

INTERVIEWEE: ELLEN GREENBERGER
Former Director of Social Ecology

INTERVIEWER: Samuel C. McCulloch
Emeritus Professor of History
UCI Historian

DATE: January 26, 1990

SM: Today is Friday, January 26, 1990 and my interview today is with Professor Ellen Greenberger who came to head up the program in Social Ecology after Arnold Binder had left it, but there was an interim of Arthur Boughey, right?

EG: That's right. I actually didn't come to take on the directorship. That happened accidentally, after the fact. I came to accept a full professor appointment in January of 1977. And, in the course of events, I was asked to be the director. The course of events had to do with the fact that we were engaged in an outside search for a Director but that search was not successful. We didn't find anybody who suited us.

SM: Well, let's put it this way, they couldn't find anybody better than you.

EG: (chuckling) That may or may not be the case.

SM: That's what I think. That's what I think. Well, I didn't realize that. Well, was Arthur Boughey the acting, or interim, chair?

EG: Yes. Arthur was the acting director. Is that right? Let me stop and think a minute. He must have been the interim

director when I came and he stepped down July 1 and I took over. That's right.

SM: Now, tell me, question one here, "What did you know about our UCI Program in Social Ecology before you were interviewed for the post of Director?" which you corrected me, as a full professor.

EG: Okay. I knew that it was a non-traditional program that was broadly conceived to bring the Social Sciences to bear on real problems in the real world, and that appealed to me very much. I had been in a curious position after getting my degree at Harvard. I should really clarify that. I had a first teaching job at Wellsley, which I loved, in a very traditional Psychology Department. I really learned psychology for the first time, as many people discover when they first start to teach.

SM: . . . start to teach. (chuckling)

EG: That's right. No thanks to Harvard for much of the education I supposedly got there, but I sure learned a great deal about psychology when I was first teaching at Wellsley. It was a job that I would have regretted staying in forever because of the very strong teaching orientation at Wellsley, which is to say the rather lower priority given, in those days at least, to research. The fact that I made a move was tremendously important in my own career.

SM: . . . career.

EG: That's right. And I went to Johns Hopkins in a research scientist position, not a tenure track position, a good old soft money position. A terrible decision, something that we did with considerable ignorance of the consequences fifteen, twenty years ago, not thinking what we were perhaps doing to our careers. The "we" is meant to include many other people but particularly, of course, women following their husbands on a career path. In any case, that was the second of two places where I developed and continued to develop my taste for an interdisciplinary sort of home.

When I went to Harvard, the best part of the experience was that it was an interdisciplinary department that I was in, the Department of Social Relations. We took qualifying exams for the Ph.D. in four fields: Sociology, Cultural Anthropology, Social Psychology and Clinical Psychology. So I was really born intellectually in that kind of interdisciplinary department. Hiatus at Wellsley, straight psychology--Johns Hopkins, into a research center dominated, in fact, by sociologists. And here was another opportunity to cross lines and to develop some kinds of research skills that I had not had before.

SM: Well, Ellen, I would think then that this program here was just really what you would want.

EG: It was perfect. It was exactly the kind of position I was interested. The competing position, just for the record and

kind of fun, was to have been Dean of the Radcliffe Institute, which I think I correctly discerned as a job that looked more interesting on paper than it would have been in fact. It would have been a tenured position at Harvard at the rank of associate professor, but I never really considered it seriously. This is where I wanted to come.

SM: You mean a full professor offer here?

EG: That's right.

SM: Only associate there?

EG: Well, the initial offer here was at the associate professor level and I made clear that I would come, if it were, if the ante were raised a bit and that I would think more carefully about it if it were not. And Gil Geis managed to get that position offer raised and, indeed, I came.

SM: Well, we're very glad you came, indeed. I've been impressed all these years with Social Ecology. I don't know whether you know it but I have had a lot of your students in my classes, particularly Constitution and Legal History of England. Those who are in the legal area under Di Mento, especially . . .

EG: Yes.

SM: They come over and are all good students. One student, I'll never forget, Gail Kasami, 3.9 cumulative average, was Phi Beta Kappa.

EG: Yes.

SM: Marvelous. And in other words, I rather think in a way maybe they like the program, but I rather think they don't like our foreign language requirement and they'd just as soon go over to your very fine program and then take what they can get over here.

EG: That's interesting. I haven't thought about that.

