materials such as those in the Oral History Collection are not by "postmodern" (Holquist, 1981; Lyotard, 1988; Morson & Emerson, 1990) standards as clear and straightforward as they appear. In order to understand this, I will first provide the "facts" of the collection, that is demographics and the more subjective, thematic aspects of it as well as the "constructed" nature of the interviews.

Selection of Interviewees

It should be noted that at no time did Myers formally explain his selection criteria. In his personal papers he did note that the target population for the Oral History Collection was "veteran psychologists over 60 plus younger psychologists who made a significant contribution to Canadian psychology as a science and a profession" (U. of T. Archives: B88-0048, Box/020). At the National Archives, the interviewee list is presented alphabetically which is the way in which it was organized for deposit. However, this listing method obscures the fact that Myers' made cross-country trips to complete the Oral History Collection. When the interviewees are

organized according to the date and location of the interview, a different picture emerges which sheds some light into Myers selection process (see Appendix C). As an example, in March of 1970, Myers interviewed three psychologists in Ottawa. In April of the same year, Myers interviewed four people at the University of Manitoba on April 14 and 15. He then continued his trip to University of Calgary where he spoke with three psychologists on April 16. Next, from April 20 to April 23, he saw seven more people at the University of Alberta; then from April 24 to April 30th, 13 more psychologists were seen either at the University of Victoria, University of British Columbia or at home. One possible reason for Myers' selection process was availability of psychologists. In his files, I noted his statement: "if the psychologist is not there, or ill, substitute" (U. of Toronto Archives: B88-0048, Box/020). Since he was in each place for a limited time, he may have selected those people who were available at that time. Myers did contact some people in advance to arrange for an interview. Most likely, these were the better known or more eminent psychologists. Myers did interview the Chair or former Chair of most of the Universities including: Carl Williams (Western), David Belanger (Montreal), Jim Easterbrook (New Brunswick), Derek Corcoran (Memorial), Glenn MacDonald (Toronto), Ronald Schaub (Calgary), Tom Nelson (Alberta), Rusty Wendt (Carleton), George Ferguson (McGill), Bill McClelland (Western), Sandy Mowat (Dalhousie), Graham Skanes (Memorial), Raymond Shevenell (Ottawa), Jane Stewart (Sir George Williams), Florence Snodgrass (New Brunswick) and Donald Hebb (McGill). He also chose twenty of the former presidents of the C.P.A. including: E.

A. Bott, S. N. F. Chant, J. D. Ketchum, D. Hebb, D. C. Williams, N. Mailloux, G. Ferguson, D. Bindra, G. Turner, R. B. Bromiley, R. B. Malmo, A. Pinard, W. R. N. Blair, D. Belanger, M. J. Wright, W. Lambert, V. I. Douglas, D. Berlyne, A. M. Sullivan, D. Gibson and A. Paivio.

Myers certainly did arrange to interview the most prominent or well known psychologists. However, he also interviewed some lesser known and younger psychologists. His selection process is less clear in this regard. Again, looking at Myers' 1969 list of eminent people, there were no psychologists interviewed in the under 35 or 35-39 age categories. Only Tulving was interviewed in the 40-44 age range and Amsel and Berlyne in the 45-49 age grouping. Myers wanted a method for measuring younger, potentially eminent people for employment purposes, but none of the psychologists listed in this category were interviewed. Again, Myers interviewed only the more established, the well known psychologists.

In the case of the psychologists who were lesser known at that time, I had the opportunity to ask two interviewees why they thought they were interviewed. John Mills (Personal Communication, June 1996) and Bryan Little (Personal Communication, July 1969), were young, recent, junior faculty members at the time. They responded that their names were suggested by the Chair of the Department. Mills suggested that perhaps the Chair thought that these younger members of the faculty had the potential of becoming eminent. Little suggested that Myers may have interviewed younger psychologists whose undergraduate education had been in Canada in order to gain some information about psychology in Canadian

Universities. This is very possible, since Myers, along with Wright, was also writing the History of Academic Psychology in Canada (1982) at the same time as the interviews were being conducted. In this way, he was able to gather information for both projects at the same time. Also, most of the interviewees were educated either in Canada or Canada and the U.S.

It is interesting to note who was not included in the list of interviews, especially among the well known psychologists. Wes Coon (C.P.A. President 1968), Ray Berry (C.P.A. President, 1977) and John Adair (C.P.A. President, 1980) were three such people. While interviewing Ray Berry and John Adair, I was able to ask them about Myers' selection process (see Appendix D and E). Berry did believe that Myers' "view was very much in favour of the concept of the 'Great Man' theory". He felt that some of the eminent people in the applied area were not included. This is interesting as Myers was an applied psychologist who did excellent work in the Ministry of Health. According to Berry, "... those programs [that Myers had instituted] in fact were an excellent application of the knowledge of psychology". But it seemed that Myers recruited people to work with him in the Ministry of Health and then abandoned them at the Opinicon Conference (at which only academic psychologists were invited). At least, they felt abandoned by Myers at that time. Berry believed that "the feelings between some of those people ... lead to some of the exclusions in the list ...". As far as his own exclusion, Berry replied that he had no idea why. "It was a bit of a puzzle to me".

I never really thought about that before but it was a little

curious because Roger was to a very large extent an important person in the development of my professional career, the whole business of being in clinical and going to the University of Toronto, of getting the position in the Mental Health Clinic in Peterborough and I followed Roger into the Ministry and I also followed Roger by becoming the next Registrar at the Ontario Board of Examiners. It is kind of strange. Or, at least, it seems so to me.

At another point in his interview, Berry remarked "Now, Roger did mention to me several times that he should really like to interview me but he never got around to it". When John Adair was asked why he thought he had been excluded he replied:

I really don't know. I suspect in anything of this sort it is probably his own interests, his own thinking about what struck him. This is very subjective and I don't know whether there was any pattern to it.

Further along in the interview, he said,

... Well, I think that there are two reasons. One is that most of the people on this list were interviewed in 1976 or earlier. My involvement in C.P.A. ... was around 1975. ... One reason would be that I was relatively newish. ... There were some other people on this list I notice who were contemporaries in terms of being Department Chairmen in Western Departments and also newish and how they got on this list, again I don't know. But, at any rate, so that was one reason, newness. Maybe not as

visible to him. That's a charitable answer. There is some validity to it but it is charitable.

I think a second reason, and not a very important one but quite likely ... I was one of the U.S. imports in those days. I was not a Canadian, really in his mind, but I don't think that that was it either.

I do know that Roger did not like what Glenn McDonald, Ray Berry and myself were doing in C.P.A. at that time. ... It was at a time when the C.P.A. Board had, by motion, decided that it would recapture for its members the organization that had been shunted off to an association-management agency. ... I think, in part, I was this American import who was now involved in the C.P.A. Gees, that was ... a different kind of thing and furthermore I was rocking the boat a little bit. ... I was not really doing anything personally, but doing it because of a feeling that C.P.A. needed this kind of thing and it was a different model than the one that Roger was advocating. ... At the time, I think there were too many things that converged on me not being interviewed by him.

At another point in the interview Adair responded:

... In this list there are a number of individuals who, I think, are on this list because they come out of the McGill-Toronto connection. They were trained there and then they moved elsewhere. On the one hand, I would make an observation that the list is a little bit dated. You

get some people who were around early on, maybe at a time that was salient for Roger (underlining added) but they didn't necessarily maintain their salience for Canadian psychology, and hence they are on this list. But he also ends up with some people who are ... old Canadian psychologists, who don't leave much of a ripple effect on Canadian psychology by what they have achieved they are very, very, you know, the list is not made up by prominence or by the ripple effect they created within Canadian psychology. I find the list to be uneven and difficult to explain because of its unevenness. Why were these selected and not others? ... I am dead certain that for some of the people on this list that the eminence criteria was not applied. It just couldn't have been applied. It's a very subjectively-created list.

There remains no clear explanation for the inclusion and exclusion process of interviewees. Interviewee availability, eminence, potential for future eminence, undergraduate training in Canada, conflicts with Myers regarding the vision of the future direction of the C.P.A. at the time, all probably played some role in the selection of the interviewees. Historiographically, what is important is that the selection of mainly well known, eminent psychologists biases in favour of a "Great Man" history of psychology in Canada.

Oral History Collection: A Demographic Analysis

As previously stated, the Oral History Collection is comprised of 108 interviews conducted between 1962 and 1977 during and after the period when Myers served as Chair of the Department of

Psychology at the University of Toronto. One interview was conducted in 1962, twenty-three in 1969, thirty-nine in 1970, two in 1971, twelve in 1972, eight in 1973, six in 1974, six in 1975, nine in 1976 and one in 1977. The majority of the interviews (62) were completed in 1969 and 1970 while Myers was touring the country. The interview format was not standardized in that Myers did not ask all the interviewees the identical questions (see Appendix F).

In an effort to achieve a better description of the "facts" of the collection, each interview was coded for several dimensions including such factors as sex, birthdate, birthplace, degrees obtained, religious practice and influential books and professors in the life of the interviewee. For the purpose of clarity and analysis the individual coded categories were grouped into the broader factors of general characteristics, educational background, personal characteristics and professional lives. A complete description of the categories, and coding scheme is found in Table A-7. These data were subjected to a general descriptive analysis and in some cases the variables were cross tabulated. As a result, not all participants' protocols could be coded for every variable; the number of respondents for each variable differs and is noted in brackets.

General Characteristics

Of the interviewees, 82% were males compared to 18% females (N=108). The majority (57%) of interviewees were born between 1911 and 1930 (n=90). Sixty-seven percent of the participants were born in Canada while 24% were born in either England or the United States, (n=106) (see Figure F-3). Information was not available for 2 interviewees. The largest number, 46%, of interviewees came from

families in which there were 2 or 3 children (n=94). Thirty-four percent were first born while 24% were second born and 13% were only children (n=92). At the time of the interview, the interviewees ranged in age from 31 to 93, $\bar{x}$ =54, mode=60, (n=88). Of 99 respondents, 30% of the fathers were employed in the service field, 23% in trade and commerce, 10% in transportation, and 6% in agriculture (see Figure F-4). Fathers were employed in various fields such as the following: accounting, building, farming, merchandising, marine engineering, medicine, law, banking and homesteading. Eighty-one percent of the interviewees were currently employed in a University (n=101). The participants were located in all provinces except Prince Edward Island. Interviewees were well distributed regionally across Canada, 19 % in Western Canada, 26% in the Prairies, 17% in Ontario, 17% in Quebec and 14% in Eastern Canada (n=92)².

Educational Background

Eighty-eight percent of the interviewees had earned a PHD (n=103). Forty-eight percent were educated in Canada and 28% were

² More specifically, there were 18 interviewees located in British Columbia (7 at U. of B.C., 5 at U. of Victoria and 6 based at home), 18 in Alberta (8 at U. of Calgary, 6 at U. of Alberta and 4 at Edmonton), 2 in Saskatchewan at the U. of Saskatchewan, 7 in Manitoba (3 at U. of Winnipeg, and 4 at U. of Manitoba), 19 in Ontario (8 at Western, 5 at U. of Toronto, 2 at Carleton, 2 at home, 1 at U. of Ottawa and 1 at N.D.M.C), 19 in Quebec (11 at McGill, 5 at U. of Montreal, and 1 at each of Sir George Williams, Allen Memorial and home), 3 in New Brunswick (2 at U. of N.B. and 1 at Acadia), 4 in Nova Scotia at Dalhousie and 4 in Newfoundland at Memorial. McGill University had the largest number of interviewees. In addition, 4 interviewees were located in the United States including Johns Hopkins, Cornell University and San Francisco.

granted degrees in both Canada and the United States (n=102) (see Figure F-5). Of the interviewees, 53% were applied psychologists compared with 47% experimental (n=91). They were working in various fields such as administration (22%), testing and counselling (22%), and physiology and animal studies (20%) (n=60). At the end of high school 64% went directly to University (n=98). Seventy-seven percent started University in either science or some other field as compared to 24% who began their studies in psychology (n=98). The majority, 67% of the interviewees, first heard of psychology in University (n=94). And finally, at the end of third year, 75% continued in University rather than working for a period or enlisting in the Armed Services (n=89).

Personal Characteristics

Most of the interviewees were Protestant (n=60). Sixty-two percent came from homes in which religion was practiced (n=68). Seventy-three percent of the homes had reading material in the form of books, encyclopedias, magazines, newspapers or journals (n=56). Fifty-four participants reported that 74% of their parents expected them to continue studying in University (n=54).

Professional Lives

The majority, 61%, of the interviewees moved once or twice during their professional career (n=76). Of the books which were most influential in the early career of the psychologists, 93% were in psychology (n=45). The most influential author cited was Donald Hebb followed by J. S. Woodworth and E. G. Boring. Other authors mentioned more than once included Kohler, G. Allport, McDougall, Freud, Rogers, James, Osgood, Koffka, Skinner, Eysenck, Piaget,

Bartlett and books on Gestalt psychology. Finally, 96% of the influential professors were in psychology (n=47). Again, Donald Hebb was the most frequently mentioned professor, followed by Bill Line, Bob MacLeod, Bill Blatz, Brother Philip, George Humphrey, George Ferguson, Kenneth Spence, Doug Smith, Ned Bott, Mary Northway, and Bruce Springbett.

Gender and Area of Psychology

It has already been noted that many interviews had missing entries and as a result only a limited set of more sophisticated analyses could be done, mainly those where a large number of participants were included. Variables of gender and area of psychology were examined in greater depth, using first, cross-tabulations and then chi-squares where appropriate.

For the variable of gender only the chi-square for gender and what field the interviewee started in in University was significant, $\chi^2 = 10.03629$, $df=2$, $p = .00662$. Female interviewees more than males began their studies in psychology, while males started in science or another field. All other chi-squares for gender were not significant.

For the variable of area of study, experimental/applied, none of the chi squares were found to be significant.

The coding and general statistical description of the 108 oral interviews gives one type of reading of the vast information available. In order to give a more complete understanding of the material, a thematic reading was also conducted. The 108 interviews were carefully read for recurring themes. Those that emerged in several of the interviews included: gender issues, how psychology was chosen, the impact of the Depression of the 1930s and of World

War II on the selection of psychology, religion, the influence of family affiliation with regard to religion and sibling illness on the development of the individual and/or his/her career. Only frequently mentioned themes are discussed.

While reading the oral interviews certain gendered themes emerged. I observed that females commented on specific experiences which were not discussed by males. These can be categorized into positive and negative influences affecting women. Positive influences included mothers as role models and husbands as mentors. Negative influences were reflected in the restrictions placed on women by society, husbands and academia.

The mother's positive influence on the female career was noted by Reva Potashin. To her mother, it was important for her daughter to do as well as possible educationally but, above all, she "must be a good person too". It is the person who was important and not the material possessions. In her interview, Marion MacDonald Wright noted that her mother had gone overseas with the Americans in World War I as a psychiatric nurse. As a result, her mother was very keen on her daughter receiving an education and in earning her own living. Nora Loeb Weckler reflected how her mother fought to go to high school and then Normal School, in order to become a teacher. Her mother organized the Birth Control League of Canada in 1915 and worked for the "Women's International League for Peace and Freedom" during World War I. For Weckler going to University was taken for granted. In some ways these mothers were exceptional in that most mothers did not work once the children were born. Before marriage or children most mothers were teachers,

secretaries or nurses. These were the positions available to women. These early options continued to be available to the female interviewees.

Despite Marion MacDonald Wright's mother's ambitions for her daughter, her mother insisted that Wright go to Normal School to become a teacher. She hated the experience because she had wanted to be a journalist and work on a newspaper. Anne Bell noted that despite the fact that she did well in school, her only options for a career were "a teacher, nurse or to work in a store". She chose teaching and taught until she married when she stopped for twenty years before returning to school. Grace Bredin came from a family of four boys and four girls. She was the youngest by four years. Bredin was born when her mother was close to menopause. As a result, Bredin recalled feeling rejected as a child because she interfered with her mother's "moving out into the world". Later, however, Bredin was to learn how her birthorder affected her own life and role as a woman. As she pursued her studies, the reason for her birth became clear. Her mother stated that Bredin was conceived to "look after me in old age". It was her responsibility, as the youngest daughter, to care for her mother thus limiting her career choices, something she resented.

Coming from an upper class family, Madame Theresa Gouin Decarie's experience was somewhat different, but she too was to discover how women's roles were restricted. Decarie attended Sacred Heart Secondary School where the goal of the educators was to make them into "young ladies". They were taught to talk well, behave well, and to know Latin. In addition, they were taught that

they were "not to go on to superior studies, but to marry someone of superior studies". One of the teachers asked Decarie if she would like to study more. He started to teach four girls Greek, astronomy and math but this was not tolerated by the Superior. The course was stopped but the girls decided to continue on their own. They found professors to teach them chemistry, physics and math at the University of Montreal. For two years they had private tuition until they were finally allowed to take the "regular baccalaureate".

Florence Snodgrass stated that "boys were to be educated. I was destined to go to teacher's college". Having received her B.A., Mary Jean Wright went to University of Toronto for her M.A. She was to be a teaching assistant to Bott. Her father thought that "I was going to get married and he thought it was pretty silly for me to go on. He said, 'I'll give you the \$1000 to go on with your M.A. or you can give it up and use the \$1000 for your sheets and pillow slips'. I said, 'I wanted to go on'". Wright realized that she was getting older and that maybe she was not going to marry, therefore, she needed to become qualified to get a proper job. She stated, "I wanted to marry but I was very achievement motivated".

For many of the female interviewees, further studies did not occur until later in life after they married and raised families. For some, their husbands exerted a positive influence. Jane Stewart stated that her husband, Dalbir Bindra, himself a psychologist, was important in her becoming a psychologist. For some women their return to study was linked to their husband's career. Muriel Stein did not go to University until she was 30 years old. She worked until her husband started his practice as a psychiatrist and then she

started to pursue her own interests. After having been granted her B.A. in social work, Virginia Douglas' husband decided that he wanted to continue with graduate work at the University of Michigan. She followed her husband with the intention of pursuing her Master of Social Work but then switched to psychology in 1953 to 1958. Anne Bell's husband wanted an academic degree. They moved to Winnipeg where her husband attended University while she worked as a music teacher. But the school needed kindergarten teachers not music teachers. She became interested in child development and started to take night courses in psychology. Her husband died and she finished her B.A. In 1957, at age 54, she threw all her resources together and decided on continuing her studies in graduate school despite the fact that she still had two daughters in high school. For Mary Salter Ainsworth, (1969) her husband's placement in Baltimore gave her an opportunity to work at Johns Hopkins in experimental psychology.

While these husbands' influence was positive either through encouragement or by opening a space for their wives, other husbands negatively viewed their wife's aspirations. Perhaps the most poignant of the negative stories was told by Magda Arnold. After completing elementary school in Austria, Magda Arnold continued in Commercial School. Following this, she recounted how she went to work in a local bank as a clerk and stayed there until she married in 1926. Following her marriage, she and her husband went to Prague for two years where she worked as a bookkeeper and foreign language correspondent. In 1927, she came to Toronto with her husband where she continued to work as a bookkeeper until she left to have her first of three children. Arnold recalled that she was

a "bright student". The teachers wanted her to go to University but there was no money and the aunts who raised her were not educated and were not interested in education. After her third child was born in 1935, as there was no money for a separation from her husband, they remained together but separate. In 1933, she attended the University of Toronto. Her husband "thought it terrible that [she] go with children". She withdrew but was still admitted, "so in 1935 after a third child and a marriage breakdown, [she] said that he could do what he wanted and [she] wanted to go to University. He agreed". Since her husband was a professor at Victoria College, she had no fees. In 1942, she was granted a PHD despite her husband's lack of support.

The reaction of academia to the female student was also a problem at times. In 1952, Muriel Stein received her BSc degree and the psychology prize from McGill University. She was told that she could do graduate work until it was exposed that she was a married woman. Muriel was finally allowed to take her M.A degree and at the age of 39 was granted her PHD. Mary Northway attended Cambridge University. She explained that Cambridge women were not "granted degrees, only titles". She protested. Northway remarked that she was "on the sideline as a watchdog in 'a man's world'". Despite her experience, she stated that she never felt less important because she was a woman. Blossom Wigdor appeared to be ahead of her time. In high school she took physics rather than music. When it came time for graduate work, she could not decide between Medicine or psychology. The decision was made for her, despite her high marks. The end of World War II meant that there

was a sudden surge in University enrollment due to the returning veterans. The Dean saw that she was engaged and stated, "We can't afford to risk taking a woman who is about to get married and we have all these men who want to make a career in Medicine and you will probably drop out after awhile". Wigdor chose Psychology. Ruth Hoyt-Cameron had been accepted into the PHD program at McGill but Hebb would not take her. According to Hoyt-Cameron, Hebb maintained that he "didn't know what to do with a woman. There was no place for women in psychology in Canada". She replied that it was her problem to deal with this and not his. She argued with him until she was finally accepted. Hoyt-Cameron did state that once she was accepted, she was never treated differently except that she was "not allowed to use power tools alone".

Harassment was also present in the academic setting. Marion MacDonald Wright mentioned that she took an abnormal psychology course from a particular professor. She did not like him as "he threatened the girls; they would complain but nothing would be done. They felt that they had to put up with this". Finally, War had a specific effect on the women. Many of the female interviewees mentioned how when men went off to War, "women filled the gap" (Wright, 1969). Mary Wright reported that the War had an indirect impact on the women.

... There is no doubt that the way in which the women who were caught up in the war effort, either at home or abroad, acquitted themselves under pressure [and] gained for them a respect and an elevated status which could not be easily put down (Wright, 1992, 679-680).

A thematic reading of the oral interviews gives a rich insight into the lives of female psychologists in Canada and also what it meant to be female at this time. Despite the limited number of career options available to females, these women were able to transcend the restrictions imposed by society and family. They displayed strength and determination in pursuing their goals.

Another theme that emerged from the collection was the variety of reasons given for choosing psychology as a career. One of the male interviewees chose psychology to become a clinical psychologist or psychotherapist because of his interest in Freud and also due to his own depression. Initially, he started in geology but then lost interest. Alf Sheppard felt that he wanted to do something to make life better for people. He started in engineering but found that he could not relate to people intimately in that field. He thought of the ministry but then turned to psychology. Ronald Schaub signed up for psychology but stated that he did not know why. He mentioned that he had been involved in the Y.M.C.A., had worked as a counsellor and as a waterfront director among other things but did not know how much influence these had on his decision. He thought that psychology was clinical and this meant that psychologists read people's minds, told them what to do and what they were thinking. For Willie Runquist his decision to pursue a career in psychology was based on a personality conflict. He started in chemistry but hated the professor and switched to psychology. Finally, Robert MacLeod's decision to continue in psychology was economic. After he graduated, he was made two offers, one from Toronto and the other from McGill. The latter graduate program offered more money so

that determined the direction of his studies.

Choosing to study psychology was not always a clear, methodical decision. Personal depression, a desire to help others, dislike of a professor and money offers, all influenced the career choice of these psychologists. Another factor was also operating at this time which affected the possibility for studies and the future of many of the psychologists.

The Depression years were cited as having had a profound effect on many of the interviewees' desires for education. Joseph Royce was born in 1921 to "well-off" parents. He remembered the ease of his childhood in this environment until the Depression years when he was forced to move in with his mother's family. He stated how he "felt poor from the age of nine on". He described this new life as one of hardship, relief, and work. Gordon McMurray received his B.A. in 1933. His father was not doing well financially at that time and as a result he was unable to go to McGill for graduate studies. Instead, he turned to education. For Rusty Wendt the Depression also meant economic hardship. He was unable to attend University at the end of high school and went to Normal School at the age of 17 and taught when he was 18. However, teaching provided him with the funds to take summer courses at the University of Edmonton, until he could finally enter the second year of University full-time. In 1931, Whit Morton graduated with his M.A. He wanted to continue in Law but couldn't afford to with the Depression. He found that the Rockefeller Foundation offered money to do a PHD in psychology. Funds were available to research problems related to the economic depression. Ace Beach's father was a farmer and

farming was particularly badly affected during the Depression. He started agricultural studies in an effort to overcome the hardship of Depression but eventually switched to psychology. Finally, for Wallace Lambert, the Depression caused him to be "sensitive to many aspects of the human side of life -- the suffering, the unfairness". He saw the suffering of those who had nothing. In addition, he experienced the "humour, and camaraderie, everyone was in the same boat". As soon as he realized that he could make a living from psychology, he was "hooked".

The Depression meant a change in lifestyle for many of the interviewees. The lack of funds affected course selection and career choice. Hardship brought people together and highlighted human suffering.

In addition to the Depression, another area that had a profound effect on the lives of these interviewees was World War II. Rather than focus on the professional research involvement of psychologists in the War effort which was significant and an area of particular interest to Myers during the interview questioning, I have chosen to highlight how the War affected the personal lives and decisions of several of the interviewees. To discuss the development and contribution of psychology during the War is beyond the parameters of this thesis and is the subject of a dissertation in progress by Katalin Dzinás at York University.