SM: Now, I've questioned some. Indeed, I have written to law school deans and so on, and to Harvard, and I'll often ask them, "Well, why did you take this?" And, well, I've always been happy with Social Ecology.

EG: Of course, one problem, Sam, is that these--the kind of student you just mentioned--never had the opportunity to fill the language requirement by taking an Asian language because that is an area that, up until recently, we have not made available to students.

SM: If you, by the way, this is off the record . . . I mean, it's on the record and, incidentally, if you want to say something that you don't want on the record, I'll just push the button, I'll just stop it. But I just wanted to know do you have any occasion to meet this new head of Eastern Studies?

EG: No.

SM: She's a poet from Columbia, isn't she?

EG: I haven't seen . . . didn't know.

SM: Yes, she's a supposedly famous poet and she's heading up this Eastern Languages and Literatures. So I think that's a good step forward.

EG: It surely is.

SM: Now, what changes in the Program occurred to you after your arrival? In other words, as you settled in, no doubt you have a curriculum committee or whatever where you make changes and you have course changes and so on. Did you really feel very happy to go as it was or did you want to see some changes?

EG: You know, it's a long time ago, Sam, and it's hard to remember the particulars with confidence. What I remember best is that we had a somewhat embarrassing sort of spectacle of courses in the catalogue, some of them representing reality and some of them representing fantasy, or good intentions for the future. And one of the first things I had to do as part of what I saw as a larger task of improving the credibility quotient of the program was to do a little bit of pruning.

We had been criticized for the rather peculiar ratio of faculty to courses that we showed in the catalogue and, indeed, that was one of several important steps in improving the credibility of the program on campus. I use that term because, as you know, something called Social Ecology is not a household word and this new upstart program, like many others in similar state of their life cycles or stage of their life cycles, come in for a good share of hazing, eyebrow

raising. What are these fellows trying to do? Can this be serious? And when I arrived we were still pretty much under the gun from that kind of criticism. There was some aura of disbelief and, on the part of the faculty, some degree of concern that we were under constant threat, that we were in a state of siege and had to . . .

SM: Well, may I offer this comment from my point of view. First, when I was Chair of the Academic Senate from 1978 to 1980, I was always, and my people I knew, respected the program because you were a fine scholar, Arnold Binder is a fine scholar, and the program where you had to turn in reports . . . What were they called? Field, field reports.

EG: Field studies.

SM: They all had to be turned in and graded. In other words, it wasn't just a breeze to go out and sit and twiddle your thumbs in the court at Santa Ana or something. And seriously, I felt I was . . . I'm very excited by the program. I'm excited, too, that you've got your own building which is yours and I have a notion you're going to have to spread out a bit and add something to it soon.

EG: That's right. That's right. But, you know, back to the issue of the status of the program on the campus in 1977, we need to remember that Arnie founded the program as a statement, in part, in a statement of separation from the objectives of the School of Social Science which was more oriented toward formal

modeling, whereas Arnie's vision was more oriented to the identification and solution of real world, social and environmental problems. So the program was founded with some tension in the air and the consequences of that birthing context didn't disappear for quite some time, if in fact they have at the present time. You know, we're still . . . The name of the battle changes. These days the battle is will we get to achieve school status or will this be an impossible battle that we're engaged in. I think not, personally.

SM: Oh, yes. I remember talking to you about this down in Melbourne and I feel very strongly you should move to the school position or status as soon as possible. I mean, I really think that if you put this thing to the test and the vote, you'd get the votes.

EG: Well, that remains to be seen. Dan Stokols, who has been a wonderful director, this is his second year, has made this a very, very high priority item on his agenda. The initial efforts to move this idea along have not met with wholehearted enthusiasm on the part of the administration but we don't expect this to inhibit our efforts, and this is a very important activity for us.

SM: It's sad in a way that you don't have Dan [as Chancellor now], because Dan told me in no uncertain terms . . .

EG: Dan Aldrich, you mean, yes.

SM: Dan Aldrich. This is why he came to found UC Irvine. He wanted to be a professor in this program.

EG: Well, then you know how fitting it is that he has his emeritus office in our building.

SM: Yes, and his title.

EG: Yes, that's right, that's right.

SM: And I love it. Well, I'm interested to hear all this and I wish you well. Now, what research project . . . You came from Hopkins . . .

EG: That's right.

SM: . . . to here. And did you pursue . . . When did you pick up that delightful study about high school students who work and don't study? (chuckling)

EG: And don't study . . . Well, there's a funny story behind that. Just before I left Hopkins, I had applied to NIMH for a grant to study adolescent work. I had sort of looked around one day and discovered that the world seemed to be in the hands of kids between the age of fifteen and eighteen, running the shops, serving in the stores and the restaurants, something that was, you know, really very different from the world I grew up in. And it occurred to me that this phenomenon had arisen unnoticed or uncommented on and deserved some scrutiny.

I made a hasty application to NIMH to study the developmental consequences of early participation in the world

of work and, at the point when I decided to come here, I began to quake in my boots at the prospect of getting this research grant funded, thinking, "My, God," you know, "I can't possibly handle that project in a new setting, in a new part of the world where I'm going with two little children," and, you know, there would be plenty to do without having this research grant. "God help me, I hope I don't get it." Well, the Lord was good and I didn't get that grant. Truly, it inspired a great feeling of relief.

SM: (inaudible)

EG: No, I was thrilled and delighted. I really was beside myself with the thought that I might have to do this dreadful project. And over the course of the next two years, I teamed up with the new faculty member, in fact, somebody that I brought here--not somebody I'd known before, but a fellow who turned out to be wonderfully talented and wonderfully invigorating--and I'm speaking about Larry Steinberg, as you know.

SM: Yes.

EG: And Larry and I put our heads together and decided that we would revitalize this grant and give it some new twists and submitted it elsewhere and, subsequently, we did indeed carry out the kind of project I had initially had in mind, but much improved by a year or two's hiatus and some great input from my very creative and clever colleague Larry Steinberg.

SM: Now, what are you doing now?

EG: Well, I continue to have an interest in work. I am fascinated by the focal role that work plays in people's lives and my attention has shifted to the impacts of adults' work lives on adults' mental health and their capacity to function effectively in the roles of parents. We're living in a world in which more and more often both men and women are employed for long portions of their lives, and one of the kinds of issues that threw me into the new research is that it is conceivable in a time of transition that there are some costs to the rearing of children involved in the influx~~ing~~^{I would absolutely never, never turn a man into a war.} of all the adults into the work place, so to speak. And I decided, frankly, that if there were costs to be identified and understood--that is, costs in terms of the socialization of children, the long-run interests of society, that I would like to be the one who carefully noticed and brought about them. Please!
08

SM: Well, good for you. Do you read any of Bob Dubin's work? He's interested in why people work and in his study of the English he showed that rather than be moved to a better position and so on, they would rather stay and continue that job.

EG: You know, I never read Bob Dubin's work. I knew him slightly. We overlapped for about two years, I would guess. But I have to say that my interdisciplinary boundaries seem to grow thick around the point of management, organizational studies, and

so on, and I've never really read a great deal of that literature.

SM: Well, it's interesting what he's done. But then I think you're talking about a book in about three years' time, are you?

EG: I beg your pardon, Sam?

SM: You're expecting your book to be done in three years' time?

EG: Well, I'm not sure it will be a book. I should, by the way, that this work is joint with my young colleague Wendy Goldberg.

SM: Oh, yes, I met her at the Faculty Club.

EG: Yes, that's right. You know, in the Social Sciences and my field, which sort of overlaps several of them, we do a lot of our publishing in the journals.

SM: Yes.

EG: And books are not as enormous an issue.

SM: I understand. Ellen, as you know, our Medievalists do this and our Ancient Historians do this.

EG: Right, right. So I'm not so sure that a book will be the outcome. I don't know for sure.

SM: Well, that's very exciting. You know, about your teaching, I was interested in right outside your door here is a notice about Women's Studies and your courses listed for this, I believe, this coming quarter.

EG: Yes, yes. I've never been active in the Women's Studies program but the content of many of my courses that have their origins in sort of developmental psychology necessarily deal with sex differences in development, sex differences in

(Interview is interrupted by entrance of a visiting professor who can't read my sign "Recording.")

SM: Well, excuse me for the interruption. We were talking about your teaching, you were talking about Women's Studies.

EG: Yes. I am very interested in the kinds of social and psychological and cultural forces that make the experience of being female and male quite different.

SM: Yes.