Derek Cororan noted the influence of the War during his high school years. He mentioned how he learned about statistics by following and discussing with classmates and friends "how many German fighters were cut down". Alf Sheppard recounted how the

University officials encouraged the students to complete their degrees as quickly as possible. This meant that he had to drive a bus from 6:10 p.m. to 2:30 a.m. to support his tuition costs and then he would go home to sleep before going to school. He commuted to University by car but eventually couldn't finish his degree because gasoline was rationed. Eventually he bought a motorcycle, finished his degree and then went into the Army. Endel Tulving recounted how War affected his career decision. He was born in Estonia near the Russian border. He was a good student in school and it was taken for granted that he would be a lawyer. In 1940, the Russians invaded and in 1944, he was taken to Germany. Eventually, he was taken prisoner by the Americans and he joined relatives in the Displaced Persons camp in Wurtemberg. In 1944, schools were set up in the camps where he was able to complete his last year of high school. He was interested in studying psychology but there was nowhere to study this in Germany so he went to Medical School in Heidelberg in 1954 to study psychiatry. He stayed for two semesters but was forced to leave for lack of money. He worked in the American Army as a translator. Eventually, he came to Canada where he was assigned to a farm near St. Thomas, Ontario. Finally, he found his way to Toronto and Psychology.

Ernest Poser's War experience is also interesting because it described life before, during and after the War. It is also one of the most poignant stories of dislocation in war time and the way careers are shaped, not unlike Endel Tulving's career, by tremendous arbitrariness. Ernest Poser was born in 1921 when Vienna was "at the height of affluence". In 1922, the family moved to Leipzig where

many literary people frequented his home. Poser noted that psychology in Europe between the Wars was a literary topic. Both his parents were traditional but not religious Jews. At the age of 10 or 11, Poser remembered that "things weren't all rosy in the state of Germany". In 1933, his family was "whisked out of Germany"; they left as if they were going on vacation. They went first to Belgium and then to England where they had family and his father reestablished himself in the fur trade. At the age of 14, he left school against his parents' wishes as they valued education. When War broke out, the family status was insecure as they had been in England for only six and a half years (seven years were required for naturalization). Poser was interned and sent to Liverpool to a concentration area where people were collected together and then sent overseas to an unknown destination. He was sent to Quebec but all the signs were removed so he did not know where he was. He was kept in an internment camp, at first, in Northern Ontario near Timmins and then, sent to a prison camp in June 1940. He had to wear prison clothing which he protested, but to no avail. Next, he was not allowed to write. No one knew where he was. Again, he and others protested. Since these restrictions violated the Geneva Convention, he was allowed to write once every two weeks on special forms which were then censored. He did not understand why the Canadians were so rough. The detainees were received as war criminals. Poser stated that the experience taught him about "affiliation, its complications and what it really mean[t] to belong". He noted that many of the detainees were left with "some kind of scarring, a residue of resentment". Despite his experience, Poser

remarked that "it was not a bad thing. ... gave a different kind of perspective on things. ... also, I had the ability to stand alone at times and be comfortable"... At first, he did not attend 'camp university', but "it was not as bad as being reminded of the concentration camp days". He found it unbelievable that "the Canadian authorities would put German prisoners of War, Nazis, in the same camp with refugees, many of whom were Jewish". The War experience, especially the camp, "helped give me a sense of destiny". It was in the camp setting that Poser began his educational career in agriculture which he later continued in psychology.

The War often meant that studies were interrupted. Many of the interviewees gained valuable life experience during the War which later affected their career choice and practice of psychology. While researching the oral interviews thematically, three other areas emerged which in some way further affected the lives and decisions of some of the psychologists. The restrictive social climate of the 1920s through the 1950s, religious affiliation and the effect of an early illness or death of a sibling on the family dynamics are briefly described.

To illustrate the social climate, Roderick Cooper stated that in the late 1950s when he was applying for a position as a psychologist in the United States, it was necessary to write on the American application that you were "not a Communist and had no Communist affiliations". In 1924, J. Win Bridges applied to McGill for a position. He ended up teaching in Medicine and not in Psychology, his preferred area, because "Tait did not like the fact that [he] was divorced". Sometimes the restrictions were internal to psychology.

As a student, Sam Rabinovitch loved his work in psychology at McGill but he "wanted to develop more than only one part of [him] self". He wanted to work with humans and he told this to Hebb. Rabinovitch recalled how Hebb "almost kicked me out of his office. He called me a bleeding social worker ...". Hebb was firm that the only psychology was "scientific psychology". Apparently, Hebb did not mind if Rabinovitch studied in another field but not another area within psychology.

On several occasions, the interviewees mentioned how religious affiliation impacted on them. Abram Amsel's parents wanted him to go McGill. "For a Jewish boy to go to University was something very special". This often meant great sacrifice for the parents. Amsel did not fulfill his parents' dream; he was rejected from McGill because of the Jewish quota in place¹ at that time. Sam Rabinovitch remembered how when he returned to Montreal in the 1950s a few people tried to block his appointment "on the basis that they didn't want another Jewish Department head".

Illness was not uncommon in the families of the interviewees. In some cases it was the illness or death of a parent which affected the family. In other cases, it was the illness or death of a child. Willie Runquist recounted the effect of his sister's death on the family. He was also ill as a child and since his mother worked, he was cared for by his grandmother. Being ill meant that they spent a lot of time together and as a result, she taught him to read at the age of three. Reva Potashin mentioned how her older sister had been ill with tuberculosis and how she was sent to a Sanatorium but later died. Potashin recalled that there was a "certain restraint in the

family" and as a result, she was "introspective and timid". Again, Whit Morton noted that his older sibling's death meant that he was "lonely" and "overprotected". Illness in the family often meant that the other children were overprotected. While it is difficult to estimate a causal link between illness of a family member, particularly a sibling, and career choice as a psychologist, there does seem to be a heightened sensitivity to psychological factors as important.

While the Oral History Collection was for Myers, in the 1960s, biased to a more celebratory, "Great Man" account of psychology in Canada, it has a different quality in the 1990s when historiographic issues which are more central to writing history are taken into account. In many ways, the oral interviews are more like conversations, more "impressions" than "facts". In this regard, one must also evaluate the Oral History Collection according to criteria of oral history research. In 1948, Allan Nevins organized the first "Oral History Project" at Columbia University resulting in a growing acceptance of oral history as an academic method of investigation. Oral history is an interview in which "historical information, insight, and opinion are sought deliberately and are deliberately preserved as a historical source" (Dunaway & Baum, 1984, p. 95). The main purpose of oral histories is to preserve and collect human memories which might be otherwise lost (p. 52). At its best, oral history can be used to empower the less 'well known' and 'less vocal' members of the community. "Oral history is a history built around people. It thrusts life into history itself and it widens the scope. It allows heroes not just from the leaders, but from the unknown majority of

the people" (Dunaway & Baum, 1984, p. 50). Oral histories have been used to empower the working class and women, for example, giving them an opportunity to record their own stories.

With the thrust of oral history work being to broaden the number of voices heard in any given historical accounting, similarly, to have a complete history of psychology in Canada, it is important to interview not only the "Great Men" but also some of the lesser known members or 'marginal' members of the profession who might see psychology in a different perspective. However, this view of oral history appears to conflict with Myers' long-standing preoccupation with "eminence". From his selection process, I see a tension between his preoccupation with 'eminence' in building psychology and his interest in the range of lived experience to be found among both eminent and lesser known individuals. As discussed earlier in the interviewee selection process, Myers tended to focus on the prominent and well known psychologists of Canada but it has also been shown that he did try to include some lesser known people as well. However, the reason for their inclusion is less clear and does not seem to be as carefully planned as his choice of the well known. In fact, some of the less eminent were most likely chosen because they provided information for his History of Academic Psychology in Canada. In addition, Myers may not have even chosen these psychologists, but rather left this decision to the Department Chair. What is important to note is that when looking at the Oral History Collection, there is a tension between the goals of celebratory history and those of oral history. The former focuses exclusively on the prominent, the people of 'voice' while the latter attempts to give

'voice' to the less prominent, less well known. Myers seems to have transcended the problems inherent in this conflict by, at least, including some lesser known psychologists in his Oral History Collection.

The second feature of the oral history collection is less about eminence and more about lives, which touches on the issue of narrative. Part of the task of assessing what type of historical accounting might result from the totality of the Oral History Collection requires a more contemporary understanding of the construction of texts. Interest in narrative has recently returned to psychology. Much has been written by Bruner (1990) and Polkinghorne (1988) among others indicating that narrative is as valid a method of understanding human activity as is experimental psychological research. For narrative-based researchers, the production of the text is critical and two areas of importance emerge: first, the difference between oral and written texts, and secondly, the interviewer-interviewee relationship. In this regard, Myers seemed uncannily aware of many contemporary text-related issues well before they surfaced in the social sciences.

The Oral History project was formally initiated in 1970 with a grant from the Canada Council. The grant meant that Myers could obtain recording equipment and he could travel throughout Canada from St. John's, Newfoundland to Victoria, British Columbia taping reminiscences of veteran psychologists. With regard to oral versus written texts, Myers noted that, "A casual and spontaneous conversation contains more idioms, more broken uncompleted sentences, more false starts, more pauses, and is usually at a faster

rate of speech than is found in ordinary dictation" (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). Since the transcript goes back to the interviewee for his/her approval, Myers stated that "an exact, literal, precise transcript is not appropriate. It does not look good " (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). In many ways, this edited and sanitized version of the oral history made interviewees more comfortable. They were not confronted with gaps in their own understandings of their lives. However, these versions may have also lost significant information about the way the interviewee thought about psychology. For example, a year and half after an interview with Endel Tulving, the well known cognitive psychologist whose special field of research was memory, he wrote in a letter to Myers the following:

What a blabbermouth I am, ... It is my impression that when I talk about bygone days I still think about events occurring then in the way I thought then, too ... Thus, reading certain parts of the interview, I knew that this is what I had said, but I kept wondering why I had said it that way, rather than the way I really think about them now. Are you sure I did not give that interview under hypnosis? ... Perhaps I should look into this matter of the apparent permanence of earlier interpretations of experienced events in the face of subsequent changes in the apperceptive mass (Interview with Endel Tulving, C.P.A. Archives, Volume 27).

The unedited oral version is likely to be more nuanced, ambiguous and contradictory than the written and expressed through contextual features such as pauses, false starts, repetitions

and idioms that reveal a different historical account (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). For this reason, the oral tapes need to be examined alongside the transcripts. According to Myers, there is a difference between listening to the recording and reading the transcript as much of the real meaning in the material is lost in the transcription. A lot of the meaning is communicated by non-verbal means such as the intonation, chuckles, and sighs (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). Myers, too, recognized the importance of the oral interview when he stated, "This Archivist [C R. Myers] is now convinced that the really important thing to preserve and study is the recording -- not the transcript" (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). When the historian of psychology goes to the Archives, it is usually to the written transcripts that s/he will go. It is for this reason that I examined both the oral tapes and written transcripts of a number of the interviewees in order to identify and understand discrepancies, if they exist.

As mentioned earlier, an editing process occurs when the oral tapes are transcribed. The 'uhs' and 'pauses' are removed giving a smooth, continuous story. Each revision of the original is part of a co-authoring process of the story. But there is also another editing process going on which must be investigated, that is, the presence of the audience or listener. During the interview process there are different levels of audience. The interviewee speaks to the audience, that is to Myers. This is one level. The next level is Myers' audience or the audience for whom the Oral History Collection is intended. This is Myers' fantasy audience, the reader, composed of future students or historians interested in some aspect of the history of

psychology. The important point to consider is that each audience 'reads' the information in a way that material is edited according to the purpose of the project and the experience of the reader. Multiple people participate in the construction of the oral interviews and their meaning.

When comparing the oral tapes with the written transcripts for Donald Hebb, Dan Berlyne, Mary Northway, Leola Neal and Mary Salter Ainsworth, I noted that the oral tapes were accurately transcribed. What is important in the transcribing process, was not the accuracy of the transcription, which is also essential, but that the oral tapes gave a different tone to the text. I stress the word tone; unlike Myers', I do not believe that the oral tape gave a different meaning. Hearing the voices of the interviewer and interviewee made me feel that I was an observer and part of the interview process. The tone of the interview was more personal and the participants were not objects on the page but rather very real people. In addition, the oral interview included, as Myers noted, the pauses and hesitations. These pauses and hesitations also give the interview another dimension. Suddenly, the replies to the questions were no longer automatic. Rather, I was given some insight into the thought processes of the interviewees. If the pause was long, which was not indicated on the transcribed page, the answer, in some cases, had a slightly different assuredness and one might alter the conclusion as a result. I was given the impression that the interviewee may have been uncomfortable about the question or uncertain about the answer, perhaps due to memory lapse. Because the written transcription gives no indication of the rate of exchange

of speech, or overlapping speech, the oral tape gives a more realistic, and truer perception of the interview. The interview is more interactive in that both participants are perceived as active rather than passive.

I found that when I read the written interview, I constructed the meaning of the interview based on my own experience and interpretation. Because I had a specific purpose when reading or listening to the interview, the story which I would extract from the material was related to that purpose. It remains an empirical question if another person reading or listening to the oral interviews would draw a different story depending on his/her purpose. Listening to the oral tapes did not alter the meaning making process, but I was very conscious of the people involved in the interview and as a result was more aware of my own interpretative process.

To get a better sense of Myers' interview process, I conducted two interviews using Myers' questions and a few of my own (see Appendix D and Appendix E). I noted the interpretative process as I transcribed the two oral interviews with John Adair and Ray Berry. It was through this task that I gained the greatest understanding into the oral/written process. Since I was involved in both the oral and written process, (Myers hired someone to do the transcribing), I realized how difficult and labour intensive the transcribing process can be. One of the most difficult parts of transcribing was taking oral conversation and converting it into writing. When the interviewee spoke at a normal rate of speech for conversation, that rate of speech was too rapid for the typing ability of this transcriber. As a result, the tape was continually replayed and only short segments of speech

could be listened to at one time. This affected the transcribing process and the meaning making process. What I noted was that when a person speaks, thoughts are not logically contained within neat sentences. Rather, the thoughts run together and it is the task of the transcriber to decide what thoughts are contained within the sentence. This is a very difficult process. Breaking thoughts or sentences at different points can result in different meanings. But, having conducted the interview and having, in one case, observed the interviewee in the process of the interview, I found both helped me somewhat in deciding on how to construct the sentence. As an example, the interview with Adair provides a good illustration of the problems of transcribing. For example, in some parts, the Adair tape sounds like one uninterrupted sentence.

... My mother's grandfather came from Biarritz France to Mexico City and her father was born there and died there and she was born there he was in a chinaware business in Mexico somewhere along the way around the time of Pancho Villa intelligencia essentially the entrepreneurs were chased out of the country but by the same token I think that when he had lost his chinaware factory so they were not in good financial shape as is often the case when people emigrate they leave to seek something better than they currently have and so they came to Texas ...

This was transcribed as the following:

... My mother's grandfather came from Biarritz, France to Mexico City and her father was born there and died there and she was born there. He was in a chinaware business

in Mexico. Somewhere along the way, around the time of Pancho Villa intelligencia essentially the entrepreneurs were chased out of the country, but by the same token, I think that when he had lost his chinaware factory, so they were not in good financial shape as is often the case when people emigrate they leave to seek something better than they currently have, so they came to Texas.

After the transcript was sent to Adair for review, the underlined following changes were made by him:

My mother's grandfather came from Biarritz, France to Mexico City, and her father was born and died there, and she was born there. He was in a chinaware production business in Mexico. Somewhere along the way, around the time of Pancho Villa intelligencia essentially the entrepreneurs were chased out of the country. But by the same token, I think that when my grandfather had lost his chinaware factory, the family was not in good financial shape. As is often the case when people emigrate, they leave to seek something better than what they currently have. So they came to Texas.

Note that not only was some of the punctuation changed but also some of the wording was altered or new wording was added to clarify the meaning.

Also, being aware of how pauses and sentences start and stop and idioms can colour a reading of the text, I tried to include as much of this information as possible within the transcription. In addition, when the transcribed text was sent to the interviewee for editing,

his/her comments and interpretation of the text resulted, again, in a different version of the interview (see Appendix G). Note how Adair clarified the meaning of the text by adding bracketed comments. He also deleted some of the repetition such as the word Catholic. In doing this, he removed some of the "thinking aloud" which occurred during the interview. By removing the pauses, idioms and hesitations, Adair created a smooth, seamless text. In contrast, Ray Berry did not edit his interview except for a few minor changes and as a result it remains a looser conversational text containing many starts and stops and incomplete thoughts.

Myers was correct when he stated that the oral tape needed to be examined alongside the transcript. There is a difference between listening to the recording and reading the transcript as much of the feeling or tone of the interview is lost in the transcription. It is not because there might be errors in the transcript. By listening to the oral tape, the reader is aware of the personal story or life history which is being told.

In the return to narrative investigation in psychology, contemporary issues facing researchers have much to do with the relationship between interviewer and interviewee in the construction of texts. Bruner (1990) delineates two modes of understanding in psychology. First, the "paradigmatic mode" of thought reflects the research of scientists who evaluate their work "in terms of tightly reasoned analyses, logical proof, and empirical observation" (p. 29). Secondly, "the narrative mode" reflects the work of those concerned with "human wants, needs and goals" and is evaluated by "how we make sense" of experiences, actions and our

lives (p. 29). History and psychology meet in narrative research and these were the two main interests of Myers in his own life's work. Psychologists have turned to narrative examination as a major principle in understanding an individual's life. Polkinghorne (1988) defined the study of narrative in psychology as "people conceiv[ing] of themselves into stories" (p. 107).; "narrative organizes experience into stories" (112). Also, McAdam (1993) wrote "Stories are less about facts and more about meaning" (p. 28).

The narrative method gives structure to events. The narrative has a sequence which gives the story a connectedness and a coherence. All stories, despite how complete they appear, are constructed in a way that certain events are included while others are left out (White, 1987). The purpose of the story guides the narrator in choosing which elements to include or exclude, thereby giving the story the appearance of unity. For example, unconnected events and inconsistent thoughts may be smoothed over. As already mentioned, the oral interview, with the assistance of an informed interviewer, can give the narrative an added dimension. It was an advantage for Myers to have known many of the people talked about as this helped him to keep the conversation going smoothly (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). As an example, Dr. John MacEachren, in Edmonton, at the age of 94, after reminiscing about experiments conducted in Wundt's lab in Leipzig, said of Myers to his housekeeper: "That young man knew so many of the people I have known, it was a pleasure talking to him" (U. of T. Archives).

Polkinghorne (1988) reminds us that "human beings are not simply constructions based on past events; they are also products of

narrative structures. They exist in narrative creations and are powerfully affected by them" (p. 121). It is important to look at how the interviewer's questions shaped the narrative. The stories that emerge in the interviews are less about truth or falsity by "paradigmatic mode" standards and more about believability and coherence according to the "narrative mode" (McAdams, 1993). Mary Northway, who was taped nine times by different interviewers (including Myers) for different purposes, supported this view when she stated the following:

When one recalls experiences of many years, the product is a creative reconstruction resulting from the way in which one has modified experience of events and recreated these with the passage of time and intervening influences. This is a legitimate approach to history provided one accepts that ... (one) is not seeking objective factual data. (These can, of course, be obtained from other sources) (U. of T. Archives).

In the interviews that Myers conducted with each participant, there is a life story being told that has more or less coherence. I want to look at his role in the construction of this coherence. Historically in psychology, the standardized interview was conducted with a fixed set of questions. The idea was that the interview was to be conducted in a neutral, objective format in order that the answers were not influenced in any way by the interviewer. The interviewee was instructed to answer the questions with short, concise, direct responses. This perspective echoes Bruner's (1990) concept of the "paradigmatic mode", the scientific or empirical standard at work in

psychological research. However, there have been challenges to this in narrative psychology.

It is perhaps because of this that Mishler's text, Research Interviewing, published in 1986 was considered to be subversive by many social scientists. In this text, he speaks of co-authorship and power relations between the researcher and the respondent. He suggests that the interview be less structured and the interviewer become part of the process of the interview itself. Instead of being deleted from the interview, the questioner is inserted into the interview. This perspective relates to Bruner's "narrative mode", how we make sense of our experiences and lives, and to other voices in psychology that start to reintroduce an earlier interest in various genres of personal accounts such as biography and autobiography into psychology (Allport, 1942; Denzin, 1970; Dollard, 1935; Runyan, 1982).

Although Myers conducted his interviews between 1962 and 1977 when the objective, structured interview was the accepted method, he did not follow this trend in his own historical work. He stated that when he attended a mini-workshop conference on interviewing methods at Simon Fraser University in Burnaby, British Columbia in 1969, that from his own experience he "disagreed with nearly everything said about the "right" way to go about collecting oral history material" (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). He was instructed that the interviewer should forget about the interviewee, who does not really matter, and focus on the prospective audience or listener. In Myers experience "the interview must concentrate wholly and solely on the interviewee and forget about the audience"

(C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). The interview should never last more than twenty minutes. The ideal interviewer, he learned at the conference, goes away and listens to the tape, prepares more questions and continues later. Myers' interviews lasted from two to five hours and on rare occasions when the interview was interrupted and continued later, Myers found it difficult to 're-establish' the reminiscent autobiographical mood which he considered "so essential" (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). He realized that there was no one "right" way to conduct an interview. Myers' ideas about interviewing have a contemporary ring given the kind of writing Mishler was doing in the late 1980s about the relationship between the interviewer and the interviewee. This was similar to feminist research methods stressing the participation of the interviewer. The focus was less on the questions and more on the understanding of the interviewee (Reinharz, 1992).

In going through Myers' papers at the University of Toronto, I noted that he was a Rogerian therapist. Some of the key elements of Rogerian theory include "active listening", "empathic understanding", "unconditional acceptance" (Teich, 1992, p. 1; Rogers, 1965; Rogers, 1959). These terms all refer to reflecting or saying back another person's feeling and thought. In this way, the interviewee feels that he or she is understood.

Real communication occurs ... when we listen with understanding ... to see the expressed idea and attitude from the other person's point of view, to sense how it feels to him, to achieve his frame of reference in regard to the thing he is talking about (Teich, 1992, p. 3).

In other words, using Rogerian principles results in positive and productive communication. Bob MacLeod, writing to Myers from Cornell one month after the interview confirmed this point, "I have had a good many recorded interviews, but never an interview conducted with so little tension. I was aware of the skills you used but never bothered by them" (Interview with Bob MacLeod, C.P.A. Archives, Volume 25). Again two years later after reading the transcript, MacLeod stated, "I am impressed all over again by your skill as an interviewer. You made it a pleasant and relaxing experience, yet you always kept the conversation beautifully under control" (Interview with Bob MacLeod, C.P.A. Archives, Volume 25).

It was important to Myers that the interview take place in the interviewee's office or home to provide familiar and comfortable surroundings. Myers' papers note that not only did this facilitate a relaxed conversation but also probably served as a memory aid (U. of T. Archives). Myers did not use a structured interview or standard set of questions. There was a structure but it was adapted to each interviewee and general at best. He did not probe or cross-question (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). His purpose was to create a warm, friendly, accepting atmosphere. He did try to establish at the outset a strong autobiographical mood by asking first about the place of birth, parents, siblings, earliest memories of family life, education and political and religious atmosphere of the home (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). Beyond this, he just encouraged a chronological account and tried to be as spontaneous and relaxed as he wanted the interviewee to be (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). After all, as Myers mentioned, "It is not often that someone sits down and, with genuine

warmth and interest, listens to us reminisce about our life history and career experiences" (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75). "Unlike the clinical interview, there is no problem to be solved -- no ulterior motive" (C.P.A. Archives, Volume 75).

Mishler (1986) argues that all interview texts involve power relations and need to be thought of as co-authored texts. Power relations and co-authorship are central to contemporary understandings of narrative research. In the standard interview, the power resides within the interviewer. Co-authorship implies that there is some distribution of power between the interviewer and interviewee. In the "narrative model" the interview process can empower the interviewee to lead the story. Mishler writes:

Although the interviewer may seek to be objective and unobtrusive, he must inevitably play a dynamic role in the creation of the interview record, and the way he plays his role often determines not only the tone and character of the record produced but also the substance of the record content. Narrators frequently respond with what they think the interviewer wants to hear. The apparent aims and objectives of the interview may have much to do with the way he responds to the interview as a whole and to individual questions in particular (1986).

The latter point has been stressed in literary theory by such individuals as Bakhtin (1981; 1990) who wrote that the listener can shape the "utterance" or response from the beginning. The resulting narrative does not belong only to the interviewee, but to the interviewer as well. Feminist research methods have also

contributed to our knowledge of shared power and co-authorship. Some feminist interviewers downplay the status differences between themselves and people of a lower status in order to encourage trust. It is believed that trust encourages interviewees to tell their stories and that the truth lies in these stories (Reinharz, 1992). It is important to evaluate to what extent Myers was a co-author with his respondents in the oral histories, and to what extent Rogerian practice influenced this co-authorship process.