EG: And a lot of the material I cover in several of my courses touches on those issues. I've had very good students who are in the Women's Studies concentrations come over to my classes. I'm always very glad to have them.

SM: Well, I think it's fine. Professor Geoffrey Blainey's daughter Anna was here. She's getting an M.A. at Melbourne University and she's working on late nineteenth century women's history. I'll think of it in a minute. And she worked at Princeton for about three weeks and then Harvard for three weeks. She worked at Columbia for awhile and then she came and sort of rested with us. (chuckling) But she wanted to meet our Women's Studies people and so I made an

appointment with Amy Drew Stanley, who's really a crackerjack. I don't really know her because she sort of comes in like a tornado about two or three days, twice a week. But she does stay around until six o'clock. She has the whole day. But she was very good to Anna. Then she put her on to Cornelia Dayton who is really very fine. And then they rounded up two graduate students, and Anna talked to them. When she came away, she said, "Oh, everybody's a workaholic." (chuckling)

EG: Well, I think that . . .

SM: The Aussies, you know, have a slower pace.

EG: Right, right. Well, they've done a really very fine job in moving that Women's Studies concentration into a going concern that I think deserves to be supported.

SM: I agree. I entirely agree with you. Have you anything more to say? I know you and I were discussing that it's much better to be teaching in a class of around twenty to twenty-five than these enormous classes where they shuffle in and shuffle out and so on. Now, do you still have some of those big classes?

EG: Well, we have mainly big classes. This is very much at the front of my mind because we had a review of our undergraduate program last week, just last week, you know, one of these regular . . .

SM: An external review?

EG: Yes, an external review. So we were thinking about things like this. It was a very interesting review. One of the people, for example, on this very high quality committee was ^{a ~~Mahr~~ Maher} Brenden Marr who's the Dean of Arts and Sciences at Harvard. So we had quite a lot of discussion about teaching issues and the problem we face with these very large classes.

For me, personally, the question is: How long do I go on trying to teach the way I did at Wellsley, so to speak, or the way I was taught at Vassar? Namely, with a good deal of writing expected of students, with exams that are not altogether multiple choice. I don't immediately want to ~~dis~~claim any special virtue here. I know that lots of my co-faculty members make efforts to do the kind of teaching I'm describing and we're driven more and more toward the more mass-produced kind of course, which really bothers me a great deal.

It makes me wonder why I am a teacher, why I come to the classroom. We might as well tape ourselves and send the students to go and look at us on video cassettes. Think of it, we wouldn't have all the problems with classroom availability. Just skip the classroom, you know, have UCI correspondence school. Now, you know, I say that partly to inflame our discussion here, but this is a . . . The problems created by the increasing size of the university do raise questions like this, you know, what kind of teaching can we

offer. Now, we're a major state university. Perhaps it's time to give up the ghost on the illusion of being able to offer a kind of small, liberal arts education, small college.

SM: What did the Harvard dean have to say? How big are their classes?

EG: You know, I didn't ask him, Sam. He certainly maintained control (chuckling) and did the question asking.

SM: Well, you were a graduate student.

EG: That's right.

SM: An undergrad at Vassar. Now, weren't your classes pretty nice and small?

EG: They certainly were. They certainly were.

SM: Well, my classes run at thirty-five or so and then we have a colloquia, taken by history senior majors, a major has to take three of them, and we never have more than fifteen. Once in awhile I used to let two more in. Fifteen is just about it.

EG: Yes. Sam, with one exception, a very specialized kind of course where simply I can't handle more than eighteen students because of supervisory time involved in dealing with them, exempting that course from this discussion, I teach courses with an enrollment of sixty to two hundred fifty, and most of them somewhere in the middle.

SM: You sort of have to be part entertainer.

EG: You do, you do.

SM: Well, you've answered those questions. What do you consider your major successes when you were Director?

EG: Well, that is an entertaining question to think about. In planning to talk to you today, I decided I'd better refresh my memory and make sure that I haven't elaborated some fantastic notion of those years, over the ensuing period of time, and I went to a file of mine called, as you will see, Sam--you can vouch--I'll let you say what the name of this file is.

SM: (chuckling)

EG: It's "Classic Social Ecology Documents." And it holds some of the answers perhaps to the question you just asked me. Let me see if I can . . .

SM: Now, the years you were director was 1977 . . .