Myers' questions focused on the biographies of the interviewees. He stated that he approached the interview in this manner as a way of making the interviewee feel comfortable and relaxed and to create "the reminiscent autobiographical mood" which he considered to be "so essential". Indeed, nearly all of the oral interviews did begin with a biography. Ray Berry mentioned that Myers was fascinated by a book about biography, most likely Murchison's early autobiographies of psychologists published in several volumes from 1930 to 1966 (1930, Vol. I; 1932, Vol. II; 1936, Vol. III; 1952, Vol. IV; 1966, Vol. V).

... I don't remember what the title was, but it was to the effect of the history of psychology through biography. I don't know who wrote it but Myers was really quite impressed by that. As a consequence, I guess he decided to do that for Canadian psychology. ... this would be about 1953-54, in his class he alluded to this publication and talked about it. He was quite taken with the type of biographical information which was presented. Whether that was the germ of the idea or whether he had it as

well, whether that was an important influence in his decision, I really don't know. However, it does indicate why his questions took the kind of form they did. ... Well, instead of asking people what they did in psychology he went back asking the kinds of questions you began with, what is your background, what is your family background and so on. He was tapping into those biographical kinds of things rather than tackling history as a subject alone or without this other background. I think, it obviously impressed him (Interview with Ray Berry, 1996).

By using a biographical question format, Myers was capturing the life histories of psychologists rather than recording the history of academic departments or the history of psychology in Canada. As demonstrated earlier, these questions lead to some insight into the discursive forces which shaped psychologists. These forces included: gender, career decision making, impact of the Depression of the 1930s, World War II and family factors. The questions also give the reader an understanding of the Zeitgeist of the time.

However, Myers' question format did not relax all interviewees. John Adair commented in his interview with me:

... I do find the questions he asked a bit ... interesting. Well, I guess he may have had in mind some model of something similar to books where you get little autobiographical accounts of famous psychologists or something like that. ... I don't know that I particularly find my childhood and my religious life I don't find it

as relevant as he might. I think other things might be more interesting. I find the dynamics of psychology within Canada of more interest than my own self personally or something of that sort (Interview with John Adair, 1996).

Myers was constructing along with the interviewees a particular life story which, when read, gives the appearance of a continuous, coherent narrative. He does this through his selection of questions which shaped the content of the interview. He allowed the interviewees to respond to the questions, giving them time to think which is indicated by the pauses heard on the oral tapes. He also encouraged the respondents to elaborate on many comments by asking specific questions which helped clarify a response. Although the story appears to be continuous and coherent, it has, in fact, been deliberately shaped. In some cases, Myers would relate a story told by another interviewee and then ask the current interviewee if he/she had the same experience. The interviewee, if asked to talk about his/her life story without Myers' questions and conversation, might have created a different story. As an example, D. Hebb, in his 1969 interview with Myers, did not include the following information which was recorded in his autobiography in Lindzey's A History of Psychology in Autobiography:

Andreyev [a professor at McGill University] was to provide me with a proper training, and I would be a proper psychological and North American representative of conditioning as it should be, Russian style.

In the next sixteen months or so, I conditioned two

dogs and began a piece of research with one of them. ... I might have gone on, but the car accident in which my wife was killed also destroyed the car and made it impossible for me to continue the experiment, for lack of rapid transport from school to university. I spent the following school year running my pedagogical experiment finishing my paper on scientific method, and playing third-rate chess, while recovering from my personal disorganization and deciding what my future should be (Hebb, 1976).

In the preface to Volume VII, Lindzey provides the reader with an excerpt of the instructions to the contributors for this Volume, including Hebb.

The important decisions in regard to the contents of your autobiography are yours. We hope, however, that the document will devote some attention to the historical details of your life. In connection with the facts of life, we hope you will identify yourself with regard to such matters as place and date of birth, significant educational and professional experiences, and family. We are, of course, particularly interested in the intellectual and professional aspects of your life as they have influenced and been influenced by events, ideas, and persons in and out of the field of psychology. Your perception of major developments and issues within psychology during your lifetime and your relation to these events will be of special importance. We should appreciate any discussion

of your feelings, motives, and aspirations or of significant events that would increase the reader's understanding of you and your contributions to psychology. In brief, we are interested in your intellectual life history, but at the same time we feel that it should be illuminated by as much information about your personal background and inner motives as you are ready and able to divulge (1980, pp. xxi-xxii).

These directions are similar in some ways to Myers' interview questions. However, the fact that the interviewee is not meeting directly with the interviewer might account for some of the differences in the recorded history. The interviewee has a greater opportunity to think and reflect before responding and hence a more logical, coherent and complete account may result.

Hebb decided to study with Lashley in Chicago. The important point for the Oral History Collection is that in the Myers' oral history, Hebb's move to Chicago appeared to be continuous with his previous work, in that the reasons that affected his decision to move had been left out. Although the outline of the story remained the same, the Hebb version in Lindzey gave a deeper understanding of his decision making process and of the man, himself.

Both the interview questions and the shaping of a coherent story were affected by Myers, the Rogerian therapist. His students recalled courses with him about Rogerian interview techniques. Charles Preston remarked, "Myers taught interviewing following Rogerian technique. We listened to records and analyzed them. The course was called clinical psychology" (Interview with Charles

Preston, C.P.A. Archives, Volume 26). By using the principles of Rogerian therapy, Myers was able to create a warm, accepting, empathetic atmosphere. Many of the interviewees commented how relaxed they felt. In addition, being a Rogerian therapist and an applied psychologist, Myers was interested in the person and the personal story. This might explain why he was so drawn to this particular method of questioning. Despite Myers' skill as a Rogerian therapist, he was very much in control of the interview. The interviewee was encouraged to respond as completely as possible, but the idea of co-authorship did not affect the interview process. First, both the interviewer and interviewee were of equal power academically, so the notion of power differences was not really a factor in these interviews other than the fact that Myers was in control of the interview process itself. Next, the interviewee at no time appeared to have lead the interview. However, Myers did participate freely in the interview, often interjecting his own stories and comments, especially during discussions of the War years.

Myers was an equal participant in the interview process. As a result of this role, he determined the relaxed tone, character and content of the story. One can conclude that Myers, the creator, was very much influenced by his Rogerian training.

As noted earlier, the Oral History Collection as a totality for Myers tells the celebratory, "Great Man" story of the history of psychology in Canada. It is only when the Oral History Collection is teased apart and reorganized according to themes that the narrative being told can be examined contextually and critically. As time passes, the documented lives of Canadian psychologists reads more

as a social history and will find greater use for contemporary historians in this regard. In fact, the Oral History Collection does not lend itself to a history of psychology in Canada which is told much better in the Wright & Myers (1982) History of Academic Psychology in Canada. But then, George Ferguson remarked on his contribution of the history of psychology at McGill University for the History of Academic Psychology in Canada that "an account of the life of a department is perhaps closer to biography than to history" (1982, p. 33). This might explain the linkage between biography and history for Myers.

The Oral History Collection has been useful to other psychologists in augmenting his/her own personal and professional information about a psychologist. Gerald C. Cupchik was a post doctoral student and then a colleague of Dan Berlyne at the University of Toronto. Cupchik consulted the Oral History Collection to augment his information and understanding of Berlyne, the person, for an article entitled "The Legacy of Daniel E. Berlyne". In this article, Cupchik "examine[d] [Berlyne's] intellectual development in the context of reminiscences about childhood and educational experiences in England". Cupchik stated,

One extremely valuable source of information is the biographical interview which Berlyne gave to Roger Myers in 1973 as part of the latter's intended Oral History of Psychology in Canada. This four-hour (238 page transcription) interview is filled with many facets of Berlyne's personal and intellectual development ... (1988, p. 172).

In summary, I believe that there was a tension between Myers, the organizer, and Myers, the creator. At the same time as he was collecting interviews for the Oral History Collection, he was involved in building an eminent Psychology Department and preparing the research for his text with Mary Wright. There was this constant struggle between the academic, administrative part of him and the part of him which was interested in people. One part of him demanded that he be objective and in control of the situation. The other part of him was less restrictive, allowing for flow of conversation which often resulted in the exchange of stories and ideas. His interviews read more like life stories than as the history of psychology, and corroborated his distinction between "facts" and "impressions".

I agree with Mary Northway when she stated, "This is a legitimate approach to history provided one accepts that ... [one] is not seeking objective factual data"; and with Reinhartz, (1992) when she commented, that trust encourages interviewees to tell their stories and that the meaning lies in these stories.

Myers did fulfill his goal to collect the impressions of the people who were active in the early days of Canadian psychology. It would be unreasonable to ask of the Oral History Collection that it be a definitive archival recording of the history of psychology in Canada. For Myers, the history of psychology in Canada was the history of academic psychology and the "Great Men" who shaped it. Myers, however, has left historians, psychologists and students with a set of illuminating accounts of the lives of psychologists of a particular era.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1942). The use of personal documents in psychological science. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Baum, Willa K. (1987). Transcribing and Editing Oral History. American Association for State and Local History.
- Belanger, D. (1992). The Structuring of Canadian Psychology in Canada. In P. O'Neill (Ed.), The History of Psychology in Canada (pp. 710-712).
- Bernhardt, K. S. (Ed.). (1961). Training for Research in Psychology. The Canadian Opinion Conference, May, 1960. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- (1947). Canadian Psychology -- Past, Present and Future. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1(2), 49-60.
- Bertaux, D. & Kohli, M. (1984). The life story approach: A continental view. Annual Review of Sociology, 10, 215-37.
- Bruner, Jerome. (1990). Acts of Meaning. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Canada, Bureau of Statistics. (1927). Sixth Census of Canada, 1921, III-Population. Ottawa: F. A. Acland, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty.
- Canadian Psychological Association. 1969 Directory. Ottawa, Ontario: C.P.A.
- 1975 Directory. Montreal, Quebec: C.P.A.
- Cohler, B. J. (1982). Biography and Society. The Life-History Approach in the Social Sciences. London/Beverly Hills, Calif.:

Sage Publications, Inc.

Cupchik, G. C. (1988). The legacy of Daniel E. Berlyne. Empirical Studies of the Arts, 6(2), 171-186.

Denzin, N. K. (1970). The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods. Chicago: Aldine. 2nd ed. Reprinted 1978. London: Butterworths.

Dollard, J. (1935). Criteria for the Life History. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dunaway, D. K. & Baum W. (Eds.). (1984). Oral History. An Interdisciplinary Anthology. Nashville, Tennessee: American Association for State and Local History.

Ferguson, G. A. (1992). Psychology in Canada 1939-1945. In P. O'Neill The History of Psychology in Canada (pp. 697-705).

Hilgard, E. R., Leary, D. & McGuire, G. (1991). The history of psychology: A survey and critical assessment. Annual Review of Psychology, 42, 79-107.

Holquist, Michael (Ed.). (1981). The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Koch, Sigmund (Ed.). (1959). Psychology: A study of a Science. (Vol. 3). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Lindzey, Gardner (Ed.). (1980). A History of Psychology in Autobiography. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co.

Lee, D. J. (Ed.). (1994). Life and Story. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Lyotard, J. (1988). The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- MacLeod, R. B. (1955). Psychology in Canadian Universities and Colleges. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Social Science Research Council.
- McAdams, D. P. (1993). The Stories We Live By. New York, N. Y.: William Morrow & Co. Inc.
- McPherson, M. W. (1988). Some Values and Limitations of Oral Histories. In L. T. Benjamin, A History of Psychology (pp. 30-32). New, N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). Research Interviewing. Context and Narrative. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Morson, G. S. & Emerson, C. (1990). Bakhtin, M. Creation of a Prosais. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Murchison, C. (Ed.). (1961). A History of Psychology in Autobiography. Volume 1. New York: Russell & Russell.
- Myers, C. R. (1970). Journal citations and scientific eminence in contemporary psychology. American Psychologist, 25,(11), 1041-1048
- Oral history interviews and transcripts. National Archives of Canada. Canadian Psychological Association. MG 28, I 161, Volumes 24, 25, 26, 27, 75.
- Personal papers. University of Toronto Archives: B88-0048. Boxes /001 to /052.
- Nicholson, I. (1994). From the Kingdom of G-d to the beloved community, 1920-1930: Psychology and the social gospel in the work of Goodwin Watson and Carl Rogers. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 22, 196-206.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). Narrative Knowing and the Human

- Sciences. Albany, N. Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Pols, J. C. (1991). The School as Laboratory: The Development of Psychology as a Discipline in Toronto, 1915-1955. Unpublished M. A. Thesis.
- Pyke, S. W. (1992). The More Things Change ... In P. O'Neill, The History of Psychology in Canada (pp. 713-720).
- Reinharz, S. (1992). Feminist Methods in Social Research. New York, N. Y.: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Riessman, C. K. (1993). Narrative Analysis. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Roger, Carl R. (1951). Client-Centered Therapy. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Runyan, W. (1982). Life Histories and Psychobiography. New York, N. Y.: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, R. (1989). Does the history of psychology have a subject? History of the Human Sciences, 1, 146-177.
- Tagg, S. K. (1985). Life story interviews and their interpretation. In Michael Brenner, Jennifer Brown, & David Canter (Eds.), The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches. New York: Academic Press.
- Teich, N. (Ed.). (1992). Rogsonian Perspectives: Collaborative Rhetoric for Oral & Written Communication. Norwood, N. J.: Ablex Publishing Corp.
- Thompson, P. (1988). The Voice of the Past. Oral History. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- White, H. (1973). Metahistory. Baltimore, Maryland. The Johns Hopkins University Press.

..... (1987). The Content of the Form. Baltimore, Maryland:

The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Williams, D. C. (1992). The Frustrating Fifties. In P. O'Neill (Ed.), The History of Psychology in Canada (pp. 705-709).

Wright, M. J. (1977). Psychologists in profile: Charles Roger Myers. The Ontario Psychologist, 2(3), 55-58.

Wright, M. J. & Myers C. R. (1982). The Golden Anniversary Symposium: C.P.A.'s First 50 Years. In P. O'Neill (Ed.), The History of Psychology in Canada (pp. 695-696).

..... (1982). History of Academic Psychology in Canada. Toronto: C. J. Hogrefe, Inc.

Appendix A

76

Tables

STAFF VISIBILITY TRENDS

Visibility Index:	<u>J 62</u>	<u>J 63</u>	<u>AF</u>
Model publication cited:	1955 <u>1956</u>	1956 <u>1957</u>	<u>1960</u>
1. McGill	654	867	602
2. Toronto	499	476	616
3. McMaster	433	437	291
4. Alta-Edm	247	235	291
5. Queen's	204	225	229
6. Waterloo	167	177	227
7. Manitoba	128	144	243
8. Western	123	159	194
9. UEC	64	215	65
10. Dalhousie	30	208	113

Canadian Departments of PsychologySTAFF VISIBILITY - 1964-65

<u>University</u>	<u>Total "Visibility" Score</u>	<u>Number of "Visible" Staff</u>	<u>Total Number of Staff</u>	<u>Percent of Total Staff "Visible"</u>	<u>"Visibility" Score per Staff Member</u>
1. McGill	2,123	11	21	52	101
2. Toronto	1,591	11	24	46	66
3. McMaster	1,101	6	12	50	92
4. Alta-Edm	773	5	16	31	43
5. Queen's	708	5	11	45	64
6. Waterloo	571	3	16	19	36
7. Manitoba	515	4	10	40	52
8. Western	476	3	16	19	30
9. Dalhousie	351	3	9	33	39
10. UBC	344	3	18	17	19
11. York	242	3	7	33	28
12. Montreal	153	1	8	13	20
13. Victoria	110	1	4	25	27
14. Saskatchewan	94	1	8	13	12
15. Alta-Cal	65	1	6	17	11
16. Sir Geo. W	-	0	3	-	-
17. Carleton	-	0	4	-	-
18. Windsor	-	0	6	-	-
19. Ottawa	-	0	14	-	-

Psychologists in Canada

VISIBILITY

First Quartile

Amsel	-	Toronto
Berlyne	-	Toronto
* Bindra	-	McGill
Dodwell	-	Queen's
Gaito	-	York
Hebb	-	McGill
Heron	-	McMaster
Jackson	-	Western
*Jenkins	-	McMaster
Malmo	-	McGill
Mandler	-	Calif (SD-LJ)
Milner	-	McGill
Milner	-	McGill
*Runquist	-	Alta-Edm
Walters	-	Waterloo
Zubek	-	Manitoba

Second Quartile

Bacon, W Ed	-	McGill
Baker, C. T.	-	UBC
Belanger, M. D.	-	Montreal
*Black, A. H	-	McMaster
Eryden, M. P.	-	Waterloo
Foley, Joan	-	Toronto
James, Henry	-	Dalhousie
*Kamin, Leon	-	McMaster
Kenny, Doug	-	UBC
*Melzack, Ron	-	McGill
Newbigging	-	McMaster
McCormack	-	Manitoba
Payne, R. W.	-	Queen's
Royce, J. R.	-	Alta-Edm
Smith, W. A. S.	-	Alta-Edm

Third Quartile

Campbell, Dugal	-	Queen's
*Cooper, Rodney	-	Manitoba
Creelman, Doug	-	Toronto
Endler, Norm	-	York
Ferguson, George	-	McGill
Foley, Pat	-	DRML
*Honig, W. K.	-	Dalhousie
*Lambert, W. E.	-	McGill
McMurray	-	Sask
*Milton, George A.	-	Victoria
Ogilvie, J. C.	-	Toronto
*Rabedeau, R. G.	-	Queen's
*Rozeboom, W. W.	-	Alta-Edm
Schnore, M. M.	-	Western
Taylor, M. M.	-	DRML
Weckowicz, T. E.	-	Alta-Edm

Fourth Quartile

Appley, M. H	-	York
Briner, C. J.	-	Dalhousie
Edgington, E. S.	-	Alta-Cal
Forrin, E.	-	Toronto
*Hellyer, Syd	-	DRETL
Inglis, J.	-	Queen's
JAKOBOWITS, L. A.	-	McGill ?
Joyner, R. C.	-	Toronto
Morgenson, G. J.	-	Western
Pritchard, R. M.	-	McMaster ?
Rabinowitz, M. S.	-	Montreal General
Shankweiler, Don	-	McGill
Springbett, Bruce	-	Manitoba
*Storm, Thomas	-	UEC
Thornton, G. E.	-	Toronto
Tulving, E.	-	Toronto

Invisible but Imminent ?

Abbey, David	-	Toronto
Arrowood, John	-	Toronto
*Chambers, David A	-	Saskatchewan
*Cox, F. N.	-	Queen's
Feider, A.	-	Toronto
Gardner, R.C.	-	Western
Hamilton, J.	-	Sask
*Hare, Robt D.	-	UBC
Hogan, J.A.	-	Toronto
Kaufmann, H.	-	Toronto
*Knights, R. M.	-	Western
Kroger, R. O.	-	Toronto
*Loth, Harold O.	-	Western
Macdonald, Glen E	-	Toronto
*McNulty, J.A.	-	Dalhousie
*Ryan, T. J.	-	Western
Stenson, J.E.R.	-	Toronto
Wall, A. M.	-	Toronto
Walters, G. C.	-	Toronto
Wardwell, Elinor S	-	UBC
Watson, D. L.	-	Toronto

THE MOST "VISIBLE"* SCIENTISTS IN CANADIAN
DEPARTMENTS OF PSYCHOLOGY
(1965)

(1)	(2)
% ile	% ile
99.9	97.9 ← RUNDQUIST (ALTA)
99.8 ← HEBB (McG)	97.8
99.7 { AMSEL (TOR)	97.7
99.6 ← BERLYNE (TOR)	97.6
99.5 { MALMO (McG)	97.5
99.4 ← JACKSON (WEST)	97.4
99.3	97.3 ← BLACK (McM)
99.2	97.2
99.1 ← BINDRA (McG)	97.1
99.0 ← WALTERS (WAT)	97.0
98.9	96.9
98.8 { JENKINS (McM)	96.8
98.7 ← MURDOCK (TOR)	96.7 ← MILNER (McG)
98.6	96.6 { STENNETT (WEST)
98.5	96.5
98.4 { HERON (McM)	96.4
98.3 ← THOMPSON (Q)	96.3
98.2 { KAMIN (McM)	96.2
98.1	96.1
98.0	96.0

* NUMBER OF ARTICLES REFERRING TO PUBLISHED WORK IN
12 "CORE" JOURNALS FOR 1962, 1963 AND 1964.

"VISIBLES" IN CANADIAN DEPARTMENTS

(CONTINUED)

(3)

(4)

%ile	%ile
95.9	93.9
95.8	93.8
95.7	93.7
95.6	93.6
95.5	93.5
95.4 ← LAMBERT (McG)	93.4 { DODWELL (Q) PAREIS (VICT) ZUBEK (MAN)
95.3	93.3
95.2	93.2
95.1	93.1
95.0	93.0
94.9 ← RABINOVITCH (McG)	92.9
94.8	92.8
94.7	92.7
94.6	92.6
94.5	92.5
94.4	92.4
94.3 ← { FOLEY (TOR) McCORMACK (CAR)	92.3
94.2	92.2
94.1	92.1
94.0	92.0

Appendix B

87

Figures

VISIBILITY OF CANADIAN PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENTS (1965 STAFF)

2

PM-1 3 1/2"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

VISIBILITY OF CANADIAN PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENTS

(1965 STAFF)

NUMBER OF CITATIONS (3 YRS.)

BIRTHPLACE

■	Canada - 67%
□	Europe - 5%
□	U.S.A. - 12%
■	Other - 5%
■	England - 11%

FATHER'S OCCUPATION

■ Service - 30%
□ Trade & Commerce - 23%
■ Transportation - 10%
▨ Agriculture - 6%
□ Manufacturing - 13%
□ Labour - 7%
■ Other - 11%

EDUCATION

■ Canada - 48%

□ Canada & U.S. - 28%

▨ Canada & England - 8%

■ U.S. - 6%

□ Other - 10%

Appendix C

Transcripts of Oral Interviewees, Date and Location of Interview

1. Bott, Alexander - 17/01/62 - U. of Toronto
2. Williams, Carl - 04/01/69 - Western
3. Philip, Brother Roger - 11/4/69 - Eastern Psychological Association Mtg.
4. Wright, Mary Jean - 13/04/69 - Western
5. Bindra, Dalbir - 20/11/69 - McGill
6. Ferguson, George - 20/11/69 - McGill
7. Hebb, Donald - 20/11/69 - McGill
8. James, Henry - 21/05/69 - Dalhousie
9. Page Hilton - 21/05/69 - Dalhousie
10. Beach, Horace - 22/05/69 - Dalhousie
11. Mowat, Alex - 22/05/69 - Dalhousie
12. Vernon, Dalton - 23/05/69 - Acadia U.
13. Easterbrook, Jim - 26/05/69 - U. of New Brunswick
14. Snodgrass, Florence - 26/05/69 - U. of N. B.
15. Neal, Leola - 03/06/69 - Western
16. Ainsworth, Mary - 02/09/69 - Johns Hopkins U.
17. Wigdor, Blossom - 25/10/69 - Montreal home
18. Belanger, David - 21/11/69 - U. of Montreal
19. Pinard, Father Adrian - 21/11/69 - U. of Montreal
20. Mailloux, Father Noel - 21/11/69 - U. of Montreal
21. Lambert, Wallace - 22/11/69 - McGill
22. Webster, Edward - 22/11/69 - McGill
23. Tulving, Endel - 29/11/69 - U. of Toronto

24. Malmo, Robert - 08/12/69 - Allen Memorial Institute, Montreal
25. Stern, Muriel - 08/12/69 - McGill
26. Shevenell, Raymond - 06/02/70 - U. of Ottawa
27. Morton, Whit - 20/03/70 - Ottawa home
28. Wendt, Rusty - 20/03/70 - Carleton
29. Bromiley, Reg. B. - 23/03/70 - N.D.M.C.
30. Clark, Charles - 23/03/70 - Ottawa home
31. Bell, Anne - 13/04/70 - Child Development Clinic, Children's
Hospital, Winnipeg
32. Clarke, John - 13/04/70 - U. of Winnipeg
33. Springbett, Bruce - 14/04/70 - U. of Manitoba
34. Wright, Morgan - 14/04/70 - U. of Manitoba
35. Wright, Marion MacDonald - 15/04/70 - U. of Manitoba
36. Zubek, John - 15/04/70 - U. of Manitoba
37. Cooper, Roderick - 16/04/70 - U. of Calgary
38. Gibson, David - 16/04/70 - U. of Calgary
39. Vernon, Philip - 16/04/70 - U. of Calgary
40. Smith, Douglas - 20/04/70 - U. of Alberta
41. Hough, Arthur - 20/04/70 - U. of Alberta
42. Clarke, Stanley - 21/04/70 - U. of Alberta
43. Fraser, Al - 21/04/70 - U. of Alberta
44. Geddes, Bill - 22/04/70 - Edmonton
45. MacDonald, John - 22/04/70 - Edmonton
46. MacEachran, J. M. - 22/04/70 - Edmonton
47. Kibblewhite, E. J. - 23/04/70 - Edmonton
48. Hobson, Gordon - 24/04/70 - U. of Victoria
49. Milton, Lex - 24/04/70 - U. of Victoria

50. Little, Bryan - 25/04/70 - U. of Victoria
51. Tyler, Fred - 25/04/70 - U. of Victoria
52. MacPhee, Earle - 28/04/70 - B. C. home
53. Chant, Sperrin - 29/04/70 - B. C. home
54. Hewson, Cec - 29/04/70 - Vancouver
55. Belyea, Ed - 30/04/70 - Vancouver home
56. Signori, Edro - 30/04/70 - U. of B. C.
57. Watson, Charles - 30/04/70 - Provincial Health Building,
Vancouver
58. Potashin, Reva - 01/05/70 - U. of B. C.
59. Bredin, Grace - 02/05/70 - U. of B. C.
60. MacLeod, Robert - 14/05/70 - Cornell U.
61. Welsh, Louise Thompson - 29/05/70 - C.P.A. Conference
Winnipeg
62. Taylor, Thomas Mayne Cunningham - 29/07/70 - Victoria home
63. Stein, Harry - 1970
64. Blair, Buck - 15/10/71 - U. of Calgary
65. Amsel, Abram - 1971 - U. of Toronto
66. Turner, Gord - 15/02/72 - Middlesex College
67. Taylor (Herle), Gwen - 16/02/72 - Western
68. Taylor, Frank - 16/02/72 - Western
69. Bridges, J. Win - 13/03/72 - Montreal
70. Melzack, Ronald - 13/03/72 - McGill
71. Poser, Ernest - 13/03/72 - McGill
72. Rabinovitch, Sam - 14/03/72 - McGill
73. Mahoney, Gerry - 15/03/72 - Sir George Williams
74. Stewart, James - 15/03/72 - Sir George Williams

75. MacDonald, Glenn - 21/09/72 - U. of Toronto
76. Myers, Roger - 25/09/72 - U. of Toronto
77. Sheppard, Alf - 25/11/72 - Winnipeg
78. Noseworthy, William, J. - 17/01/73 - Hospital of Mental and Nervous Disorders, Newfoundland
79. Cororan, Derek - 18/01/73 - Memorial U., Nfld.
80. Hart, Dave - 18/01/73 - Memorial U.
81. Preston, Charles - 18/01/73 - Nfld. hotel
82. Sullivan, Art - 19/01/73 - Memorial U.
83. Mills, John - 20/02/73 - U. of Saskatchewan
84. McMurray, Gordon - 21/02/73 - U. of Saskatchewan
85. Northway, Mary - 09/04/73 - U. of Toronto
86. Berlyne, Dan - 1973 - U. of Toronto
87. Jourard, Sidney - 01/09/74 - New Orleans hotel
88. Weckler (Loeb), Nora - 02/09/74 - New Orleans hotel
89. Schonfield, David - 04/11/74 - U. of Calgary
90. Woodsworth, Joseph - 05/11/74 - U. of Calgary
91. Davidson, Park - 25/11/74 - U. of B. C.
92. Suedfeld, Peter - 25/11/74 - U. of B. C.
93. Skanes, Gordon - 12/05/75 - Memorial U.
94. Nelson, Tom - 03/11/75 - U. of Alberta
95. Royce, Joseph - 04/11/75 - U. of Alberta
96. Runquist, Will - 04/11/75 - U. of Alberta
97. Schaub, Ronald - 05/11/75 - U. of Calgary
98. Weyant, Robert - 05/11/75 - U. of Calgary
99. Jackson, Douglas - 10/02/76 - Western
100. McClelland, Bill - 11/02/76 - Western

101. Paivio, Allen - 11/02/76 - Western
102. Arnold, Magda - 02/04/76
103. Wake, Robert - 16/09/76 - Carleton
104. Hoyt-Cameron, Ruth - 25/11/76 - Vancouver home
105. Wilson, Robert - 25/11/76 - B. C.
106. Decarie, Theresa Gouin - 21/12/76 - U. of Montreal
107. Douglas, Virginia - 22/12/76 - McGill
108. Dorken, Herb - 27/08/77

Appendix D

Interview with Ray Berry

I, Ray Berry Ray Berry (signature) consent to be interviewed by Judith Kolin for her M.A. thesis research. I give my permission to have the interview tape recorded yes (please check if in agreement) and would like the tape returned yes or deposited in the C.F.H. Archives: yes (check preferred arrangement). I understand that I can choose not to answer any of the questions if necessary. I give my permission to be quoted directly or paraphrased from the interview yes (check if in agreement) with either no time limit restrictions yes or with the following restrictions yes (check preferred arrangement).

This is a continuation of the Oral History Collection of Psychology in Canada which was started by C.R. Myers. I am talking long-distance on the telephone with Ray Berry in his home in Sidney, British Columbia on Sunday January 28, 1996. I am studying the C.R. Myers Oral History Collection for my M.A. thesis. This interview has been transcribed exactly as I heard it. The transcription was sent to Ray Berry for verification and editing. Very few changes were made and as a result the transcript style is very conversational.

Q: First, did you get the release form?

A: Yes, I did. [good]

Q: So, is everything O.K. on that? [oh, sure]. Then you will just mail it back to me. Great. O.K. We got through that.

A: And also, I haven't had a chance because I just go it on Friday and I really haven't had a chance to look through the list and to think of other people who you might want to interview. [O.K.] But one that comes to mind immediately is Wes Coons. [Oh, O.K.] I really don't know why Roger missed both Wes and myself, although I have some ideas about why that was so. But Wes is another person who was very significant in the development of psychology at that time. [O.K.] And he is missing from the list.

Q: O.K., perhaps we can get back to that. How I have formatted this interview is I have taken the questions that Roger Myers used in the interviews and I have used that for about three-quarters of the interview and at the end of the interview I have added some of mine which will address such things as why do think you were not

included in this. And again, if you have any comments as you go along as to ... comments about the types of questions he asked and why you think he asked these kinds of questions. O.K. So to start off -- where were you born?

A: I was born in Oshawa, in Ontario.

Q: O.K. When?

A: 1925. [O.K.] Do you want something closer than that? [Nope, nope].

Q: Fine. Now, what did your father do?

A: He was a physician. [He was a physician O.K.]

Q: And your mother?

A: My mother was a nurse. [O.K.]

Q: Did you have any sisters or brothers?

A: I had one adopted sister.

Q: O.K. And where did you fit into the family?

A: I was the eldest. [O.K.]

Q: I just want to see if I am getting this recorded or not. Can you just hold on a moment? [Oh, sure]. Great. Let's continue. I just wanted to make sure because I haven't done this before. What were your earliest recollections of the home? I am thinking of things such as reading materials in the home. Was there a lot of reading material; did your parents read a lot?

A: Yes. My father was actually educated in the Boston Latin School, the grammar school and in those days they were concerned with classical education. So, having had a classical education, of course, then that carried on with a great reader in a wide range of subjects and certainly my mother was also. So, we were -- we had a lot of

material to read and a great interest in that sort of thing. Mother, also, was a singer. Actually, she participated in the musical community in Ontario quite substantially, sang in the Mendelssohn choir and so on. That's the kind of home situation I had with, those kinds of parents and the kinds of things to which I was exposed.

Q: So, I gather ... was there a lot of stress put on education?

A: I would think so, although I think that whole thing sort of came naturally. The idea was, in fact, with my father's kind of education and background of both my parents it was just taken for granted that that's the sort of thing that I would do.

Q: Right, did you feel any sort of great burden or that you were being pushed or anything like that?

A: No. Just kind of natural, that kind of thing was just going to happen.

Q: No. I gather with your father's and mother's positions that the home must have fairly financially secure, there weren't any problems that way.

A: This was during the depression. [It was during the depression] Things were difficult, even then, for medical people. We were living in Oshawa which, of course, was General Motors town and the situation with regard to General Motors was very difficult. As a consequence my father did a lot of medical practice essentially for free. [right] And took back a lot of things in payment in trade. Things people grew or things that people made or periodically in work, although we didn't have a lot of work for people to do. It was pretty tough for them, but I should say that there wasn't any

problem we were never short of money. We were never without things even though, in a sense, it was still hard for us.

Q: Right, so with regard to education, if you wanted to go on, this was not being blocked by finances.

A: No, never a problem.

Q: What about religion? What was the religious atmosphere like in the home?

A: My family were Anglicans and when I was young I sang in the choir at St. George's Anglican Church. And again, because my mother was a singer, it sort of came naturally. That's the kind of thing that happened, and mother sang in the choir and my father sang in the choir and because of the musical background of my family that was the kind of thing that was sort of natural.

Q: Did you attend Sunday School?

A: Yes.

Q: Was it a strictly religious home?

A: No, I don't think so.

Q: No, so it was sort of participating more in the religion itself and the music.

A: Yes, that's right. [and the music] yes, that's right. And while these people went to church and we all had the same usual background going every Sunday still it was not fundamentalist in its approach at all.

Q: What about the home politically?

A: Conservative.

Q: Was there a lot of discussion of politics in the home? Were they involved politically?

A: Yes, they were. [they were]. There wasn't a great deal of discussion as I recall although when I think about it, obviously I knew what the situation was. Now, something else that is important is in 1937 (decision in '37, actual move in '38), we moved to a small community, Berlin, which was just southwest of Chatham. And, in fact, the reason we moved there was because my father was having some difficulty with the income with the situation in Oshawa. And so the decision was made to move to a small country practice. Which was what my father had always wanted to do. So, in 1938 we moved to Merlin and my parents were then fairly active in the political scene there. Now, I can't recall, actually, very much in the way of details there, but I reckon they were in and supported the Conservative Party there.

Q: What were your earliest recollections of school? Where did ... when did you start school and where was your first school?

A: I went to kindergarten which was a bit unusual back in those days. I just recounted to my wife that when I was in Grade 1 saying to the teacher that the reason I was so good at cutting things [laugh] was that I had already been to kindergarten. [laugh] So that my early school days were relatively pleasant. There are always incidents that are not so good and there are always teachers that are not so good but the overall experience was pretty good.

Q: Did you do well in school?

A: No. Actually, the usual kind of report card. Ray would do better if he would just apply himself and I think that that followed me all the way through. I don't think that I was ever a really good scholar. And it's curious; I have thought about that a great deal. And the

thing that intrigues me is that public school was so easy for me that I didn't have to do any homework, apply myself to this sort of thing. I would go to the classes and so on I would be able to remember it and be able to handle it and deal with it. And then in the last year, I am not sure that I am going to get these dates right, but I was ill. I can't recall now what the problem was but I missed one year of public school. I guess I repeated a year in public school and whether that had any impact; I don't really know. But, I never found school threatening or a problem.

Q: What was your most favourite subject in school? Do you remember?

A: Probably, reading.

Q: Do you remember if you read before you started school?

A: No, I can't remember.

Q: O.K. and did you have a least favourite subject?

A: hmmm.... least favourite subject. I think, in fact, when I got to high school, Latin. I found, we took French and Latin, and I found those difficult. They were difficult because I did not apply myself to them, I am sure. But, I didn't have any great aversion to them. They were just things that were a little more difficult and I guess they would probably be my least liked subject (The only exam paper I can ever remember on which I achieved 100% was on a Latin exam. My teacher had made critical comments on earlier work I had done so to show her I set out to do well on the next exam and made the 100% -- but that didn't last).

Q: O.K. Now, I gather you went to elementary school in Oshawa and did your secondary school in Merlin.

A: It's Merlin. Merlin. [Oh, Merlin, thank-you]. Actually, I finished off my public school in Merlin. I am trying to think that would be about Grade 8. I think that last grade of public school I did in Merlin and at that time this was a country school. There were three classrooms and each of those classrooms had two or three grades. That's the old style, kind of fun actually.

Q: How did you find that? Did you find that a good system?

A: Ya. It was good on a lot of counts. The older kids spent time helping the younger in many cases and the other good thing about it, of course, was if you were in one of the younger grades you could listen to the advanced grades so that you would actually have some exposure to that work even before you got into the class. That also seemed to me to be a good kind of experience. [especially if you had been bored, or found it so easy that would have been good for you]. Particularly, for certain subjects. If you were interested in a particular subject and you would see what was happening in this subject in the next year, or even in the next two years. If you were in one of those classrooms with three grades; it would be great. And then you would then do really well when you got into that grade because you already had some exposure to it.

Q: Do you recall what you planned to do at the end of high school? Did you have any notion of what you wanted to be or what your plans were?

A: Yes. We had a very good friend, actually, my parents had a very good friend from Montreal, who is in the chemical business and I used to talk to him and at one point I thought that I would like to be a chemist but the kinds of things that the kinds of things that I

anticipated was being a physician like my father, being a chemist like his friend or also being a clergyman. My family were very supportive of the little church we had in the village. They, of course, had been very active in churches before in the choir and musical activities and so on. And consequently, as a result when we moved to Merlin, they were very supportive of the church. I had sung in a choir both in Oshawa and also in Merlin and then had a fair amount of contact with the clergy especially in the small community. And at one point that was also a consideration. Now, a scientist on the one side and a clergyman on the other seem to be rather far apart in terms of the kinds of things one aspires to but those were the kinds of things considered.

Q: So, what happened at the end of high school? What did you do next?.

A: Well actually before I got out of high school, I went into the Air Force. [ahh] and the last, let me see now, I joined the Air Force in December of my last year of high school, that would be Grade 13. I was to go to the Air Force within about three or four days or within the first week of leaving school at the end of that term. Now, for a person who wasn't a great great scholar to start with, one began to worry more about that then whatever it was I was doing in school. What happened at the end of that year was, I can't remember exactly now, but I missed a couple of the subjects and then went into the Air Force. I was in the Air force from then until the fall. Went to Manning Depot in Toronto and went to an air crew training base in Assiniboine, Saskatchewan. And at that time because of the way the situation was going in Europe, they didn't need aircraft people. They

needed people in the Army and so we were actually told we were going to be discharged from the Air Force. So, that's essentially what happened. I came back to Toronto, I think, in November or December of that year in 1944, and was discharged. Well then, I was in a bit of quandary. My family, of course, wanted me to stay home and go back to school. And I had a great deal of difficulty deciding what to do. I finally decided that I would join the navy. I went to Windsor and applied to join the Navy. Was given one of the intelligence test, one of the tests that was used. I will make a comment about that in a minute, don't let me forget. [O.K.] because that was rather a significant event. So, I was taken into the Navy and then in about March, I think, was actually expected to report for duty which was what I did and I travelled from there to Quebec city for training and was in Quebec City at the time of V-Day and went then to Cornwallis and did some training there, went home on a month's leave and then was posted to the Uganda in Esquimault, went aboard the Uganda. It was there for about a month. It was there for refitting. Then the war was over. So, then things changed radically. So, then people started pushing all sorts of buttons to get out, to get back to school. That was in the fall. And I really did want to get back to school. My family worked a way in Ontario and I worked a way there and was able to get discharged quite rapidly. I went back, I can't remember exactly what the months were, but I think it was in November, and couldn't get into Western (because it was too late in the year). I went to the Assumption College in Windsor which is now the University of Windsor and it, at the time, was affiliated with Western so, in fact, I was starting that first year

at Assumption. Some of the subjects would, of course, have been acceptable at Western when I expected to transfer. Now, to go back to this experience in the Navy, I went there to do these tests and examinations in my Air Force uniform which gave me some kind of status I thought, [laugh] and I sat and I worked through that test, I can't remember what it was, but it was the usual tests they use for all candidates. I guess it was probably developed by Bott and team [right] and I did very well on it. I don't know what gave me that idea I suppose it wasn't very difficult or didn't seem very difficult to me and I was able to get all these answers and it gave me an incredible boost in my sense of confidence and self esteem. I was able to do this. So, here I was sitting here in this Air Force uniform with these other guys and I did this test and I felt just on top of the world. I don't quite know what it was about, but it was really quite a significant event for me. [that's very interesting].

Q: So here you were, you went on to University. What did you take in your first year of University?

A: Well, this is also very interesting. At Assumption I took the basic courses that one had to take for first University (Speech Education (English 19), General Literature (English 20), Composition and Rhetoric (English 21), Physical Education 11, Library Science 10a, Mathematics 10a (Algebra), Physics 10, Chemistry 10, Psychology 20 (Introduction to Psychology)). One of those included psychology [aha] now, the other thing was the kind of general course one would get. And I can't remember now. I don't know if it was categorized as a general science at the time, but obviously I was going to go into science or some aspect of that. Now, whether that was the case or

whether, or oh, there's another little incident which I forgot, but anyway, I don't quite recall what the, how that was designated but in any case I took English, and I took psychology among other subjects and I got a D in psychology which didn't make me feel very good and I really didn't like that course anyway. But I should go back some. The courses I had missed when I left high school as a consequence of going into the Air Force, I had to pick up on those courses somehow in order to be eligible for University when I returned. [that's right] During the time between the Air Force and the, my going into the Navy that was from January through to March, I asked the high school program people if I could go back and review those courses and write an examination to see if I could get them out of the way. So, from January until March, this is what I did. Now, I can't remember what it was that I had failed but anyway I took some classes and I worked on those things and, of course, I passed them without any difficulty. The principal was really angry at me. She was angry at me because I failed them the first time. She said, "Look here Ray Berry, if you had done this kind of studying before you wouldn't have had to come back and do this". But, however, I was glad I got those over anyway because it would have created a really serious problem for me when I came back but it did not, of course, and I was able to get into Assumption. I was there for that year and the second year I went back to University at Western.

Q: I see. Now, that first psychology course you took, was that the first time you heard about psychology?

A: Yes.

Q: O.K. Can you tell me something about the course, the book you took or whoever taught it to you? Do you remember?

A: I am ancient. I don't remember those things. [O.K.] I think, I can't recall the man's name, Brath, that doesn't sound right. [that's alright]. maybe I can come up with it later but I can't come up with it now. [O.K.] and I don't know what the problem was actually, I don't know that I found the course very interesting and certainly I was very distressed by getting a D on it. And then when I went to Western, they said I should really take that psychology again. And I improved the mark. OOh. [laugh] sort of poetic justice in a way. So, actually what I did was I went into General Science with the idea of chemistry but more likely to go into Medicine. And so I was taking the general science course and then of course I took psychology. I took it from Mary Wright and what I did was I read absolutely everything on the list, the booklist, at the expense of my science courses interestingly enough. Things that were supposed to be very important in general science were left aside while I spent all this time on psychology and then philosophy. Courses which I really hadn't had before and I became really heavily involved and committed with these other things and I liked history too, so I spent a lot of time in the non-scientific courses. And, therefore, had a great deal of difficulty with organic chemistry and physics, which were really the ones that were creating problems for me. As a matter of fact, I did so poorly on those they were saying that if I didn't pick up on a sup I would have to go somewhere else. As I said I was never really a great scholar. And those, it's interesting because I got completely diverted once I got into that course and then I wasn't

sure what to do. Transferring was not the easiest thing in the world but I spent, I guess I kind of struggled through there for two years trying to think what I was going to do with all this and I think that I still completed the third year in general science. But in that third year of general science I decided I was going to switch to psychology. I went to talk to the head of the department, who at that time was Johnson, and Liddy of course was also in the department. I talked to Johnson about what on earth I would ever do if I became a psychologist. At that time of course, the opportunities were really quite restricted. There was no question in my mind at the time that as interested as I was in scientific psychology that I was going to be a practicing psychologist doing good work for people. So what occurred was that I talked to him about that and came back and told my wife. At this time I was married, and said, the most I could ever earn if I go into psychology will be \$5000 a year if I am at the absolute top of the ladder here. And that was still O.K. and that's what I decided to do. So, I decided to make the shift and that left me taking an extra year at the undergraduate level. I actually spent four years but I didn't get an honour B.A. because of the switch that I made. [right so you had to pick some other psychology courses] Nine courses in psychology in that year. [nine!] Now, don't forget back in those days there wasn't that much psychology to study. The publications, I think, at that year were only about 3000. The abstracts contained only about 3000 publications, now they contain about, what 60,000? After a while, it sounds like a really major undertaking but it didn't seem to me to be all that much. And I'll tell you one thing for sure, when you take that many courses you get

buried in the stuff. You are getting information from one course and of course it applies directly to another course and so on. It was a difficult shift, of course, because I had to pick all of these other subjects which I had not done before. The other thing is I took German and I can't recall whether that was a requirement in general science. I rather doubt it. The German was in the Arts Program which I was now shifting to. A lot of kind of fascinating things that happened.

Q: Do you remember the courses you took and from whom you took them? A: (Experimental Psychology 1, Genetic Psychology, Social Psychology, Theory and Construction of Mental Tests, Experimental Psychology 11, Statistics, Applied Psychology, Abnormal Psychology, Problems in Clinical Psychology. Graduate Courses: Basic Problems in Psychology, Modern Systems in Psychology, Research Problems, Personality, Advanced Clinical Methods, Problems in Industrial, Advanced Abnormal, Advanced Genetic, Advanced Statistics). Well, I had taken an introductory course from Mary. [right] I took courses from Leola Neal; I took courses from Liddy; I took courses from, now you're thinking of undergraduate, I am going to get this mixed up with the [graduate] graduate courses I took later. Because the graduate courses I took also included Brother Philip and Gord Turner. I am trying to think, I don't think, that's about it.

Q: Did you take many philosophy courses as you went along?

A: I think I probably took two philosophy courses. (Nature of Philosophy and Philosophy of Religion). Liddy, of course, was a philosopher and I enjoyed his courses very much. In a sense, both Liddy and Bott because of their philosophical kind of approach and it

always seemed that afterwards you could always tell who were the students of Bott and/or Liddy kind of logical approach they took towards things. I'm sure that I could pick out students of Liddy later because of the different kind of approach they took to understanding things and so on. It was a philosophical logical kind of approach to things which I think is excellent in psychology. It seemed to me rather different then the kind of things one might pick up otherwise. I think that it is important to say that people who were important influences for me were Mary, of course, who started this thing, Liddy and Gord Turner. I took, as a matter of fact, that's another interesting thing in the period of time at the graduate level and the undergraduate level I took all of the courses offered by the department. Because I had an undergraduate degree, even though it was a four year degree, it was still an undergraduate degree, it wasn't an honours degree. So, I had to take two years at the Master's level. [so once you finished your undergraduate degree, you went right on to your Master's] That's right. [and that was two years] That was two years because of the requirement in the university. [I see] So as a consequence of that I took all the graduate courses that were offered by the University at that time too. I was an assistant to Gord. He was ill for a period of time, I can't remember what the problem was but he was in hospital for about two months. And during that time I took responsibility for the course. I worked very closely with him of course and then took responsibility for that course.

Q: Did you do any other teaching during that time?

A: No.

Q: O.K. now. So you did your M.A. in two years, was he your thesis advisor for your M.A.?

A: No. Brother Philip was.

Q: Do you remember what your M.A. thesis was about?

A: Yes. (A Study of the Ability of Psychotic Patients to Discriminate Colour Mass). It was about colour vision. Brother Philip had done a lot of work in colour vision. As an undergraduate thesis, I undertook to study colour vision in young children. I did a study with students in one of the public schools, collected a lot of information on colour vision with those kids and that was my undergraduate thesis. And got quite interested in the whole area of colour vision, of course. The Master's thesis was looking at the differential responses to colour of people who are mentally ill. I worked with people who were brain damaged; people who had brain operations; people who were schizophrenic; people who were manic depressive. Trying to think of the categories now, but essentially that is what the thesis was about. It was kind of curious in a way because in fact people who are manic depressive respond in much more significantly to red. By and large there was not much difference between the people with the exception of that particular group who responded in that manner to red, which is kind of fascinating. It would have been interesting to follow it up, but I did not follow it up.

Q: O.K. You received your M.A. from Western and then what happened after that?

A: I spent a year working at the hospital in St Thomas. I had done an internship the summer before at the psychiatric hospital in London. And then, of course, that again was a rather horrendous

experience. That would be in 1951. I don't know if you have seen pictures like the snake pit. It was a very, very horrendous experience, hugely overcrowded, small numbers of staff in relation to patients, not very much in the way of treatment was available except ECT and a variety of medical or drug treatments like insulin therapy and so on. Pretty basic and the numbers of overcrowding, the kind of overcrowding that occurred then was just horrendous. When I think about it, it seems almost impossible. It would have wards, very large rooms with, and they would be full of beds to the extent that people who were sleeping in the bed next to the wall had to crawl over other beds to get there. [oh, my gosh] When I think about it it's almost incomprehensible. We were trying to do psychological investigations there at that time. As a matter of fact, whenever I went any where in that hospital from the base, this is in London, when I went anywhere in that hospital, I always went through the female senile ward because my sense was that if I am going to have to work in these kind of circumstances I am going to have to get used to this. It was that bad. We were attempting to learn here about this whole process of the application of psychology and it was exceedingly difficult, exceedingly difficult. Those were the days when the superintendent was, in a sense, a chief of a fiefdom. He ran those hospitals in whatever way he thought fit. The year that I was there as an intern, Stevenson was the superintendent and Harold Blackwell was my supervisor. Harold and I did a study on the elderly patients there, patients over 65, to try to determine if patients who were there at that time needed to be in a mental hospital. And of course what we found was what people found many

times later and that was that there was a very large proportion of those patients who could have very well have been looked after in all kinds of other facilities. Just dealing with the fact that they were elderly, so they didn't actually have to be in that hospital. I can't remember what the numbers were but they were quite substantial, something like two-thirds, could have been cared in some other kind of facility. Now that was the sort of thing that I thought, we thought, that psychologists could do very well. The study itself received some attention by the superintendent, Dr. Stevenson, very positive about that study and sent that study to Queen's Park to indicate to the people there that these were the kinds of conditions and that some other kind of arrangements should be made for these people and so on. So that my first experience in the applied area particularly in that very difficult one, was a positive one. And it had to do with kind of application of psychology of looking at an area and doing a study on that area, coming back with data that would enable other people to make decisions about the kinds of things that should be done.