EG: Well, I guess it was 1977 to 1980. That's right, four years: 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980. The years may be slightly off. That's the period of time. I think overall the best thing I did for the program was to help create a more stable environment in which people could get work done. That is, in which scholars could get their work done. We had an extremely junior faculty at that point. I tried this morning to reconstruct who was here and I'm sure I'm off by one or two, but we were 60 percent assistant professors and that was about fourteen people. I think that's right. No, it must have been ten people, sorry. Ten assistant professors, three associate

professors and four full professors, including me, with Arthur Boughey on his way out momentarily as a professor emeritus. This was an extremely junior faculty. There was an atmosphere of anxiety when I came about what will become of Social Ecology. The threat in the air was we will be absorbed into the School of Social Sciences.

SM: That's right.

EG: From which we had come, you know, to which we will return. That concern really hung heavily in the air and inspired a feeling somewhere between anxiety and panic, depending on individual dispositions. There was endless conversation about what we should do to withstand that threat, talk about how bad it would be for us. Assistant professors worried that they wouldn't fare very well at tenure time if we were absorbed into an entity that hadn't originally wanted them, that they would be the ones who took the brunt of this reorganization effort.

And I think one of the important things I did was to settle that question down a bit and I did so in the following way. I have a folder here that is almost an embarrassment, as I look at it, lo, these many years later. It's a set of agreements I worked out with Jim McGaugh who was the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. And among the agreements we reached, one to a page as I can show you, each signed by him and by me as if it were a legal document . . . Now, that's

what I meant by "almost embarrassing." Maybe not almost embarrassing, really embarrassing, as a style of extracting an agreement from an administrator.

But in any event, one of the things I requested as a condition for assuming the directorship was a guarantee that there would be no reorganization of the Program in Social Ecology for a five-year breathing period. Give us time to get our acts together, to get our assistant professors moved along, give us time to not just breathe but to grow and develop. I thought that was an extremely important thing to have done. I should perhaps backtrack and say that when I was invited to take the directorship I came to Jim with eight or ten "must haves" on a list and said, "I've not only got to have these, I've got them one to a page and you and I have both got to sign them and you've got to show them to Dan Aldrich because I trust you completely, Jim, in these matters, but you are heavily recruited for other campuses and you might disappear tomorrow and what is the status of my agreements?"

SM: Right, exactly.

EG: I don't want a future vice chancellor saying to me, "Well, that's an agreement you made with Jim McGaugh. I'm not Jim McGaugh. I don't agree and I can't live with this arrangement."

SM: I know.

EG: So this was only one thing, but I think we can talk about what else is in that set of agreements if you want, but I'll stick to your initial question which is: What do I think are some of the accomplishments of my Directorship? I think it was an accomplishment to help ten assistant professors get tenure. In fact, two of them left very, very early and didn't stay through the course, but eight, at my count, assistant professors went to tenure during the time that I was there.

SM: That's a great accomplishment.

spelling? correct

EG: One of them failed, that was Peter Scharf, but the vast majority of the people who were here at that level, in the first place, stayed, and, in the second place, went on to tenure. Now this is not quite so routine as you might think. You could say, "Well, we hire people that we expect to be tenurable." But remember, these people were being exhorted to do something a little bit different from the disciplines they might have been trained in. They were being encouraged to cross disciplinary lines, to publish in some nontraditional places, to get involved in kinds of research that were perhaps not, at that point, in the mainstream.

SM: Yes.

EG: For example, intervention research. We never quite lived up to that as much as we initially thought we might. The intervention orientation of the program diminished very dramatically.

SM: What you're saying, Ellen, is just that you really were for years were able to settle the program down, have a five-year breathing span, and get your assistant professors who were worthy of tenure to gain tenure.

EG: Oh, absolutely. I think so, Sam. And as a consequence of the place in their academic careers that so many of the faculty were, I found my . . . oh, what shall I say, my perspective very much focused on that younger generation. That was where my heart was and my concern was and, over the years, in many respects, that's where my friendships have been. I think I under-utilized the resources of the senior faculty and my close friendships are not in that direction, though I have wonderful relations these days with Arnie Binder [and a man we've known very much as a colleague.]

SM: That's a very fine answer, Ellen, and I'm very grateful to you for giving it to me.