Q: Now, was the internship part of your program, part of your M.A. program or did you do that on your own?

A: It wasn't actually part of the M.A. program; there was no requirement for that. Myers, of course, at that time was the consultant to the Ministry of Health. And he was interested in recruiting people to work in that area and therefore worked with the psychologists who were interested and there were, this was an opportunity to work and to get some money, not very much, but, so that in fact it had a number of important aspects to it. The

opportunity to work in psychology, to learn something. The opportunity to make a little bit of money and also to begin to explore the possibility of this as being a career. [right] Internships were available and a very large number of psychologists worked in that internship capacity throughout the Ontario Mental Health Services, that is, in the Mental Health Hospitals. Some of them in clinics, although that was a very unusual thing at that time. We had a number of travelling clinics. And in that time of working in the hospital we were, we had the opportunity of, working with the clinic people for as another experience, once or twice. So we had some knowledge of what was happening there. So this was essentially the attempt on my part and of other psychologists, to attempt to move into this applied field in psychology.

Q: You finished and you moved into a hospital once you did your M.A. [that was in St. Thomas]. O.K. in St. Thomas. [that was after my M.A.]. Right and you continued doing the same kind of thing where you applied tests to the people in the hospital. [that's right]. Now, where there many psychologists on staff at that time?

A: In St. Thomas, there were probably about three psychologists on staff. In addition, probably five new people moved in. My colleagues who had graduated from university. We went into that hospital and developed a department of psychology under Sid North, chief psychologist at that time. That hospital, as I recall, had received an opportunity from the Ministry of Health to try to develop significant numbers of staff. So we had a fairly substantial psychiatric staff, quite substantial psychology staff and, I think, also the social work department was well staffed too. The idea was to try

to provide the professional staff that would be required to make significant impacts on the kind of services and programs which were available in the hospital. It also had an out-patient service under Dr. Pratton and we did a little bit of work in that area as well. It was quite an exciting time for those of us who were starting out. We did a number of interesting things in the hospital to try to change programs. There were studies of the activities in the dining room, for example, to try to reduce the amount of conflict or difficulty in the dining room at the times so there was a study done with regard to that. We were actually asked to do a study, that wasn't actually a study, it was an attempt to decide who should go for a lobotomy. This was the most difficult thing that we did. Here we are supposed to be able to make some recommendations about what patient would be suitable for lobotomy. You can well imagine that psychologists did, even in those days, were not very attuned to this kind of approach and we did do the studies and I don't think we recommended a single patient who had been referred to us. We didn't recommend a single patient for lobotomy, so, of course, they stopped asking us. What else would you expect? [yes]. I thought about that strategy afterwards, and I thought, we probably made a mistake because what it meant was that there was now no more psychological input for anybody else. Perhaps what we should have done was that since these people were probably going to go and have lobotomies anyway, we probably should have tried to have found some other criteria which would have enabled us to make those kind of decisions and recommendations that would have enabled us; perhaps we couldn't, I don't know. But, it seemed to me that all we

did in that process was to cut ourselves off from being able to make any contribution. That's really what happened.

Q: How long were you at St. Thomas?

A: I was there for a year. The following year I went to the University of Toronto to start a P.H.D. program.

Q: Tell me about that program. Who did you have and what was the program like?

A: Well, there are probably a number of things that I should tell you about that. What I had done was to apply to a number of universities and had decided on the University of Toronto because Myers was there and of course Myers was a consultant for the Ministry of Health and I had had a lot of contact with Myers. Also, there was a bursary available to do that which I took up. I am trying to recall, I can't remember if I had a bursary for my Master's or not, probably I did. (Yes) So, of course, what I did was I picked this up for the PHD program and then I went to Toronto. That was a bit of a devastating experience. Because having worked with Myers, I thought that I would walk in there and I would sit down and say O.K. now how, what can I do in this program that would suit me to do the kinds of things I wanted to do. This is the area I want to work, I want to be in applied. What can I do about that? That interview was startling because what Myers said was it is up to you to make up your mind so you'll have to go and discover what kind of courses you want to take. I was taken aback by this. Here was a person I had been working with and for, in contact with and I thought that it would be O.K. to go on and get advice from him but now he his playing a different role. He is now in charge of the graduate program

in psychology and he is playing a different kind of role all together. In fact, Myers did do

End of Tape 1, Side 1

Tape 1, Side 2

I vaguely knew about some of the other people there but that was all. So here I had to start now to scrounge about to figure out what I should be doing. He didn't give me any time to do that. He said, "well, come back tomorrow and make all these decisions". I came back. He said, "now make all the decisions and what courses you are going to take and so on and what you are doing to do for your minor". I can't remember what you call that, but anyway I had three opportunities here for a minor, one was in psychiatry, one was in education and something else which I can't recall now. And I was to make a decision about that even before I had a chance to investigate. So, I decided on the educational one (Educational theory). I took that program at the college of education? [OSIS?] OSIS wasn't there then. Whatever proceeded OSIS. That was an interesting experience too but I was really taken aback by this kind of approach by the this person I had expected to be a mentor and an assistant. Anyway, so then I proceeded to do this thing and I would have to say that my first year there was not the greatest. Now, let me see, I'm trying to remember what courses I took. One had to take a course in statistics and one had to take a course in social and I took a course from Myers and the courses themselves, the titles didn't really make very much impression on me. It was just a matter of who or what the course content was. Things like scientific psychology and statistics and so on. I assisted Ketchum in his Social Psychology program, acted as an

assistant to him and so on. And at the end of that first year they laid down the law if I didn't pick up my socks, I was going to have to go someplace else. This is the story of my life, you see. I'm trying to recall what the problems were because I had done the French section, and I had done something, but in any case they weren't very happy with my performance. Between the first and second year at the university, I had decided that I was going to stay there and really go to work on my thesis. And I went in and sat down and I talked to Myers and he gave me a dozen different reasons why that wouldn't work. The reason he did that was because he wanted me to go to Peterborough to the Mental Health Clinic. Once again, here was the conflict. He's now wearing the hat of the consultant in the Ministry of Health. So, what happened was and that was an exciting opportunity for me, I thought I should stay there and work on a thesis but I ended up going to Peterborough for the summer in the Mental Health Clinic there as the resident psychologist, exciting experience. In many ways very difficult because I was entirely on my own; there were no other psychologists there and I was working with this clinic; however, I was working for the Director, Dr. Pratten, who had been the director of the out-patient clinic at St. Thomas Psychiatric Hospital, so that was a help. So I put in the summer and that was a very successful summer and at the end of the summer, Dr. Pratten said to me, "Would you come back here?" I said, "Well, if you can recruit someone in the meantime because that is essentially what you would like to do, then that would be fine. If you don't recruit someone then I will come back to work here after I finish my residency program at the University of Toronto". And so that was

agreed. Then I went back that year and I think I did reasonably better, at least they kept me on anyway, and at the end of the year my German exam, which is a requirement and also did my comprehensives and I didn't do very well on those comprehensives. Now, I am trying to recall these dates here, which, of course, is not a complete disaster because not everybody gets their comprehensives on the first round. But, in any case completed that and had an idea in mind about what I was going to do my thesis on and that was going to be on the reasons why people actually came for help and I had a very complicated set up with a variety of different testing mechanisms and that sort of thing. Now at that time, Roger was going to be my advisor. So that's what happened when I left the program to go to the clinic in Peterborough. Now, you want to pick up anything else in the interim. [no. That sounds O.K.] O.K. So, then I went to Peterborough as the sort of in resident psychologist and we were doing a variety of things there. We not only saw people in the clinic but we also developed and did fairly extensive community consultative work which of course was what those clinics were supposed to do. I began fairly heavily engaged in consultation work in the school system, developed a number of different kinds of programs that were pretty new and unusual in those days. And very shortly developed a concept that my working in the clinic, particularly with kids, was all very well and good but in fact the kids spent an awful lot more time out there in the big world than the one hour a week that they spent with me. As a consequence of that, I became very concerned about working within the school system with teachers, with the general school population there to improve the

therapeutic activity within the school program or within the classroom. So that instead of just working with the kids in the clinic, I actually went out and worked with the principal and teachers in the classroom and so on. And from that, developed the process of going to schools on a regular basis and allowing them to bring up problems that they had there, not necessarily specific names and so on, but problems the teachers were having so, in fact, I would go there and spend the morning and the principal would be there and would bring in teachers who were having difficulty and we would talk about that and talk about the way in which they might be able to cope with those kinds of problems. Now, that was very exciting stuff. That was brand new at that time. Nobody else was doing this kind of stuff. And it was part of my concept about what psychology ought to do. That it should be making available to other people whatever knowledge we had and understanding about human behaviour, so that we would be working through other people who are actually the people on the line dealing with the kids. The teacher who is dealing with the kid in the classroom is the person who is going to be able to be the most therapeutic in my view. So, if I could help that teacher to do these kinds of things more effectively, that was the route to go. Now, when we started doing this, of course, that wasn't happening very often. And that seemed to me to be the logical way to go. You helped others people deal with their clientele more effectively. That was a very exciting period of time in my life. I enjoyed that very much but, of course, you can well imagine how much time was spent trying to deal with my thesis topic. Practically nothing. Although I was doing Q-sort and stuff, had a Marchant

calculator, that is an adding machine; I worked out hundreds, hundreds of correlations on this crazy Marchant adding machine and it took ages and ages and ages and was really not making all that much progress and no contact with Roger. That just didn't work. Anyway, what are we talking about now. We are talking about the development of years. I was there from 1954 to about, I think, 1962 when it became very obvious that I am going to have to do something if I am going to complete this PHD. So I went to Roger and I said, "O.K. what am I going to do here?" We decided that I would come back into residence for a period of time. And get a new supervisor and revise the topic and to do something else. Now, I should go back a little bit because during this period of time when I am doing this, the rules are changing. The rules changed on the French examination, for example, I had left without completing that French requirement and what happened then was that you sat an examination. There were only going to be two examinations a year, so you had to make this examination or not. If you didn't make it now, you wouldn't be able to make it until later. When this came around, I had about something like fourteen days until the exam [oh my]. Before that it had been an oral exam, you went in and read something and you translated it or something like that nature but now it's not going to do that, it is going to be written. O.K. That's fair enough. So I sat down and I said to myself, "If I were a psychologist and I were presented with this problem, what would I do?" [laugh] I said, "Well, what you will do is you will improve your vocabulary because you won't have a book, you will have to have a vocabulary." Alright, if I was a psychologist and I had this problem what would I

advise somebody to do to get that vocabulary. And said, "well, what you will do is learn 100 new words a day." So what I did, I took ... this is what we knew about learning that kind of stuff in those days. I took my list of 100 words and I sat down and learned them. And the next day, I took another 100 set and I sat down and I learned them. And the next day, I took another 100 set and I sat down and I learned them. And you did that by making the list and working your way through the list and so what I did was I reviewed those, what I had learned on that previous day and the next day and so on. And by the time I got to the exam I had a vocabulary in excess of 1400 words. And since these were the common words because I had taken ordinary material to take these words out, and I had myself a vocabulary. And I went into the examination and passed it. [Wow]. Now, that was also something that became very important for me in the application of psychology, and that was to sit down and think about the problem and to think about it in terms of what knowledge in psychology had to offer to this kind of problem. I solved the problems for myself in that kind of context and also tried to solve problems for other people in the same manner. I would say to myself, "If I were a psychologist and I were presented with this problem what would I recommend." [good] I did it and it worked. [very good way of approaching it] Anyway, when I decided to go to spend my three months or whatever in residence as I mentioned before I had to change my thesis topic all together because the one I had wasn't suitable to the new approach of the department of psychology at the University of Toronto which had become much more scientific [right] and much more ... experimental in its approach.

So that had to go by the board so I now had to come up with something else and at this time I was offered a position as Executive Director of the Ontario Division of the Ontario Mental Health Association. Roger talked to Dr. McNeil who was then Director of the Mental Health Program at the Ministry of Health, and Dr. McNeill had been the superintendent at the hospital at St. Thomas when I was there, so we knew each other and Roger said to McNeill and Roger told me this, he said "that I said to him, if you don't get Ray Berry, you are going to lose him." And so, McNeill called me in and offered me the job of consultant psychologist which Myers was actually leaving. He had been doing that on a part-time basis, but McNeill wanted somebody on a full-time basis. There had been a previous meeting of chief psychologists at which Roger had said, "I'm going to quit this job because it is only part-time and Dr. McNeill wants a full-time psychologist." And there was a discussion there with the chief psychologists of the hospital talking about these kinds of things and trying to decide if one of those people would go and take this job. And we went around the table and nobody said they would. Roger said it would be a disaster if somebody were to go in there and take that full-time job and not have some kind of university affiliation. I argued very strongly against that and said, "No, that I don't believe that. I think that that is incorrect. The person who takes that job should be full-time and should not have that university affiliation because when the crunch comes and the decision is to be made between the two, unfortunately it may well be that person to decide as you have done and go the university route, rather than the mental health services route and I don't think that would be a very

appropriate decision for the mental health services." So that was my feeling about that at the time. My reason for refusing at that time was I didn't think I had enough experience for that job. So, all the chief psychologists had refused to take that job. And then of course McNeill approached me and asked me if I would take it and I said, "Well, no, I am not really very interested in Mental Hospitals. I am interested in Community Mental Health and the development of Community Mental Health services, so the job at the Ontario Division of the Canadian Mental Health Association is, I think, more the kind of thing that I would like to" do. He said, "if you come in, it will be necessary for you to provide some assistance within the hospital sector but I also want to develop those community mental health services and you'll have an opportunity to do that". So I was now faced with three really major decisions; well, I had to make a decision about these three major areas of activity. Do I stay in university and complete my degree? Do I go to Ontario Mental Health Association in that directorship position or do I take the job as consultant in psychology? Wow! [tough decision] Now that's marvelous having those kinds of decisions to make but boy or boy was it ever difficult. And I said to everybody O.K. I am going to take ten days or two weeks or whatever to make that decision. And I worked away at it. I talked to some of my colleagues. I talked to a colleague in the university and then I made up my mind that I would take the directorship of the Ontario Division of Canadian Mental Health Association. And then I got depressed. So I phoned Dave Gibson, who had been a colleague at the University of Toronto, who is now in Calgary at the University, I guess so he could talk me

out of it. And he did. So what happened was I then decided that I would go to Toronto and take the job with the Ministry. That's what I did. A major decision, best decision, I think, I ever made. O.K. So, in '63, that's where I went. O.K. And now what do you want to do? Do you want to move on with that. [Yep]. Anything about the University? [I'm going to get back to that] Oh, do you want to do that now or later? [after] O.K. [So, just go on with the Ministry, how long you were there] That's very interesting because my colleagues said, and one colleague in particular said you are crazy to take that job but, I'm glad you did. A whole lot of administrative things were happening in the Ministry at the time, as a whole new set up within the government about staffing positions and a whole new development of the way in which they were going to assign staff and this is not for psychology, it's for everybody. They had all kinds of personnel development were going on and at that time, I can't give you the numbers, but more than fifty percent of the proportion of superintendents said that they really didn't care whether they had psychologists or not. There was probably only one superintendent who said he thought he really would like to have psychologists here working and the rest really couldn't care less. So, what I did was I set myself a two year task and said to myself if I can't accomplish this, if I can't make some changes within two years then I am going to go. And what I did was to sit down and reviewed all of the personnel and established a whole new classification system for psychology. A lot of thought went into this as you can well imagine because things were not nearly as clear cut as they are now. There was no registration or anything of that nature. It was just coming

into play but it had not been a major factor up to that point. So what I did was, I went through this classification scheme and I had really two approaches and I think that they turned out to be very significant. One was that you could come in sort of anywhere and learn to work your way through and eventually get to be a chief psychologist no matter what your background was providing, of course, you could meet certain kinds of requirements. And so one would come in at the bottom and work one's way up to become a chief psychologist and that was it. The other approach was to say that psychologists within the government would have to be registered. They couldn't be non-registered psychologists. And the argument for that was that surely the qualifications for the people who are working in government service ought be, at least, equivalent to the qualifications or requirements for people working outside the government service. I think that was a very critical decision because the act itself would have allowed the government to ignore the registration requirements. So, I think that was one of the probably very few quite critical decisions that I made. That had a significant impact on psychology then and in the future. So what I did was establish a classification scheme so that there were psychologists with three different levels and then there were psychological assistants which we called and I coined the term psychometrists for them. So we had a classification for psychometrists and a classification system for psychology. I wrote a long article, a long paper actually, about psychology and the theme which ran through this was the one which I have already suggested and that is that the role of psychology within the applied areas including the one in the

Mental Health Services in Ontario was one in which the knowledge of psychology would be applied to the problems which were presented within that system and the knowledge would cover things like direct clinical intervention, research, program development, data collection for problem solving or decision making throughout the system and so on. So that, what I saw psychology doing was a very broad application the knowledge of psychology to whatever kinds of problems were presented in that system including those relating to individual patients or those relating to organizational development and structures as well. Which is a pretty high falouten and sophisticated approach, I must say, but one which I always worked out throughout my career and which I always tried to apply and to develop within the system so that there were different kinds of psychologists available in the different hospitals and services. So we had research psychologists working there and organizational psychologists and so on within the system. It is a consequence of that success, I stayed on and during the next, I would say, '63 from when I started to 1975 there were major developments within Mental Health services, within the Ministry and developments within both in terms of Community Mental Health Services, community clinics, that's a period of time in which there was a dramatic reduction in hospital populations with patients being discharged and incredible application of behaviour modification programs, to teach people social skills. It was a most exciting period of time in which psychology was making quite an important contribution to the development of these new concepts, these new organizational developments. [so you stayed with them until '75] No, I stayed with

them actually until 1983 but, in a different role. After this time there were reorganizations within the Ministry, in fact, there had been two or three reorganizations during that time, in which the various components, that consultant components and so on were shifted around from place to place within that organization. The significant change came, well actually there were early ones but we needn't go into those because in fact while there were more support and consultant staff that came into the Ministry during that period of time, the really significant one was made later on when the decision was made to take all of the consultative staff from all of the Ministry and put them in one area. So you didn't have a Mental Health Division anymore. What you had was all those consultants who were relating to hospitals, whether they were Mental Hospitals or General Hospitals or whatever into another category all together. And while I had actually been consulting in General Hospitals in the development of their Mental Health Services and so on, now the whole process was reorganized so that the professional services branch where I had worked before was now cut right down the middle and the medical consultants were sent off in one direction and the non-medical people were sent off in another direction and were put into different kinds of branches. So that in fact, the kinds of organization we had had which had been so effective was now completely discontinued. We are now into a different kind of operation all together and that was a very unpleasant experience for all of us. Nobody likes change, of course, and we saw this as a rather devastating process in terms of reducing the opportunity to do the kind of developmental things we were doing before. Now, a very

good colleague of mine, Dr. Lynes, had been the Director of the Mental Health Clinic in Peterborough after Dr. Pratton left, also was in the Ministry. In fact, I had recruited him for the Ministry talking to my boss and saying that's the guy you should have come in here, and for a while Dr. Lynes was my boss inside the Ministry until this major shift, when we all got separated. So, Dr. Lynes and I decided that what we would do is to get together and he and I would develop a program evaluation protocol for looking at the program within Mental Hospitals. Now, the reason we did this was because the Hospital Accreditation program did not take into account patient programming. They were concerned about all sorts of physical things and organizations things but didn't look at patient programming because in General Hospitals you don't do that. You find out if the medical staff have appropriate kinds of rules and regulations and so on and that's what gets accreditation acceptance. But not looking at the actual medical procedures and so on, whereas, in the Mental Hospitals, it is the procedures that count. What are the programs you are giving patients, how are you dealing with them, what do you do with their rights, what do you do with all kinds of aspects that are social psychological kinds of things within that system. And Dr. Lynes and I thought that what we should be doing is developing an assessment program that would take those kinds of things into account, so we spent about six months, I think, developing this protocol. And afterwards it became a regular protocol used within Mental Hospitals and the Executive Director or the Medical Superintendent could request an assessment by us or senior people in the Ministry could request us to do an assessment of the Hospital

and we carried out that program for maybe two or three years, really quite successfully and I think that the program was a very good one. Then, and I must say at this time that I was very uncomfortable with the boss that I was working for, we did not really get along very well and I had the opportunity of doing a project with the Federal Government in the context of looking at what kinds of responsibilities the Federal Government should have with the development of Mental Health Services throughout the country. That was very shortly after the publication of the Lalonde Document which title right now I can't recall, and I'm sure you'll probably know it. So, I went there on a part-time basis seconded from the Ministry of Health in Ontario to look at Mental Health Programming across the country. And I spent about nine or ten months doing that and I think that by the second or third day I realized that nothing was going to happen with this because everybody above me, except my immediate supervisor, was in an acting capacity. The Director of the Mental Health Division, the Director of the Section that I was in and the Deputy Minister were all acting. Therefore, they didn't have any commitment to what I was undertaking and I was hoping that what would occur is that there would be a new Deputy Minister before I was finished so that in fact there would be someone with whom I could work and to whom I could give this report. That didn't actually happen. What did actually happen was two days before I completed the task and was to return to Ontario. But it was a marvelous experience for me. I was able to visit all of the provinces and talk to all of the Mental Health Directors and work through with them the kinds of things that they

were doing and had a chance to look at the Mental Health system throughout the country. Marvelous, marvelous opportunity for me. I wrote a substantial document in which I gave them some options about what could happen and suggested as my major recommendation that they become or establish an information centre for the rest of the country, that they would collect information about on going programs and so on because if they were to do that it meant that everyone in the country would come to them for information. They would become a focal point for information about the development of services throughout the country, so in that sense the Federal Government would become an important agent in all of this activity. Well, they didn't follow up with that. But that's O.K. Those things happen. I think that it's too bad because if they had I think they would have played a more significant role and would have been seen as much more important than was the case. Because the old issue that health services are the responsibility of the Provinces not the Federal Government, that's what caused them to make this request in the first place but they didn't really see the value of what I was suggesting, I guess. But in any case, they didn't do it. It's interesting. There is a little episode, the Deputy Minister who had been appointed, I met him on the morning of the day that I was returning to Ontario. My plane left at something like, I don't know, 11:30 and I saw him at 9 o'clock in the morning and I handed him the report and said, "Sir, you're not going to have an opportunity to know anything about this report and I clearly can't tell you very much in an hour. I'd be more than willing come back and spend a day or whatever time you would like to make this presentation, to discuss it

with you, to look at the implications and in fact I'll do it on my own time. I'll take a day off and come and do this and I would be very pleased to spend the time to do this." And, of course, that was never followed up. I never went back. However, that's par for the course. These are the kinds of things that tend to happen. [right] So then I went back to Ontario, back to my other job where I was still relatively unhappy and then there was another reorganization with the development of a program development branch. And I applied for the Directorship of that branch and was awarded that Directorship so from 19... when was it, about 1975, I guess, until '83, I was the director of that branch and became responsible for the development of programs, not psychology, not mental health but general health and one of the significant things was to become responsible for what was called in Ontario, the Health Service Organization Program which was an alternate medical health services system with capitation payment for physicians and also became responsible for the Community Health Clinic program. So I had here this medical aspect and also the program for health clinics in the province. Pretty exciting time. Lots of developments occurred then too but never anything in the way of support from the Ministry itself with the development of these programs. The history of my life there. [oh my] Trying to change the world. Having an opportunity and having some small impact on doing some of these kinds of things. So, in '83 I was made a Director, again a reorganization, of the Mental Health Planning Branch and within a matter of what three months, had a falling out with the Director of that branch who I think, is one of the worst administrative people I have ever had

contact with and didn't really think I would be able to work for him when I took the job on but, I was determined to give it a try. But, it clearly did not work out. There was an opportunity to retire from the Ministry and I had served thirty-one years in the Ministry at that point, so I took that opportunity and left. And then I did consulting in Mental Health Development or Health Development Programs until '91 and during that time I also became the Executive Director of, oh, wait a minute, I am not sure what the title is here, I guess it would be the Executive Director of the Ontario Psychological Foundation which is something that previously I had been responsible, I think, in supporting and in developing. So I have had a long and exciting career in psychology [you certainly have] due to lots of very fortunate circumstances which just happen to come my way. Then when I came across the mountains here in '91 I thought I would continue to do my consulting work but something happened and I just never did. And retired from the scene and have become a full-time mariner. [oh, that's o.k.] laugh Well, I have been very active in Canadian power squadron (a boating group) for almost thirty years and am now teaching the weather course. So, I'm interested in meteorology now like I used to be interested in psychology and of course there are important similarities. In meteorology, you are dealing with a number of very complex factors which interrelate in complex and difficult manner. So that prediction of weather elements is difficult and the best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour. So, it sounds just like psychology.