EG: There's one other thing that also speaks to this sort of settling down. This was kind of a family organization, a small organization, a cottage industry, in 1976 or 1977 and the administrative arrangements in the program were fairly primitive. We had some staff who were tolerated because they had been around for a long time and had sort of old ties to people on the faculty.

SM: Yes.

can
the
typist
re-listen
to the tape
here.
This
is a
real
puzzle!

EG: But who had long since ceased to function well for the organization. I won't elaborate on that but there was a generally rather disastrous state of affairs with respect to the administration of the program. I think that I helped work that through with the system. I did something that I don't think anybody in our sort of part of the world had done before. I called in an actual management consultant to come and look through the organization and make recommendations. I did that only after three years of sort of banging my head against the wall.

SM: Did you get help then?

EG: I got a lot of help from that and I looked over what their recommendations were this morning and realized how many of the things they recommended we, in fact, put in place and still sit there in place in the program today. I'm going to enjoy showing this to Dan Stokols who may have forgotten and who's made other very important changes himself.

SM: That's very exciting. Now, let's move past your Directorship to what are your successes or how has the Program gone from the time you left in 1980 to 1990, a decade has gone by.

EG: Well, I think maybe two or three things should be said. One is that we've had very consistent sort of growth and development of the program over the years. It is really a going concern. What we thought breathing space under my Directorship, to do, has really come to fruition and the

program is very active, very energetic. We have a very large student body, as you know.

SM: I was going to say your student FTE is very high.

EG: Yes.

SM: I was looking at the figures.

EG: Yes, our majors, I think, are at around 1100. Our work load figures are the second . . .

SM: Eleven hundred?

EG: Yes, and our work load figures, I understand from a conversation I had recently, are second highest on the campus. That is, in ratio, in proportion to our faculty, I should make that clear, the size of our faculty.

SM: Yes.

EG: So we have a lot of student interest. We have an extremely bright faculty, really a very talented faculty, unusually so. When I go away to give a talk or whatever, I often come back and think, you know, "I wouldn't trade this group of people." Oh, a couple of them I would trade happily, you know.

SM: That's nice of you to say.

EG: But I view these people with real respect and think I have some of the smartest people on the faculty in Social Ecology that I could want to have, you know, second to none. So there's been continued growth. I think one of the important . . . two important lines of growth, both of them having to do with a greater degree of specialization, one at the

undergraduate level, the other at the graduate level. We used to offer up a kind of cafeteria, what we might call cafeteria-style education, placing trust that the consumer would come along the line and select the courses that . . .

SM: Make the right ones.

EG: That's right, the right ones. To the consternation of a small number of our faculty members, we have had to batten down the hatches a little bit and tell people the way to do it. We've had named concentrations develop in the undergraduate program. We used to just offer the B.A. in Social Ecology. We now offer the B.A. in Social Ecology with three areas of concentration, as well as one can still elect the overall B.A. in Social Ecology without a concentration. Concentrations are in Environmental Analysis, Criminal Justice, Law and Society, and in Psychology and Social Behavior. I think that's been to the good that we are. It has prompted us to offer a more ordered curriculum to students and for students, on the other hand, to get a more ordered and systematic undergraduate education. I'm all for it.

SM: Now, tell me something. Since you're talking about (inaudible) how can a visiting accreditation team look at Social Ecology when they really don't offer that sort of program in their own universities?

ok?
as
currently
pursue-
trated,
one
might
think
that
"Criminal
Justice" &
"Law
& Society"
are
two
separate
Concentrations.

EG: Well, look at it they can, Sam. And I'm going to be very interested in reading that report a couple of weeks down the road.

SM: Yes, very interested, yes.

EG: One question that they raised and is, indeed, a very hard question to answer is why we have the particular disciplines . . .

SM: Concentrations.

EG: Right. . . . represented that we have. Now, in a way, it isn't hard to answer at all. The answer is history, tradition.

SM: Yes, yes.

EG: That's what was here, that's what got developed, you know. If it hadn't been Arnie Binder who formed the program but somebody with interests other than his, perhaps the direction, the initial direction of the program would have been set in a slightly different path. But we started with something resembling these three areas, though not named as such in the early days, and guess what? That's what we have now. It's not due to some . . . You can't claim that there's some theory about the world that prompts us to have the three areas of concentration that we do and not four others. That's a kind of hard . . . It's not a wondrously elegant argument to make to a committee looking over your enterprise when that frankly is the way it is.