Q: Hmm, I was just wondering I want to go back and pick up on the university and then I want to get into some of my own questions.

I'm wondering if we should leave the interview at this point and if I should contact you again at another time.

A: O.K.

Q: Like have you had enough right now and we could continue and pick it up. It's the logical place to break that's why I'm saying. And we could continue either in a couple of days, I could call you. I could review the tape to see if there is anything, you know, that I might have missed.

A: Or like to pick up. I might think of some other things too.

Q: And then, of course, I have a series of questions, a different direction that I want to go [O.K.] with my own questions [alright] and it would go back to the university where we didn't sort of finish that off but it would directly relate to that. [o.k.] Hmm... when would be a good time for me to contact you again.

A: Well actually, let me see here how we do this. It is obviously better for you to call when the time is cheaper. [right] So if you call after 6 o'clock, that's 9 o'clock my time. Now let me think about a time for that actually, I think Tuesday would be fine.

Q: So, O.K. if I call you at what time now.

A: Well, at 6 o'clock your time. [O.K. I can call] That gives you the cheaper rate.

Q: Alright. So I'll call you at 6 and we'll just follow through then with the rest of this interview.

A: O.K.

Q: O.K. That's super.

A: How much time have we taken so far.

Q: About an hour and a half.

A: Oh great.

Q: Yep. So I figure. Let's break and we'll go back and we'll finish it off.

A: O.K. fine.

Q: O.K. This has been really interesting. I've enjoyed it. I look forward to continuing.

A: Well, it's kind of fun to recall all this stuff which I don't think about all the time.

Q: But it's been good. O.K. Well thank-you very much.

A: You're very welcome.

Q: Alright. Bye, bye.

End Tape 1 Side 2

This is Tuesday January 30, 1996 and I am again speaking long-distance on the telephone with Ray Berry in his home in British Columbia.

Tape 2 Side 3

A: This has been kind of interesting as it has lead me to doing a lot of thinking about the past. So, how did you find it? [good, very good thank-you] Q: Do you have any idea what Myers' purpose was in doing the oral history collection?

A: [coughing] No, I don't. About that time there was a publication, and I don't remember what the title was, but it was to the effect of the history of psychology through biography. I don't know who wrote it but Myers was really quite impressed by that. As a consequence, I guess he decided to do that for Canadian psychology.

Now, I don't know anymore about it than that. Other than the fact that, when would this be about 1953-4, in his class he alluded to this publication and talked about it. He was quite taken with the types of biographical information which were presented. Whether that was the germ of the idea or whether he had it as well, whether that was an important influence in his decision, I really don't know. However, it does indicate why his questions took the kind of form they did. [ah, can you say more about that?] Well, instead of asking people what they did in psychology he went back asking the kinds of questions you began with, what is your background, what is your family background and so on. He was tapping into those biographical kinds of things rather than tackling history as a subject alone or without this other background. I think, it obviously impressed him. I don't have any more information than that. It just happened to be one of those kinds of situations in which because of his interest and expression of that interest that seemed to be why he was following the course he was. [that sounds interesting] The other thing that's important when you think about Roger 's interviews is that Roger was trained and very much a Rogerian psychologist [yes] and did non-direct therapies and lot of the kinds of questions in his approach, that kind of theoretical action. [right]

Q: How do you think he went about selecting the interviewees for the Oral History collection?

A: I have never understood that. [laugh] As a matter of fact, when you raised the issue I went back and looked at some material I had and I still don't understand. There are very significant people who, in my view, are missing and I don't know why they are missing.

Bruce Quarrington, for example, and Wes Coons who was a President of CPA, and myself. Now, Roger did mention to me several times that he should really like to interview me but he never got around to it. Now, I have some ideas about the exclusions. But I don't know what the criteria were for selecting people or what it was. When I look through the list some of these people have made very important contributions to psychology in a variety of different ways. However, they also tend to be academic. I think for whatever those reasons were Roger tended to be more concerned about the academic side of it than he was the applied side which is kind of curious in a way. In fact, when he and Mary Wright wrote the book, they wrote a book about academic psychology [right] and there is still no book written up to this point about applied psychology. I should give you one aspect of this thing which I always find interesting, Ray Shevenell and Roger were on different ends of a continuum and Roger's view was that if we have a very strong scientific base then applied psychology will become a kind of by-product and a very important by-product but be a by-product. Yet there is a very strong academic base and then it will likely be that applied work will be done. Shevenell's view was quite the opposite, if we have a very significant applied base and we are doing important things to assist and help people, and we come to be seen as important on that basis, there will be all kinds of research money for us to extend those activities. Now, I think that it also expresses his encouragement to develop the department of the University of Toronto in the direction he did. [right] The development of psychology at the University of Ottawa also reflected Ray Shevenell's approach. I heard them both express

these views at a meeting. I don't remember what the meeting was about. But it seemed to me that that kind of approach was very important for Roger and may have been the reason for his developing the list of candidates for oral interviews and also the reason he wrote the book on academic psychology.

Q: In work that I have done about Myers, himself, I went to his file in Toronto in the archives and he was really very, very focused on eminence. He was so interested in it and I wondered if there is some connection between the eminence and the list of people he drew up.

A: Well, in fact, that's what began to puzzle me. Well, I suppose we have our own view of eminence and certainly some of the people he interviewed were exceedingly eminent, no question about it, making very significant contributions to psychology but many of them did not. There were also I think eminent people in the applied area who were making significant contributions but they are not included. So, but I think that the point you are making is right because I think Roger's view was very much in favour of the concept of the "Great Man" theory. [ya, it is sort of interesting because his own background was applied] Yes, he and John Boyd were among the very first people to go off into the applied field and they did that excellent work at the Hospital for Retardation [right] in Orilla and in fact something like 20 years later, 25 years later, someone from Australia came and went to the Ministry of Health and asked what had happened to those programs because they had thought that they were so excellent. I think that those programs in fact were an excellent application of the knowledge of psychology. Doing the kinds of assessments they did, developing programs of activities as a

consequence of that. So, Roger had a very strong applied level of psychology at that point. He became the consultant to the Ministry of Health largely on the basis of the work that he did in Orilla and held that position until 1963 when he left it and I took it on. That's also another interesting factor. Roger made a quite significant contribution to psychology but along the way there were some very serious bumps. There were people who worked in the Ministry of Health at the psychiatric hospitals and were designated as Roger's boys because he recruited them and, in fact, was responsible for a lot of kinds of activity that happened there. But, he seemed to abandon them and at Couchiching, for example, his view was very much in the area of academic scientific, his change in the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto and also some of the exchanges that went on with some of those people who were in the applied field, lead to feeling that Roger had abandoned them. Now, you can make of that what you like but certainly that was the kind of thing that I think happened. The feelings between some of those people, I think, lead to some of the exclusions in the list which are, well I don't know enough about the direct interactions of these people but, these are my conjectures about what happened.

Q: Any ideas about your own exclusion?

A: No. It was a bit of a puzzle to me. Well, I have already told you about some of my experiences with Roger which were really kind of puzzling, particularly when I went into the graduate program at the University of Toronto. When I thought, in fact, that he would be a mentor and advisor he turned out not to be either. Also, the thing that intrigued me after our conversation last time was that when it

when it came to the really serious crunch to talk to people about my future, I didn't talk to Roger. Bob Gibbons who was in the department of psychology at U of T and Dave Gibson who was a colleague in Alberta were the people that I talked to and I didn't talk to Roger. I never really thought about that before but it was a little curious because Roger was to a very large extent an important person in the development of my professional career [definitely] the whole business of being in clinical and going to the University of Toronto, of getting the position in the Mental Health Clinic in Peterborough and I followed Roger into the Ministry and I also followed Roger by becoming the next Register at the Ontario Board of Examiners. It is kind of strange. Or, at least, it seems so to me.

Q: When you were at the University of Toronto in the clinical program, can you tell me a bit about that and your experience with Roger, well you mention as an advisor, as a teacher, as a well, here is this man as a Rogerian therapy background, was he an approachable person? I get the feeling that he wasn't that he was very inconsistent.

A: Exactly. Since other people have mentioned this too. The fact that I guess you couldn't make predictions or at least it took a while to learn how to make the predictions if he's there as the person responsible for graduate studies in the Psychology Department at the University of Toronto. You knew that then you knew what kind of thing was going to happen. If you thought of him in terms of social exchange then that was really quite different. Roger was a very nice person, an excellent person, a very nice person socially and so on was well thought of and then if you thought of him in terms of being the

consultant in psychology for the Ministry of Health that was a different kind of role as well. It took a little while to be able to identify those roles so you knew how you were talking to Roger. That was. I guess everybody does that to some extent, plays a role but, it was very abrupt and startling, not only to me but also to some of my colleagues as well. I think, in a sense, they became uncertain of him. It got to the point where they were not really sure if they could trust him or not. Now, when you talk about teaching, I was trying to find out what is was I actually took from Roger there; I thought he was excellent, absolutely excellent. I took advanced clinical from him and advanced interviewing and much of these were essentially small group interactive teaching sessions. They were excellent. [that's interesting. It seems that he really had this split because he was very much this academic administrator and yet he was very much into the applied too]. That's right [That's quite interesting. I hadn't quite thought of it as so divided before. But I can see that you would have to know in which role you were approaching him.] That's right and to go back to my first experience when I first went there, that was a bit of a shocker because I expected to go in and have an exchange with him in which he would be helpful and say well these were the kinds of things and so on. Instead of, the sort approach he took which was what kind of courses do you want to take and who do you want to study with. Bingo. My response, of course, initially was well you know what I have done and you know what kind of interest I have and where I want to go. This is what I want to do, what would you advise me? He didn't have any advice for me or at least he didn't give any. He said it was

up to you to make up your own mind. Well, that's not very Rogerian. It was much more Gestalt. [laugh]. One was taken aback by that. Then the next time there was a really significant shift, I think, had long term career implications was that summer between first year and second year when he essentially pushed me into the clinical position in the Peterborough Mental Health Clinic. Now, that did two things, it reduced my opportunity to complete a doctoral degree at the University of Toronto, which I didn't realize at the time but kind of felt I should be there doing that instead of going on to a clinical situation, but it also provided me with what became a very, very significant career activity, and change. It was an excellent position for me that followed up later. So, Roger had quite a significant influence on what happened to me. But on one hand, I have a little bit of difficulty being grateful for that because of these other kinds of exchanges. [right] A bit of a cunundrum. [laugh]

Q: Yes. Yes. I can see that. Eventually he went on to be Chair of the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto [yes] and it is my understanding that when he was chosen Chair, it was quite a surprise that it was felt that Professor Bernhardt had been the acting Chair and that he was the logical choice and then suddenly Myers became the Chair. Do you have any thoughts on this or any information about it, why he was chosen?

A: I think all of us were a little bit startled by that too because when describing this approach, rather different than Bott whom he was replacing, and it seemed to me that when I look at it, Bernhardt was a better compromise between Roger's approach and Bott's approach. Now, I have no idea why the decision was made for Roger. A lot of

the people who were in the field thought that that was marvelous because now applied psychology would really get a tremendous amount of support. And contrary to that, as if they went very definitively in the direction of scientific psychology and so on. That's fair enough. I have nothing to argue about that. The really serious bump was the fact that people really didn't anticipate that.

Q: From what I understood he tried to set up an applied program as well as the scientific but the applied program was denied.

A: That may very well have been the case.

Q: Was it just a matter of where the funds were at that time?

A: I don't know. I don't know what the inner workings were at the University of Toronto were at the time. By then I was out in the field so I wasn't close enough to have any knowledge of that. There was a lot of discussion then and later of course about the establishment of professional degrees. I don't think that Roger was in favour of that, but then one doesn't know. If you think about what has happened so far, what I have mentioned so far [right] if Roger tried to put in an applied program and that was turned down then, one could expect that he would go gungho in the other direction. That makes sense in terms of the way Roger dealt with these kinds of things. I don't know what happened and all I've got is little learned conjecture by people who really didn't know what actually went on there.

Q: No, no one seems to and the interesting thing is that there are absolutely no records. There's nothing. There are no departmental records kept at all. They can't find them, so the solution is they just didn't keep them.

A: There certainly should have been some proposal put forth and I assume you are talking about graduate programs, one would have thought that there would have been a proposal put forward to the Dean of Graduate studies about the desire on the part of the Department of Psychology to put together an applied program. Would that not be the case? [perhaps, through the Dean. Ya, it is just interesting that the records of the Department itself don't exist. Ya, and we have looked for them and for some reason either they are somewhere and we don't know where they are. We have looked in the Archives and can't find them, unless they were distributed among different department, we don't know] It seems very unlikely to be. That is very puzzling. [Yes, it is especially since it is so interesting and it took quite a dramatic turn. There is nothing there to sort of help us understand why] Well, you would think that it would have been in the Archives because certainly the Dean of Graduate Studies wouldn't have that in his files at this late date. So, I would have assumed that it would be in the Archives and any kind of specific proposal would have been put forward and would have been retained but maybe not. [ya, I haven't looked at the Dean's files so maybe there would be something there]. Have you talked to Mary Wright? [Yes, yes and Mary Wright hasn't been able to give me anything further other than I already know. I have been trying to track down some of the people who were in the department at that time who might know. But so far, no luck.] What about Al Sheppard? [I haven't tried him]. I can't recall of course, whether he was in the Department at the time that this actually happened, so I really don't know. [I could see, I could always check that out]. But

you could see the puzzle, when in fact, with his background and with all of the people who related to Roger and all of a sudden the Department seems to take this dramatic turn. And it caught a lot of people and I happen to be one of them where the ground rules kept on changing and the kind of study that I was going to do was a comparison of attitudes toward parent-child relationships in clinic and non-clinic parents. Now, when we started, that was O.K. but by the time I decided whether I was going to go into residence or not in '61 or '62, there was no way, I didn't have the kind of scientific background that would be acceptable to the Department at that time.

Q: So you got caught, so you couldn't go back then.

A: I would have to start back again in terms of developing a thesis topic and would have had to been much more research oriented and under those circumstances it would have been a much more significant commitment to do that. So, with these other two jobs in the offing I passed on that one.

Q: Well, it looks like you did the right thing.

A: Oh, absolutely. The interesting thing is that I spent a long time talking to Bob Gibbons who was in the Department and who had been a student at the time I was and I asked him what I should because a doctoral degree was becoming far more important in those days than it had been in the past. After talking to him, I think all afternoon, I decided well I am not going to do that one. Then I talked to Dave Gibson to make the decision between the other two. Which is interesting. And not to Roger. And the thing that is curious was when I talked to you earlier and I began to think about it, I was thinking Roger should have been the logical person. [yes, certainly,

but then you didn't know what to expect if you were going to speak with him]. That's right. [so he wasn't that approachable, at least professionally]. That's strange, I mean, this is a Rogerian. [yes] I would have thought that would have make it even easier, where I would go in and we would have an opportunity to talk these things through. [exactly] And, in fact, if I had, he may well have responded in that way. [ya, and also he was working in the capacity of advisor of the head of the graduate studies. I mean that was his position. It was almost as if when he became an administrator he assumed a different type of role entirely and his Rogerian background almost went by the side.] I would not be least surprised to hear Roger say, well, when I am in a Rogerian situation well that's how I respond. But when I am an administrator, this is how I respond. And he did it very well providing you knew which one it was. [I suppose if you just approached him as a person, he was probably more approachable]. Oh, yes. Roger was a very nice man. And we all liked him. There was not the slightest bit of doubt about that and certainly in social situations he was very gracious and very nice. My wife was speaking of him yesterday and talking of one of the things and that is that Roger seemed to like us and we liked him because we were accepting of his relationship with Mary. So, we had a friendly relationship and that became more difficult of course at the time that he was Executive Director of CPA.

Q: O.K. I was going to ask about, he was very, very involved in CPA and I was wondering how CPA shaped this whole Oral History collection. If it played any role in it?

A: He obviously came in contact with people through CPA and Park Davidson, for example, did a major paper on psychology for the Federal Government; it was on training and so on. And Park was a president of CPA, so there were a lot of contacts there which would have been useful and would have provided an avenue for to contact people. And Roger was very active in CPA, of course, right from the very beginning when it was first formed. [I see. So, you knew him through CPA as well]. Yes. Roger was executive director, as you know, for some years and there were some people in the association and I guess, I would have to say I was one of them of them although I don't think I was an instigator in this process., who became very concerned about the organization of the association. It was growing in size and we had a part-time executive director and a whole lot of things were happening including financial kinds of issues that were being raised. Two, three people, I guess, I am trying to recall this, were appointed to look into the organization of CPA. Glen MacDonald, and myself and I am trying to think of the name of the other, maybe I'll think of it as we go along here, who wasn't able to participate, in fact, because he became ill at that time and so was not able to participate. So, much of this activity was left to Glenn and I. Roger blamed Glenn for the kinds of recommendations which were made because essentially they were that the head office should move to Ottawa, that there should be a change in the use of executive suite, I mean the people in executive suite had been appointed as secretary treasurer of the association which we thought was not appropriate, and there was a very good working relationship between Roger and executive suite. And what we recommended is that the the

association should have a central office in Ottawa, that it should have a full-time Executive Director and it most assuredly, the responsibility that had been given to the executive suite withdrawn and put into the board responsibility. Well, you can imagine that did not go over well with Roger for a lot reasons. He obviously still saw me a friend even though these are the kinds of recommendations that are being made and invited me to lunch in the faculty club and we sat down and we talked and what Roger said was that this is a terrible thing that was happening and talked about the kinds of issues involved here and talked about defending the organization as it was then and talking very bitterly about Glenn MacDonald and Glenn's attitude toward Roger. I would have to bear at least fifty percent of the responsibility for what had happened but, Glenn was getting the blame and Roger was appealing to me to make sure these things didn't happen. My response was that Roger you have to make up your mind when you want to leave, and target a date and do that or otherwise what is going to happen is that as the organization moves along the decision will have to made whether you carry on or whether you don't carry on and so on and I said you have to make that decision and you should make it. Don't let the association push you out. Essentially that's what had happened because Roger obviously wouldn't go to Ottawa and that was a very, very uncomfortable time for Roger. Very uncomfortable. I felt very badly about that because clearly what the association did was what had to be done. It's the old story of being one of the ancients who is left behind because things change. [right] I really felt badly about that. There are other colleagues I have had through my working life

with the same kind of situation occurs and I just think that that's tragic.

Q: Around what time, year was that. Do you know?

A: No. But it is not too difficult to discern because very shortly thereafter the board made the decision to go that route. [O.K.] So, if you went and found out when they actually moved to Ottawa then you would look up and it would be several months before that that it occurred.

Q: Good. I can look that up. I think that that covers most of my questions. I guess just two general questions which Myers would ask. He would always ask, who were the most influential teachers that you had throughout your career?

A: I have been thinking about that and I think that it is relatively easy. Mary Wright, because it was in her class that all this interest really evolved. Liddy because of his philosophical approach. Liddy was kind of an unusual man, kind of a strange man. I'm sure that if you talk with other people you will hear that. The kind of guy who would lock the door to the class. [Oh, my gosh] when it actually started and a variety things like that, but it was beautiful to watch his thinking, his philosophical thinking about things, it was very logical approach to things. He was very influential. Brother Philip because he took me under his wing and gave me a Master's thesis topic, and assisted me in that process. So I think that he is very important. And I think also Gord Turner because Gord was Organizational psychology and as I mentioned before, because of the strange way I went through psychology at my Master's level I took all of the graduate courses that were available, including applied

psychology and so and was exposed to those people. Gord was a very important person, I think. He was interested in phenomenology which is now coming back and because I had worked with him as a student assistant then that also was very important. Now, the curious thing is that when I went to Toronto I can't pick any one out. Roger, of course, because this was an ongoing relationship and the courses that I took from him in interviewing and so on they were important because they were central to what I was trying to do. But the gaps between Roger and myself were, I don't know, they didn't lead him to be a very influential teacher. He was very influential in what happened to my career, but was not an influential teacher like say Liddy was. [no, I see what you are saying] And there was, there really wasn't anybody, I learned from those people, but there was no person there who was really significant, influential on what happened. Which is kind of curious, I guess.

Q: What about books, were there any really influential books that you can recall?

A: Yes. You want me to come up with titles now. [well, just generally describe them] Well, there was a two volume series on social psychology which was very important. I can't remember now. I mean I not very good at that sort of thing anyway. They were really very important to me and I became quite interested in social psychology. As a matter of fact that is quite interesting because at one point I was thinking about going to the social psychology department at Ann Arbor but that didn't, it didn't actually materialize; I guess because I thought that I was much more interested in clinical and so on but I did take advanced social

psychology when I went to U of T. O.K. Other books other books. One on the history of psychology and I am trying to think of who wrote that. And I can't offhand but the thing about that book was that it became very clear to me at that stage that much of what went on in research or scientific investigation was not really based on the development of scientific thought, it had to do with the zeitgeist. And anybody who went somewhere else in terms of what they were looking at instead of zeitgeist had a heck of a lot of difficulty doing anything. That's still the way and that's of not only in the social sciences but it is true in the social science but in natural science as well (recent article in New Scientist mentioned a number of scientists who had great trouble being recognized because their theories were removed from current thought). Now, that book had a remarkable influence on me because it taught me that. Now, in fact, other people might argue and say that's not true but I believe it to be true and I think that that book demonstrated it and I think that it is still true. So that, while scientists think they are going in this direction on the basis of their scientific investigation and so on that's only true to a minor degree. One is able to do the research based upon and wants, and is encouraged to do it and thinks about doing it in terms of the kind of Zeitgeist in which they live. [very interesting] You want to think about that and do a little observing you begin to think gosh that's really right. [ya, I hadn't thought of that at all. That's a very interesting thought]. Now, I don't know why that appealed to me but it obviously had something to do with the way in which I thought about things, I guess because it was very influential in the way in which I thought about things from then on. Now, I can't think of,

there are all kinds of books about all sorts of things. I generally tend to read very broadly. I can't pick out anything that was significant other than those two because I still think about those two. But I can't tell you who wrote them. [that's O.K.].

Q: Any thoughts about where psychology is going to go in the next decade or so?

A: Ya. I think again that one has to look at the Zeitgeist and the influences that are there and it will take psychology a while to catch up to the fact that that is where it is going but you know those kinds of things happen. The whole process of the information system is going to have a tremendous effect on the teaching of psychology and so on. There are already programs in the United States in which one can get a PHD through home study essentially dealing with that kind of information technology. There are programs actually being taught in Canada. You can get an MBA from Queens' University, I believe. So, that is already in progress. That's going to have a tremendous impact, I think, on the teaching of psychology. I think also those kinds of interactive information systems are going to have a huge influence on the way in which we deal with clients because we don't do that on the professional, and I got all this marvelous information for you because the client will be able to tap into all that information to, at least, an equal extent and probably to a greater extent because it will be more specialized in the area the client is interested in than the professional psychologist, whoever that might be. And that's true for everything. It is true for research for applied psychology, for organizational psychology and so on. Those are going to have tremendous impact on psychology. Now, psychology because of its

orientation and knowledge in these areas ought to be in the forefront. Will it be? No, it won't be. Because psychologists seem to be, and it still seems to be the case are incredibly conservative. I don't know if you have found that. We have some creative thinkers and we have some people who are really quite advance. But, by and large, I think psychology is pretty conservative. So, I don't see it as the leader it ought to be. It will be a follower as these things develop. Now, research, where are we going in research? I think that's maybe a bit of a puzzle because there's a big dilemma about what consciousness is and so on [oh ya, right, yes] as you are probably well aware. And depending on how some of that stuff comes out in theory well there is a great deal of importance in terms of where we go. The other thing of course is that a lot of the work that is going on in neurology and theology (? biology) and so on a much better understanding of genetic background are going to have a tremendous impact on the kind of underlying information for psychology. It is not going to interfere with the business of looking at behaviour. It's going to change it because if we know that some of this behaviour is much more likely to be governed by genetic background. You know, the old problem of nurture and nature, but those are going to become increasingly difficult and increasingly important areas of activity, I think. Now, the other thing that I think is interesting is memory. We have a huge category of people who are going to get older and in which memory aspects are going to play very important and significant role. I think that psychology can make major significant contributions in that area. And I hope it will. We have some really excellent people in that area who are making

important contributions. Now, how about that other very important and interesting area of behavioural interactions. Now, I am talking about things like, on the one hand all those things relating to violence and the role and aspect that it plays in our society and also all those horrible problems of interracial, interactive areas of activity. Now, we share those fields with a huge numbers of people, sociologists, anthropologists, and social psychologists and so on and what I think should be happening there is much more conjoint studies. [right]. Is that where we are going to go? Well, I think that that's where we are probably going to go because it is probably where the money is going to be available because people are trying to get answers to those problems. Psychologists go where the money is. Why wouldn't they? [that's right] O.K. So, that's what I think is happening. I see really major changes in the way it's going to go. The opportunities, the challenges and the pressures.

Q: That ends my questions, my specific questions. Are there any things you would like to comment? Or, just any thoughts about the interview?

A: Ya. A number of things have kind of intrigued me. [O.K.] One goes back to Roger's approach. He really didn't ask anybody about psychology, did he? [No. that's right]. Why didn't he do that? Because this is going on, I am thinking about myself and you didn't ask these questions either. And, of course, you didn't ask these questions because

end of Tape 2, Side 1

Tape 2, Side 2

and was instrumental, I think, in supporting and helping to develop and perhaps to a large extent was responsible for developing the accreditation program for psychology in Ontario Psychological Association. I was also very instrumental and on the committee and worked very hard to establish a what was then called the Provincial Organization of ... what the heck was it called ... that was the organization concerned with the group which met for provinces and I can't remember what the name of it now is either. That is the Council on Provincial Associations of Psychology. I guess at that time I was the chair of the professional affairs committee of CPA. It became very clear to me that something like this had to happen. And let me give you a very good example and you will understand about the Quebec situation. We had on the board of CPA a very sharp psychologist from Quebec, Roger Lapointe, and in discussions on the board there were a number of issues which were taboo. They would not be discussed there, Roger would not let those issues be discussed because he could be outvoted. Now, when the council was established Roger was one of the first representatives on that council and from Quebec and it was decided that the issues that were raised would be decided by consensus and in those days Roger brought up topics which were taboo on the CPA board. Now, if you want to understand the situation with regard to Quebec and English Canada there it is.

Q: What kind of issues?

A: Things like registration. The application of registration, services all across the country. [O.K.] In other words, if you could think of psychological issues that would relate to provincial responsibility and

concern as an organization being decided at CPA board, that's a no-no. Because essentially the other people on the board could have outvoted him and said well this is what the regulations on the board ought to be, these are the kind of regulations that should to be in place in all provinces which would have national standards and those national standards should say this, this and this. National standard for psychology should be at the doctoral level and so on. That's just one key one but there are all kinds of others too in terms of health care services, in terms of research grant funding and so on where they wish to be able to make provincial decisions about these things and did not want to be overwhelmed by some National standard. When in fact the National standard was decided by other people in other jurisdictions. That's exactly what it's about now. [exactly]. Having seen those things happen on the CPA board and the other kinds of things happening that is what made me decide very strongly that we needed that council. I pushed very hard for that and getting support from CPA and also from the various provinces and we had a couple of meetings and it was actually produced. Now, I think that that's significant and I think that the other one was significant too. Then I was one of the people, there was Neeufeldt and a couple of other people instrumental in establishing the applied division of CPA. So, what I am pointing out is I was involved in a number of these really critical areas and being lucky enough to have the opportunity to be there and, of course, that ended up in being influential in doing those kinds of things. The reorganization of CPA for example and also being at Couchiching. Now, there are other people too, but what I am saying is that it seems to me that Roger should have been

interested in those things too. Those questions are not asked. [no]. Why? I am puzzled. I don't know why. I thought they might have been. Why did you do this? Why did you follow this particular research approach? Why did you make those kinds of statements would have been, I think, significant sorts of things to ask psychologists because what they did and said and wrote were the things that were influential. [ya, no, he didn't. I am trying to think. He would ask how sort of the course of development where they went and why they chose that place, and things like that. But he didn't ask them about why they were making the statements they were asking. No, he never asked that.] That's right. [you know, why are you claiming the things you are. No, he didn't]. It is a kind of an oral history or biography of the people he interviewed. [yep, it's much more a life history than a history of psychology in Canada. That's what I have sort of felt very strongly.] Very much so, very much so. [ya. I don't think that you could actually sit down and draw a history of psychology in Canada from these. Now, he asked a lot about, especially when people went into new departments or departments split from philosophy, he would ask sort of, tell me about the development so he was very much interested in the academic development of certain departments. And that comes through quite clearly.] That's right. [But other than that no.] You almost have the sense that applied psychology didn't exist. And that's a tragedy in some ways because a lot of departments of psychology were very influential in things that happened in the applied area, including the University of Toronto when they sent Myers and John Boyd out to Orilla. And those things happened quite

often throughout history of course. It's still a puzzle. To some extent it is similar to what we were saying before in, that is, that Roger categorized or compartmentalized things like that. Maybe that's why. I don't know. I have a lot of respect for the guy in spite of feeling, how should I put it, at some distance from him I can't find the words here to describe this. Very often nonplused by the kind of responses that he made and so on but I still have a lot of respect for him and for the things that he tried to do and he did accomplish. Look what he did for the University of Toronto. Just a major, major development. [right] very significant, very important. He is responsible for that. [yes, well he certainly did build it up into a fine department and brought some of the best people in. Actually, as a result of it from what I understand reading the others, is that this movement started in Toronto and other universities felt compelled to follow it and it really, changed the whole direction in Canada was because of what happened at Toronto.] That's right. The other interesting thing, of course, is that the other universities responded by trying to do something else in many cases. The applied benefit in other universities because they have to be different than the University of Toronto. I mean all of things have very significant kinds of influences and Roger was responsible for that I don't think that there is any doubt about that in the world. [very interesting, very interesting. You've actually helped me look at it quite differently, in a much broader way than I was. So it has been very good.] Well, I appreciate what you are saying because that's how I try and approach these things. It's all very easy to get involved in the small cary(?) of the thing and you really have to put it in context.

Like Cain, we are all human. Right? [right] We respond to these things differently and so on. [I have been feeling bogged down because of the details and suddenly it's starting to fall into a larger picture which I really appreciate. And you have been really helpful in doing this, very helpful.] That's my job. I try to do it. [laugh, you are doing a good job].

Q: Well, are there any other comments?

A: Ya. and that is the names I mentioned, I should ask before I make a comment about that, is this process continuing? Is the Oral History process continuing? Is somebody responsible for that and doing it? [No. No nothing was done since he started it. It just sat there. And no one has picked it up and no one has continued. Now, you know, with your permission I would add this interview to that collection.] Yes, I that would be appreciated. [Yes. I mean it would be very good if someone continued on and actually maybe focused it more on the history of psychology. But certainly there are probably a lot of people who should be interviewed.] I have some names for you. [O.K. I would appreciate that. And the other thing is even if there are not the history of psychology in Canada, they absolutely wonderful life histories. They are terrific life histories and I found them very inspiring as a student. You know I have learned a lot about psychology and people from reading them.] I'm sure. And of course you begin to have some appreciation of what people do when you understand some of that background. And I have to give him credit for that. That whole approach of the bibliographical history of the people who were significant and do things, that's important stuff to know because then you begin to understand, why did they do that.

Why did they move in that direction? The thing that strikes me is that, I guess that I was always like that, that my approach to things has always been the same and psychology has been an incredible addition to way in which I view things and think about things and so on, but my approach does not seem to have changed at all. I've got a lot more stuff now to use, but in fact, two things, one, that broad approach, probably I think I have always tried to understand things in that manner and the other one, of course, is looking to the future. I don't consider myself a futurist, but have always been interested in looking at where we are going. If you believe in cause and effect then you want to think about what kind of causes would we put into place now for effects we would have in the future. And I am utterly amazed at how few people think in those terms. What I would think of, and this is kind of my fantasy, is that they look at the hill, I am going to climb the hill and look and see where I am going. And I would try and do that and after a while the top of the hill would begin to get a little crowded so that I would look for the next show. So I would always be thinking where are we going, what are the implications for this, what kinds of causes do we need to put in place now for effects which we think would be appropriate in the future. That has always been my approach. I am sure that came right out of my childhood somewhere whenever that was, and I am sure that that must have been a kind of learned approach to things. Why those particular ones, who know. But that is true for everybody. Whatever Roger did throughout, I am sure is exactly the same kind of thing, so that if one looked at his biography one might be able to pick out those kinds of things that led to those sorts of developments.

Anyway, I think about it in that way. [right]. O.K. Let me give you some names. [O.K.] Now, these are people who made important contributions. Bruce Quarrington. Now, Bruce Quarrington was a professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto and he was also the chief psychologist at the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital. Now, why Roger didn't interview Bruce, I don't know. Maybe, he didn't see him as a significant person, but I think o-contrar, that there was some conflict between Bruce and Roger. The other person who make important contributions and who was president of CPA and who was, I think to a large extent responsible for actually getting the Couchiching Conference in place is Wes Coons. At one point, Wes along with all the rest of us, was one of Roger's boys. But they had a falling out and maybe that's why Wes isn't included, I don't know. Another person was Lynn Newbigging who was at McMaster. [Len] Lynn Newbigging. And developing the Department of Psychology at McMaster, I thought, was kind of significant. [Ya, I don't think that I have covered anyone from McMaster]. Very strange, very strange. O.K. now, I am trying to pick up those people in the past. Because I didn't give you a whole long list of people in the future who might be [I'd be interested in the future too]. Well, maybe what I ought to do is give it a little bit of thought and send you a list [ya] and also indicate why I think these people are important. One other person who is at Queen's, and I don't think there are very many people at Queen's on that list. [I have a few, yes]. A couple who are missing who are no longer available, but one of the people who is not on and might have been is Jimmy, Jim Inglis and as far as I know he is still be at Queen's. [O.K.]

The other person is Barbara Wand. Barbara was Registrar in Ontario for a long period of time and therefore was quite influential in what happened. O.K. I'll hold off some of the rest because they're later in this whole development. But maybe I'll send you list of these people. [Oh, I'd appreciate that]. And indicate why I think that they're important. It gets harder of course, because now there are a lot more psychologists. [right, yes, there are].

Q: O.K. That would be good if you would just send a list.

A: O.K.

Q: Ya, that would be very helpful.

A: O.K.

Q: And if you ever think of that History of Psychology book, the name or the author, I would be very interested in it. I would be interested in looking at it. If it comes to you at some point.

A: I would really like to tell you both of those. [well, if you think of them]. And you know what I did of course when I moved here I gave away my psychology library. [ohh]. Gave it away to a colleague and but anyway I'll give it some thought and see if I I'm getting too old really [laugh] and see whether I can come up with it. [if you can. It would just be interesting to look at it]. Ya, it made a really tremendous impact on me because I began, of course, you know with my broad approach that all this stuff has to fit in this way. And I used to have this view of the creative scientist who went off and did his own thing; it didn't really matter what other people thought or where the rest of the thinking was, but, of course, I don't know that's really strange when you think about it. We are the

product of culture and society and the time in which we live. And it also produces the kinds of things we'll investigate and look at. O.K.?

Q: O.K. Well, thank-you very, very much. It has been very interesting. Are you coming East at all in the [no] this summer. Any conferences or anything? [that's a possibility, I guess but I don't have anything planned at the time.] O.K. Well, I would like to meet you. [If I do I would be very pleased to do that.] It would be very nice to meet you but I really, really appreciate you been very, very helpful and it's been a pleasure to speak with you. [You're welcome. Obviously, I've enjoyed it.] Good. Take care of your cold. [I'll be receiving that transcript from you.] I'll send it. It will take me a while. [Oh, yes]. But I will send it to you. [O.K.] O.K. Great. Thanks. Good-bye.

Appendix E

Interview with John Adair

I, Dr. John Adam, John G. Adam (signature) consent to be interviewed by Judith Falin for her M.A. thesis research. I give my permission to have the interview tape recorded ✓ (please check if in agreement) and would like the tape returned or deposited in the C.P.A. Archives ✓ (check preferred arrangement). I understand that I can choose not to answer any of the questions if necessary. I give my permission to be quoted directly or paraphrased from the interview ✓ (check if in agreement) with either no time limit restrictions ✓ or with the following restrictions (check preferred arrangement).

John G. Adam

This is a continuation of the Oral History Collection of Psychology in Canada started by C.R. Myers. I am talking with John Adair in the lobby of the Lord Elgin Hotel in Ottawa on Tuesday, January 16, 1996. Dr. Adair has just flown from Winnipeg to Ottawa to assist in organizing the program for the upcoming International C.P.A. meeting. I am currently working on the Oral History Collection for my Master's thesis and this interview is part of my thesis.

Q: I am going to start with where were you born?

A: I was born in San Antonio, Texas in the U.S. gosh when 1933 [O.K.] and grew up there.

Q: What did your father do?

A: He was an electrical engineer.- worked at a radio and television transmitting station; kept the station on the air and things of that sort. His father was a Methodist Minister, who had three sons all of whom became electrical engineers - all of whom worked in the radio business, which probably was, if you think about it, the computer business of the 1930s. So they all went into the new industry. One of them became the chief engineer for the Federal Communications Commission during WW II, so he had quite a high level post for a number of years. He lived in Washington, D.C. The other two worked at the same radio station.

Q: What did your mother do before she was married? Did she work?

A: She was a housewife. She did not work outside the house; she did once or twice, but minor things. She didn't have that kind of career.

Q: Do you have any siblings?

A: I have one sister; five years older than I; she was a high school teacher in Colorado, but is retired. I was the younger sibling.

Q: What were your earliest recollections of the home before you started school, basically, was there a lot of reading material in the home?

A: Oh gee, earliest recollection -- I don't really recall, certainly not an abundance of reading material compared let's say to the home of my grandchildren-- or even of my children. You have to recall, in a sense, that those were the depression years. [right] and my earliest recollections are more like the beginning of WW II and throughout the war, those were the years I was about 7, 8 years and on. I don't recall that much about the ...

Q: Were your parents ... Were they readers themselves, do you recall? Were they interested in education?

A: Yes, my father had gone to university and my mother had not. My mother was born in Mexico City of French parentage. My grandparents are buried in the French cemetery in downtown Mexico City. My mother's grandfather came from Biarritz, France to Mexico City, and her father was born and died there, and she was born there. He was in a chinaware production business in Mexico. Somewhere along the way, around the time of Pancho Villa. The intelligencia essentially and entrepreneurs were chased out of the country. But by the same token, I think that when my grandfather had lost his chinaware factory, the family was not in good financial shape. As is often the case when people emigrate, they leave to seek something better than what they currently have. So they came to Texas. In the course of all of that my mother really didn't have all

that much formal education when they came to Texas. We've recently been looking at photos of this. They went on an old Model T on a trek again looking for better conditions in California and pictures of that looks like the "Grapes of Wrath". It was really incredible. There were no roads. There were board roads where the desert was, to try to keep you up off the sand so that you could go. There were rocks and just ruts to travel the rest of the way. That was in the 1920s. So with that kind of jumping around, she really didn't complete her education. And with the depression, my father didn't complete university either. I wouldn't say that what you think of today as an educated family's environment was there. (This is more negative in tone than was the case; I think my parents, especially my father, encouraged and supported intellectual pursuits.)

Q: What about religion, was it a religious family?

A: Yes, it was. In a sense, yes. My father was a Methodist Minister's son [right] but he worked at this radio station on Sundays for some thirty odd years. He never went to church during these years and after, initially because it was physically impossible to go to church. My mother was raised as a Roman Catholic. I went to Catholic church; was baptized in the Catholic church, and the like. But then, she had a falling out with the Catholic Church. She didn't like it. She decided to look elsewhere and became an Episcopalian, what you would call here an Anglican. In many senses they are fairly similar, and has some similarities. In Texas, in the U.S., she was an Episcopalian. That's the U.S. equivalent of Anglican. I was a loyal Church Sunday School attendee, attender. I was an altar boy, a very

devoted altar boy. I grew up in a Church environment; so much so that I began to consider the possibility of becoming an Episcopalian priest. I was even what they call a Postulant. I was enroute to becoming a Episcopalian priest and pretty much had plans on going to seminary. However, I had gone through university fairly rapidly, so I was quite young on graduation. I had gone on a ministerial scholarship, and it was decided that I was probably too young to go to seminary, and become a priest. I would have been very young; so I was told I should take another year's education to mark time, while I grew up, or got older, or whatever was expected of me. So I took a year of graduate psychology and that's where I decided to switch careers. I had been accepted into seminary. I had my room reserved in seminary and as it got closer I had to make the decision that that was not what I wanted to do.

Q: How old were you when you graduated from University?

A: Probably would have only been 20.

Q: What was the normal age?

A: Well, at least 21 or 22, somewhere around in there. So 20 was a bit early. So I did one thing. I guess I had a bit of guilt feelings about all of this. And so, I graduated with a BA and Master's degree from Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas. And I had gone through three years of university; I did four years in three years getting a ministerial scholarship. I must have had a bit of guilt feelings because I went to the University after I decided not to go into the ministry, and said, "look I am not going into the ministry, I want to pay back the scholarship". That threw them for a loop. They really didn't know what to do; here they had this fellow who wanted to pay

back his scholarship. Pay the money really that was rightfully his. I guess. I guess I had pretty strong feelings about it. So I paid it back. They accepted the money.

Q: I want to come back to this but just before we do that, you went to elementary and to high school in Texas?

A: Yes, I went to elementary, high school, junior high school in San Antonio. Q: Were these graded schools?

A: Yes [O.K.] Yes, they were graded.

Q: Some people went to graded, one room classrooms.

A: Oh no. There were 400 and some odd students in my graduating high school class. It was a huge ...

Q: Were you a good student in school?

A: Ya, reasonable so.

Q: Did you have any favourite subjects that you really liked and some that you didn't like?

A: Probably liked math. I always liked math. I liked dealing with numbers. I liked history. I liked school. Ya, I liked school.

Q: Was there anything you didn't like?

A: Well, I recall I had a wood working class. [laugh] I just couldn't stand that class. It just upset me to no end. I couldn't do anything with my hands. I just didn't like it and so that bothered me. But aside from that I didn't seem to have any trouble with school.

Q: So, when you finished high school you were inclined to go into the ministry, or at least, you thought about going into it or was it more in university that you thought about it?

A: Well, probably in the first year or so I thought about it.

Q: And where did you go to university?

A: Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas. It's a high-quality liberal arts university. It has a very good reputation these days. You know, one of these high powered universities that attracts all these merit scholarship winners and things of that sort. It is not, it's really small but really high quality, really high quality. Now, it was not at that level when I was there although it had aspirations at that time. It had moved to a new campus. It was, it was kind of an adventure in university because it was starting out. It was a good setting. A nice school. Presbyterian School.

Q: What kind of courses did you take? You said it was liberal arts. Did you take a combination of humanities and science? What kind of courses did you take?

A: Oh gee, all sorts of courses. I recall comparative religions. I took a lot in government and law and political science, I guess and in psychology.

Q: Is that when you were first introduced to psychology?

A: Yep! I didn't even know about psychology until those days.

Q: Do you remember who taught you psychology and what texts you used?

A: No! There was one nice old lady - gee, I can't recall her first name. Her last name was Goodenough, like Florence Goodenough; it was kind of famous. This person was not. She was an excellent teacher. She was kind of meticulous, obsessive and all that. I like her course.

Q: Was it an introductory course?

A: No. I can't even ... Oh, I remember now. Ya. I didn't go to Trinity University all three years. I started at what's called a junior college.

I guess in Quebec it would be a CEGEP. I don't know what it would be equivalent to elsewhere in Canada, probably don't have anything like that. It was a two year institution. Kind of a transitional school between high school and university and I went there for a year and a half and then left at the end of the year and a half and went to Trinity for a year and a half before completing the degree. So I had introductory psychology from a teacher from a teacher at, it was called, San Antonio college. The teacher, I thought was a bit weird. He really didn't turn me to the subject that much. I thought it was kind of fascinating but not really. I thought it was different. I didn't think much about it. So I don't recall any other psychology at San Antonio College. Then I went to Trinity, taking these courses with various psychologists. San Antonio, I don't know if you are familiar with it, but it is a military town and probably within a radius of a 100 miles of San Antonio there must be 25 military bases, the U.S. military. The reason I mention that is that there was one of these bases was the Lackland Air Force Base. Lackland Air Force Base was the training centre for the U.S. Air Force. And at Lackland Air Force base was the Air Force Personnel and Research Training Centre. That was a major, major psychological branch for the U.S. Air Force and the U.S. military. They called it Af Patrick, or Air Force personnel and research training centre, AFPRTC. At any rate, a lot of very prominent psychologists were stationed there. For example, in the more experimental areas Arthur Melton, Art Bray of the Weaver and Bray study of hearing in the cat's ear and things of this sort, R.M.W. Travers, who was a very prominent educational psychologist in those days, Frank Schmidt who was a statistician, Dee Norton who

was really ... his dissertation was on the robustness of the violations of the F test to homogeneity of variance assumption in the analysis of variance to demonstrate that it's much more robust. All of these people Abraham Carp who became the top psychologist in the Peace Corps when it was at its prime. He taught me Social Psychology. There was a physiological psychologist who also had several books. I can't recall his name right now. So we had all these people for courses. Often they would be evening courses because they would moonlight in the evening. It was a good exposure to a good variety of psychologists. While you are looking at that (paper) my M.A. thesis supervisor was Abraham Carp's wife, Francis Carp, CARP. She was good.

Q: What was your M.A.thesis on?

A: It was a socio-psychological study attempting to relate ... I can't recall the exact hypothesis but it was taking Rosensweig's Picture Frustration Study and applying it to Latin Americans. The picture frustration study was in a sense a set of cartoon like pictures in which I attempted to translate those into real figures and portrayed them as Anglos or Latins. We projected photos of these and collected individuals' data in response to narratives in response to each picture in an attempt to analyze these. It was a fairly involved study. It was kind of fun. It didn't work out all that well. The reason for this study, in part, was that while I waiting to, while I was in the ministerial stream I did several things for the church or the church did several things for me. One was to work at a summer camp on the weekends even during the year doing the maintenance work. And I was eventually in that for four years. The other was as

a group worker in the southwest side of San Antonio, Texas trying to create boy's clubs, coaching baseball, coaching football, coaching basketball, teaching cooking class to kids, and generally trying to provide a service to the community. It was a community centre. I worked at that full-time, pretty much full-time, I mean lots of hours each week. It was full-time on some occasions but pretty well part-time most of the time but substantial hours for four full years. In my thesis I was kind of relating that setting to this study. That was a fascinating experience, just a fascinating experience because it was ... I lived in a gang environment and had one vivid memory as bringing ... I moved from that setting of work to work at another setting which was a missionary setting. But it was also providing community service for that neighbourhood and pretty much the same kind of thing. I drove the school bus and did all sorts of things like that. I brought the kids from the one setting to this new setting to play baseball together. Well these kids who play baseball are not gang members; it's the others who are. So we were having a great baseball game and in the middle of the baseball game the pitcher from the visiting team got stabbed in the back while sitting on the bench. There I was with the person who had committed the stabbing in the crowd and had to cart this kid off to the hospital and meet his parents there at the hospital and do all sorts of things. We had a real hair raising experiences, quite regularly. So it was quite an experience working in that setting. I enjoyed it.

Q: Did this have any influence on your decision go into psychology at all, or not to go into ministry, your work experience?

A: I really don't know. I really don't have any feel for the connection. I enjoyed doing the social work but I guess what it probably did more than that was in a sense, to make me feel I probably wouldn't like to do clinical work full time. So I didn't pursue that direction in psychology.

Q: You graduated with your M.A. What did you decide to do, what came next? Did you go immediately on to graduate school?

A: You assume that I had the opportunity to decide what I was going to do. [right]. Ya, well, that wasn't the case. You see, living in the U.S. as I did at that time, with a ministry deferment from the military service. When I was subject to the draft and that would have been around 1956. Now that was post the Korean War. The ministerial deferment had extended through this Korean War, but the draft continued. So I was confronted with two options. One was to let the draft come. I had a great head of the draft board, a draft board clerk. I would stop by and chat with her and find out what the story was and she would tell me as time got closer she said, " Probably that your number is going to come up soon. So I had either that option, which was no option at all, which would have meant two years in the U.S. Army and with the Army you don't end up doing anything that's very exciting there. The other option might, just by chance, end up doing something in psychology which I was interested in at the time. That was with joining the Air Force, the U.S. Air Force and possibly ending up at the U.S. Air Force Base and Training Research Centre, which I did. But that was a choice that I had to make because, it is kind of like approach-avoidance options, because to go that route meant that I had to make a commitment for

four years and not for two. So short term pain or long term gain, maybe a chance of a gain. I went in that direction. Since we have a tape we might as well hear this story. I ended up going downtown because Lackland Air Force Base was on the other side of town (where I lived in San Antonio, Texas). So when I volunteered, I just drove downtown and then they drove me out to Lackland and we arrived at 10 at night. They wait until they accumulate everybody, flights from New York and so forth and so on. They would bus everyone out there. There were several hundred fellows, new recruits in a huge hall. This sergeant up in front, (he was Airman First Class or something) says, "Call out the number of years of education when I call your name. I am going to go through everyone's name". He calls them all out; there were a lot of ten years, eight years, occasional thirteen years. Well, if you counted 12 years of public school, 4 years of university plus 2 years of master degree, it came my turn and I said, "Eighteen". [laugh] "Adair, what was that?" I said, "Eighteen, sir", scared to death of course. He went on and on and then he finished all of this. He had called everybody's name out and had some time to kill. He said, "Adair, come here". [laugh] So I came up there and stood straight and all of that and he said, "Relax." He said, he had a low voice so I had to lean over to hear him and he said, "What in the hell are you doing here?" [laugh] He said, "Why don't you go into officer candidate school or something?" I didn't want to make a career of the thing. I was just wanted to get it over with. That's why I did that. And sure enough, he said, "I hope you are lucky" and I was. I ended up at the Air

Force Personnel Research Training Centre for only 17 out of the 48 months.

Q: How did this come about?

A: Well, remember that was about the time of Sputnik. The U.S. got really uptight about science, science education, mathematics education, and the like. Remember, I liked math and although I had no formal university courses in university algebra and that sort of thing. I had university statistics and a few other things, but not really mathematics in university. I had no course that I had enrolled in for education credit. However, I got off the base one day and went down to the local school board where I was met by my former Vice Principal of my high school who remembered me. I applied for a job that was regarded as a critical job for the public sector: that of teaching junior high school mathematics. If you could be identified as a person qualified to be employed in this critical job, you could be released from your military service obligation. And I was. Within three weeks and at 4:45 one afternoon in a military uniform, I left the base and at 8:30 the next morning I was in the high school teaching kids mathematics: Grade 9 Algebra and Grade 8 Geometry and math and things of that sort. This was in December. I did that all the rest of the academic year and all the next academic year. I decided I did not want to teach junior high school by then and decided that what I wanted to do ... it dawned on me, ... I thought that I would like to teach psychology. So I went down to the junior college, San Antonio College, to the gentleman who had taught me introductory psychology, (the one that I thought was a little different) and I asked him for a job. "There is no way we can offer

you job. I have so many people teaching here who have graduated from Trinity University, that if I don't get some people from elsewhere it looks incestuous. You know how it is." He said, "I really empathize with you" and I said, "What can I do about it?" As strange as it sounds, at that time being somewhat naive, but only having a Master's degree and not knowing the system at all and maybe the system wasn't quite in place then as it has become. He said, "Why don't you go up to the library and in the library you will find some educational journals. And in certain of these journals you will find ... " [background announcement] He identified particular journals to go to. He said, "In there, you will find advertisements for a college teacher placement agency. You send your credentials to that agency and they will act as your broker and they will send your credentials out to colleges who are looking for people like you to teach classes." I did and I found one and I filed my credentials with them. They would mail out cards that would identify college positions that were available. I ended up getting an interview with one of them, Dakota Wesleyan University in Mitchell, South Dakota. Mitchell, South Dakota is home of the "World's Only Corn Palace". {We were there at the corn palace}. Well, I interviewed with the president in Kansas City. He couldn't afford to have me all the way up but we met in Kansas City. I was interviewed and was offered the position. I took the position. Gee, this all happened, it was quite late. I probably had three weeks to pack my things and get up to South Dakota, Mitchell, South Dakota. I went as Director of Testing and as a psychology professor. I was effectively THE psychology department. There was no one else. I taught everything. Fifteen semester hours per term, it

was a heavy load plus Director of Testing plus plus I was head of the men's dormitory. Don't think that I didn't burn the midnight oil and had some hair raising times as head of the dormitory. It reminded me of my social work job again. The Dakota Wesleyan University had a history professor just six years before I arrived by the name of George McGovern, who ultimately ran as the Presidential candidate who ran out of that county where Mitchell, South Dakota is. So, I was there for four years teaching psychology and that's how I got into psychology. Well I have been going on.

Q: O.K. After being there for four years, then what happened?

A: O.K. What happened was that the National Science Foundation in the U.S. collaboratively with APA provided visiting lecturers in various ... who were kind of well known psychologists who were sent to small colleges to elevate the college's profile in terms of psychology and the like and of course, to benefit from this you had to be aware of the program. You had to apply for it. You had to have this person in and host them and so forth and so on. But APA, NSF paid all of the expenses. So it was really nice and they did it for this kind of program one year and another kind of program another year and so forth and so on. Well, for the first year I had Michael Wertheimer, from Colorado, the next year I had Joseph Cohen, who was a Vision kind of fellow, I think, from Illinois and the third year I had Edward K. Bennett who was the author of the test for mechanical comprehension put out by the Psychological Corporation but by then he was also president of the Psychological Corporation. Now, we shouldn't have been eligible for more than one of these. But each year, I would write and say it was great and build it all up. It

possible, could we have another and we were getting them each year. In the meanwhile, I heard of an NSF program for college teachers there was a summer institute for college teachers. There was some incentive to get the PHD. So what I did was try to [is it raining yet?] [yes, I think that it is] [really? it doesn't look too bad out there.] I applied for this institute and sure enough I got a fellowship to this institute at the University of Iowa. My first summer in South Dakota, I went to Iowa as a summer graduate student. Had Boyd McComdess in developmental psychology; had Gustav Bergman, the philosopher of science from the Vienna circle. He was quite well known. At any rate, because this came up at Iowa, I just went back there again. And then, the next year, Bennett arrived and was the visitor and by then I had applied to go to the University of Iowa for doctoral studies. I know what it was. NSF then had a full fellowship program. So I applied for that and they gave me more money than I was making teaching full time. end of tape.

Side 2

So then I was going to ... so I got this scholarship to return to the University of Iowa full-time for my doctorate. I resigned from the Dakota Wesleyan University. It was my fourth year but by then I had had our last visitor. The link with Bennett is that he was a classmate and good friend of Kenneth Spence of the Spence-Hull learning theory fame. Kenneth Spence was one of THE behaviourists, kind of in the classical conditioning, eye-lid conditioning. And B.F. Skinner was the other operant, learning theorist at that time, learning researcher. Bennett was impressed with our little operation

in South Dakota so he wrote his good friend, Ken Spence, and extolled the virtues of me in preparation for my arrival at Iowa. So I arrived and Ken Spence called me into his office and said, "Edward Bennett wrote to me about you and he said he was quite impressed with you and your operation there and the like, so why don't you be my teaching assistant for this course", which I was also taking. The result of all that is that I turned out to be the last teaching assistant for Kenneth Spence before he left Iowa that year to go to the University of Texas. I later saw him that year at Texas and then he died the next year from cancer. He paved the way for me at Iowa. At the end of that year, not only did Spence leave, but a number of well-known Iowa psychologists left that year, Leonard Eron, famous for research on TV violence, the TV watching and violence among children, person who just recently got an APA career award for all that career work he had done. He became head of the department. He asked me, my fellowship had run out, he asked me to take over L. E. Farber's undergraduate class, that I would be my own teaching assistant, and teach the course. So I had 250 Iowa undergraduates who I taught in a large lecture hall each term for my next year in graduate school. I, within a reasonably short period of time, two years, finished my doctorate and was out. I had had those summers before so I did have several years of course work. I began to look for a teaching position on graduation.

Q: What year would this have been?

A: That would have been the spring of 1965.

Q: So, [can't hear] hiring you were in?

3 OF 3

PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

A: Oh Yes. I did the by then, of course, I was doing the convention circuit. I went to, I kind of half way thought of returning to Texas and my roots and so forth. I went to the Southwestern Psychological Meetings. Had an interview with a fellow from SMU. I think it was very clear that I was ultimately, I was going to get an offer from there. I think that I may have gotten an offer from there. It's hard to recall now what was and what was hoped for. But certainly, I had two offers from Canada. One, I met Willy Runquist from Alberta at a Midwestern Psychological Association Meeting. One of my teachers at Iowa, Rudy Schultz, worked on the same general area as Willy and extolled my virtues to Willy and Willy pursued me; for the other my advisor had been approached by Alf Sheppard at Manitoba. He had made him an offer and my advisor was going to be moving at that time and he said, "why don't you look into this. They were talking to me. Canada has lots of good opportunities. You ought to consider this." I ended up combining the two and I flew from Iowa to Winnipeg, interviewed in Winnipeg and then went to Edmonton, interviewed in Edmonton and then flew back to Iowa. The only reason that I didn't go to Edmonton was that it was so darn far up there from Mitchell, South Dakota which was by then my wife's hometown. Winnipeg is only 500 miles. Edmonton would have been 1500 miles or thereabouts. It just seemed so far. The salary was greater at Edmonton. Although Winnipeg then matched it. I just didn't have any basis to make a decision. It was a toss up. I decided to go to Manitoba. I haven't regretted it at all. Although university wise and the like, I think that Edmonton has done very well. Manitoba, I have always referred to as the Maritimes of the Prairies

because it is not a very well off province. So that was how I came to Canada in 1965, September 1, 1965.

Q Tell me a bit about Manitoba when you went there. Some of the people there.

A: The head of the department was Alf Sheppard. Alf Sheppard, that was in part the Iowa connection. He was Don Lewis' first PHD, I believe. Don Lewis was a motor skill person, researcher from Iowa. Alf Sheppard was from B.C., I think. But he took a position at University of Toronto, probably with Roger Myers in about 1951. I don't know what year it was '52 or something. He was there about 10 years. Then he came to Manitoba in about 1962-63, 64 somewhere around there. The reason he came to Manitoba, he came as department head. The reason he came was that Manitoba had a previous department head who was not well. He had ... I don't know if he was whether he was well liked or not. I doubt that he was ... but he was a bit of of a dictatorial or autocratic head and that got him into trouble. That was John Zubek. John Zubek was a sensory deprivation researcher. He was a Hebb student who had done all sorts of work with sensory deprivation, isolation dome and the like but he had run into administrative difficulties. What they liked was they edged Zubek out of head ship into a research professorship and brought Alf Sheppard in to be head of the department. What that meant was that John Zubek never again taught another class. All he did was research which has an important twist to it because subsequently, if all you do is research then it is incumbent on you to constantly get research grants. If you ever stumble and fail it is the very essence of your being that is challenged. He stumbled. Lost his

grant. And in combination with a number of other factors, but I think that was one of the precipitating factors, he committed suicide.

Q: I am glad you cleared that up because I read through files and there was always this mystery about him ... and I suspected

A: Ya, He ... That was quite sad. But in essence, ... he was quite a nice fellow and we got along quite well socially. There was just a combination of events that occurred. He lost his father. Had a bit of guilt feelings about that. Any personal loss like that is tough. He was constantly challenged by the media for his sensory deprivation research which somehow this was what the IRA was using in terrorism or something of that sort. I am not quite sure what the connection was. So that he was bad mouthed in the press. Being attacked there, didn't do any teaching, so he didn't have that other role to perform and then first the Defense Research Board dried up his money and then the NRC, I think it was called then, (I don't think it was called NSERC yet), told him his grant was going to end or he was given only one year or something like that. It was a blow to him. He was seeing a psychiatrist to help carry the load and the psychiatrist was giving him medication and gee it was not the right medicine or not the proper dosage. You could tell that by looking at him. He was glassy eyed and things of that sort and as a consequence he, one day, went out and was found in the river. We looked after his daughter during the interval in which he was missing. I was department head by then. It was difficult really, really difficult.

Q: [not audible]

A: Yep. Yep. It was. That was that. But Al Sheppard was head, there were . . . my recollection was that there were 11 faculty members that first year, 1965, four of us were new so that meant 7 others that was 1965. By 1971 I went on sabbatical along with the other four, 1971-72 went on sabbatical. I think that was or was it 72-73, at any rate, we went on sabbatical. The four most senior people went on sabbatical and Al Sheppard hired 12 new people that year. It just exploded over night from a small orderly department to a . . . one of almost total anarchy by the time we returned from sabbatical. I mean it was chaos. There was no tradition imposed on the new people. The new people were as much right as the old people were and it was difficult. That's the context in which tried to impose some order. Developing some procedures for the department. That year on return from sabbatical, we spent that entire year doing that and then selected a new chairman which was myself to try to bring order to it. I think we succeeded, but it was a totally new department, a totally new mix by then.

Q: How long were you head of the department?

A: Five years. It was a five year term '73 to '78. Almost went for a second term and then decided that I didn't want to do that at all. I think five years, it was enough.

Q: I am going to move on to a different line of questioning. In your knowledge what do you think was Myers' purpose in doing the oral history collection? We are going to get on to Myers.

A: I really don't know [laugh] what his purpose was. I kind of heard little snippets here and there that he was doing this thing. Probably due to his position of then, I guess it was called Executive Officer of

CPA. It was probably his notion that we should kind of get a record of the history of psychology in Canada. I think that that's probably a good idea. If these are the questions he asked, I do find the questions a bit ... interesting.

Q: How? In what way?

A: Well, I guess he may have had in mind some model of something similar to books where you get little autobiographical accounts of famous psychologists or something like that. He possibly modeled it after that. I don't know that I particularly find my childhood and my religious life or not. I don't find it as relevant as he might. I think other things might be more interesting. I find the dynamics of psychology within Canada of more interest than my own self personally or something of that sort.

Q: How do you think Myers went about selecting people for his interviews?

A: I really don't know. I suspect in anything of this sort it is probably his own interests, his own thinking about what struck him. It is very subjective and I don't know whether there was any pattern to it. For example, if you looked at the list, I noticed a few people from Manitoba but there were a very, very few at all. I don't know why he selected these. He probably had some scheme in mind. If we knew the rationale for it, it might explain it but I don't know.

Q: It seems to me after reading the interviews that Myers interviewed many people associated with CPA. How might have this affected his selection? You were active in the organization but were not included. Why do you think you were not included in the oral history collection?

A: Well, I think that there are two reasons. One is that most of the people on this list were interviewed in 1976 or earlier. My involvement in CPA I had been in CPA, oh, I don't know exactly when it was, but I think it was around 1975. I was on the CPA board for six years. It might have been '73. I can't recall the exact year. The record is there. One reason would be that I was relatively newish. I should have been visible at that time but newish. There were some other people on this list I notice who were contemporaries in terms of being department chairmen in Western departments and also newish and how they got on this list, again I don't know. But, at any rate, so that was one reason, newness. Maybe not as visible to him. That's a charitable, quite frankly, a charitable answer. There is some validity to it but it is charitable.

I think a second reason, and not a very important one but quite likely ... I was one of the US imports in those days. I was not a Canadian, really in his mind, but I don't think that that was it either.

I do ... I know that Roger did not like what Glen McDonald, his then department chairman, Ray Berry and myself were doing in CPA at that time. It was kind of in the twilight of Roger's career as Executive Officer of CPA. It was at a time when the CPA board had by motion decided that it would recapture for its members the organization that had been shunted off to an association-management agency. I don't know whether you are familiar with this. O.K. There were several things that had happened in CPA's growing-up process. One was a major attempt to set up its own head office and ... so they raised the dues and lost lots of members. In the process of trying to manage CPA it was decided, well before my time,

but Roger was certainly involved in this, to give ... contract out the management of CPA to a company of association managers. There were two gals in Ottawa (or gee was it Montreal. I think it was Montreal). It was called "Executive Suite Ltd." We pejoratively referred to these two gals as, particularly the one, as "Executive Sweetie" and they, in essence ... one of them is an Honourary Member of CPA; ... I think she still is. She was a paid agent, a person under contract. What in the world are we giving them honorary memberships for? At any rate, ... it had been given to ... the management of CPA had been given holus bolus to this agency. So much so, that we, the CPA board, didn't even know our own financial affairs, other than what they told us. It was kind of at my first board meeting or at least, if it was not at my first board meeting, it was at the end of my first year of board meetings that it was decided that we needed Oh, oh ... they were identified as Susan Edwards was our treasurer. I think that you will find she was listed as our treasurer for several years. It was decided that we should have a board member as our treasurer. And our board member as treasurer should know what's going on and be as informed as they are. They can still manage it but the board member should query these things and find out what's going on and make recommendations and operate a little bit independently. This was seen as the first step in resting control of CPA's management from this arrangement. Well, Roger was a very nice gentleman. These ladies quite liked Roger and Roger quite liked these ladies. So there was mutual respect there and trust. Some of us didn't have the same level of trust. Maybe it was appropriate to have that trust but

we didn't know because we had no information; we needed that, to have that kind of information, or we weren't being responsible board members. Bob Gardner from Western Ontario was a board member. He, out of the blue, said, "I nominate John Adair as treasurer ". I think Ray Berry said "I second that." There I was, made treasurer of the association. I can't recall. I think it was for a couple of years. At any rate, I took my ... Glen, Ray and I had a vision for where CPA should be going. Glen was elected to the Board the same year I was. Ray was elected president the next year. The three of us spent a lot of hour charting where we hoped things would go. They sort of went in that direction. We weren't plotting things; it was a matter of responsibility that it had to be brought back to the members. We would have welcomed Roger's participation in this move but he had this view that it should have remained with Executive Suite and that they were doing a fine job. Well, taking my job seriously stepped on toes. That's something that Fran [Cherry], ... isn't she archivist for ... ya ... should pursue because my ... I don't know if there are now, but I think that they archived office records, but my correspondence never got archived. It is sitting there in Manitoba and it would be interesting because I have the exchanges that occurred between Executive Suite and myself, between Park Davidson, who was President and myself and others; because Park was trying to keep me in line and I was trying to get things in line as I saw them. There were some things that had to be ironed out. I think that in our mind it was quite an improved operation once we got hold of the information and began to insist on things. For example, that our money should be invested in short-term deposits or something or

another so that we were gaining interest. Where is the interest income from all this money we've collected? It wasn't there. At least we didn't see it. So we would identify these things. I would write letters. We would have meetings and it would ... these were tense times. I think to some extent that Roger had a different vision of where things were going then we did. When I say we, again I want to underscore, we shared a common vision, we did not plan a common vision, we shared a common vision. In our views with one another, with each acting according to his own views in that regard. I think, in part, I was this American import who was now involved in the CPA. Gees, that was kind of a different kind of thing and furthermore I was rocking the boat a little bit. I think time, recognizing that I was not really doing anything personally, but doing it because of a feeling that CPA needed this kind of thing and it was a different model than the one that Roger was advocating. I think that as time went on the feeling between us was quite amicable. Certainly between Mary and I. I think she is a doll (This sounds sexist. When you know Mary's age, etc. it takes on quite a different meaning). She is a great gal, a really great gal. I think that it ended up very positively and had the time been on Roger's side to do further interviews I might well have ultimately gotten on the list. At that time, I think there were too many things that converged on me not being interviewed by him. I think that probably the same kinds of reasons would have applied to Ray Berry although, gosh, Ray was not ... Ray is a thorough going born Ontario, Canadian with a long history in psychology in Canada, very long history in Canadian psychology, and it's appalling that he got left off this list. I can see

why I got left off and I think there would be a little of each of these elements, but I think Ray should have been on there.

Q: Can you tell me more about Myers? You told me a little about him. Do you know anything about him as an experimenter, or as a teacher, a clinician, an administrator ... as chair of the department at the University of Toronto? Do you have any idea why he was chosen head of the department at Toronto?

A: Probably no to all of those questions. I don't know. The only curious thing is that as a clinician and a department chairman, he built a very good department but it had no clinical training in it and that I find interesting. I don't know what to make of it. That is the only thing I really observed about his chairmanship and the department. But kind of when I started to get really involved in with other psychology departments in Canada, he was no longer chairman so I really ... I know much more of Glenn McDonald or Joan Foley, Gus Craik, Endel Tulving, people of that sort who were Chair rather than Roger. Can't help you there.

Q: Were there any questions that I haven't asked you that I should have? Anything you would like to include.

A: No. I think that ... no I can't think of anything.

Q: What about the list of interviews. Were there any names that you would add to that list?

A: You want to stop this a second [looks at list of names]. In this list there are a number of individuals who, I think, are on this list because they come out of the McGill-Toronto connection. They were trained there and then they moved elsewhere. On the one hand, I would make an observation that the list is a little bit dated. You get

some people who were around early on, maybe a time that was salient for Roger but they didn't necessarily maintain their salience for Canadian psychology and hence they are on this list. There was a new wave of people you don't see on this list, but there are exceptions to that. Peter Suedfeld is one; why did he interview Peter Suedfeld who came from Rutgers in probably around 1973 or something like that gets interviewed in 1974, and so that's unusual. But he also ends up with some people who are ... old Canadian psychologists, who don't leave much of a ripple effect on Canadian psychology by what they have achieved they are very, very, you know, the list is not made up by prominence or by the ripple effect they created within Canadian psychology. I find the list to be uneven and difficult to explain because of its unevenness. Why were these selected and not others.

Q: It is interesting you say that about prominence because Roger Myers, from what I can gather from his files in Toronto, was really dominated by this idea of eminence. I think it had something to do [ya, sure] he built the department, he wrote papers about it. I wonder what the effect was in the selection of these people. Did he sort of think of these people as being eminent? I was trying to figure out the relationship.

A: I am dead certain that for some of the people on this list that the eminence criteria was not applied. It just couldn't have been applied. It's a very subjectively-created list.

Q: Were they members of CPA? ... Would that have had a connection?

A: Some were clearly members of CPA. But others I don't think were. I mentioned the Wrights. Morgan Wright and Marian Wright, both were very, very nice people. And Morgan was a colleague ultimately of mine but I don't see Marian being that prominent a figure in Canadian psychology at the National level, but at the local level. So I don't know why she is there. There are others ... for example, in terms of Manitoba psychology, Curly Tyler, was Brandon University Psychology Department Head and very prominent in Western Canada in getting the Western Chairman's group going and things of that sort. He is an older figure in Western Canadian Psychology. I would think him to be more prominent than Marian Wright and yet he is not on this list. At the University of Winnipeg there was a psychologist by the name of Cliff Robson who we named an award, a distinguished psychologist award after in Manitoba. He is not on the list. But John Clak who moved into administration out of the psychology department was on this list. John was interviewed in 1970. I don't know why. I just can't explain it. So if you try to look for a pattern here, I don't see a pattern as much as I would like. There are a number of prominent historical psychologists who I think of, but it is fantastic that it's fantastic that he's got interviews from all these individuals but there are some others who, I don't know So that was great he got Park Davidson who died a few years after he was interviewed. He's got Bott, he's got Belanger, Amsel, Ainsworth, Berlyne, Bindra who also died. These are all prominent Canadian psychologists many of them connected with CPA. I notice he's got Ann Bell, she's also from Manitoba, but I wonder about the selection from my own province, for example. I don't

know that I would have selected the same set. I may have selected others in addition to these or whatever. That's it.

Appendix B

199

Figures

way. That was in the 1920s. So with that kind of jumping around, she really didn't complete her education. And with the depression, my father didn't complete university either. I wouldn't say that what you think of today as an educated family's environment was there. *(This is interesting because I have heard that my father considered an education)*

Q: What about religion, was it a religious family?

A: Yes, it was. In a sense, yes. My father was a Methodist Minister's son [right] but he worked at this radio station on Sundays for thirty ^{some} odd years. He never went to church, because it was physically impossible to go to church. My mother ^{was} raised as a ~~Catholic~~, Roman Catholic. I went to Catholic church; was baptized in the Catholic church and the like. But then, she had a falling out with the Catholic Church. She didn't like it. She decided to look elsewhere and became ^{an Episcopalian} what you would call here an Anglican, ~~which is~~ In many senses, fairly similar, and has some similarities. In Texas, in the U.S., she was an Episcopalian. That's the U.S. equivalent of Anglican. I was a loyal Church Sunday School attendee, attender. I was an altar boy, a very devoted altar boy. I grew up in a Church environment, so much so that I began to consider the possibility of becoming an Episcopalian priest. I was even what they call a ~~P~~ostulant. I was enroute to becoming a Episcopalian priest and pretty much had plans on going to seminary. However, I had gone through university fairly rapidly, so I was quite young ^{on 21 minutes} and I had gone on a ministerial scholarship and it was decided that I was probably too young to go to seminary, and ^{a priest} then come out. I would have been very young, ^{as told} and so I should take another year's education to mark time, while I grew up, or got older, or whatever was expected of me. So I took ^a ~~another~~ year of psychology and that's where I decided to switch careers. I had been accepted into seminary. ~~Think~~ I had my room reserved in seminary and as it got closer I had to make the decision that that was not what I wanted to do.

Appendix F

The C. R. Myers' Interview Questions

1. To begin with, when were you born?
2. What did your father do? Mother?
3. Do you have any brothers, sisters?
4. What were your earliest recollections of the home before school?
5. What sort of home (income)?
6. Any cousins? Your age?
7. What was your home like from the point of view of reading before you went to school?
8. Were there lots of books and newspapers?
9. How did your parents meet?
10. What about religion in the home?
11. Was it a political home?
12. What were your earliest recollections of school?
13. What did you think of yourself?
14. Did you play sports? What type?
15. Where did you go to high school?
16. What were you going to do at the end of high school?
17. Was it taken for granted that you would go to university because your parents did?
18. What was your first recollection of the word "psychology"? What was its real meaning for you.

19. Names of the most influential professors?
20. Books used?
21. Where did your sense of social conscience come from? Parents?
22. What were your plans at the end of third year?
23. What was your thesis on?
24. Work?
25. Career discussion.
26. What made you move? Was it money or opportunity or both?

These questions varied from interview to interview.

END

1 7 - 0 6 - 9 7

FIN