SM: Well, that's interesting. Now, I next turn to the question of Sal Maddi. And what the faculty hear is that if you bring in someone from Harvard or Princeton or Chicago, they're all very heirarchically organized and run, and those who come can't get out of the ways of Harvard.

EG: Or, in this case, Chicago.

SM: And they may tend to run into the Academic Senate committees and (inaudible). So he has a good reputation as a Social Ecologist.

EG: Yes, he has a fine reputation as a scholar in the field of personality, personality theory. There's no question about that. And when we hired him, we hired him largely because we were so impressed with his very good mind and the broad reach of his mind and thought that he would make a wonderful addition to the Program and bring added visibility to the Program. Perhaps the mistake was to view him as the right choice for Director. I mean, that's something, of course, one says with hindsight, because we hired him as Director and hoped he would do very well in that role. Circumstances turned out to be different from that initial expectation, as you know.

SM: Is he teaching here now?

EG: Yes, he is, and I was going to say perhaps the best one can say is that we did get a very good scholar.

SM: (inaudible)

EG: Yes, as far as I know. I think certain hard feelings were left as a consequence of the manner of his leaving the Directorship.

SM: Has he got a wife who teaches somewhere?

EG: No, he does not.

SM: There's a Maddi, another Maddi. It's a she and she's somewhere in the sciences.

EG: No, no. Sam, if I could go back one moment to the issue of what has the Program done in the intervening ten years.

SM: Yes, yes, yes.

EG: There's another very important thing for me to say and that is that largely under Dan Stokols' Directorship we have made enormous moves toward differentiating and building up our graduate programs.

SM: Oh, yes, I know.

EG: So we have several new Ph.D. concentrations moving in the direction of free-standing Ph.D. programs. That is to say, a program that we are hoping to put into place that will end in offering the Ph.D. in Health Psychology or the Ph.D. in Environmental Analysis and Design. And it's worth saying something about that. If you want to, I can tell you explicitly what the four or five directions of graduate growth are. If not, you know, if there's no particular reason to do that, we'll skip it.

SM: No, no, I'd like to hear it.

EG: Okay.

SM: I've got to turn this reel around in a second.

EG: Okay. Well, the areas of development are in urban planning, an M.A. program in Facilities Management, an M.A. program. And then at the Ph.D. level, a proposed Ph.D. in Health Psychology, a Ph.D. in Human Development and a Ph.D. in Criminal Justice Law and Society.

SM: And these are approved?

EG: No, these are in various states of being underway. The Health Psychology proposal is already being reviewed by a ^{our} graduate council and so on. Human Development Ph.D. proposal is about to go that route. The Criminal Justice Law and Society Ph.D. is still in an earlier stage of development. And a fourth that I didn't mention a moment ago, a Ph.D. in Environmental Analysis and Design is, again, still a bit further behind the last one I mentioned. Now, as an historian, you will be interested in why we have felt it necessary to move to what I'm going to call free-standing Ph.D. programs, not merely concentrations within Social Ecology.

There are several reasons, but the one I think you need to know about is that the name Social Ecology continues to be a bit of a problem for us. Or, to say it more dramatically, it haunts us. We live in a fairly conservative condition or culture at the moment. We have to be concerned about . . . And we also live in a sort of market here at UCI, where we're

told we need to drum up our graduate enrollments and so on and so forth.

SM: Yes.

EG: Students, when they shop for a degree program, are very concerned about what that Ph.D. is called, and a Ph.D. in Social Ecology is still a rather peculiar bird to have hanging around your neck, if not an albatross, at least not a golden goose. And we have known this for a long time and we have finally taken some steps to, on the one hand, it's not just cosmetic, in changing the names, though that is part of it, but we have finally taken a step to sort of differentiating and strengthening some particular areas in which we feel we are very good and can offer a fine graduate training program. And that's where a good deal of our energy is going toward these days, and I think it's going to be very successful and very good for the campus.

SM: Well, that's interesting, Ellen. Another of my good students who I had in three courses, she only got an A minus because she was always working for the student body, vice president or something. It's Babs Sandeen. Did you know that?

EG: Oh, yes.

SM: She married Charles but he's going down the tubes, I'm afraid.

EG: Beverly Charles, Babs Charles, yes.

SM: Well, I know her as Babs Sandeen and she was vice president of the student body or something, but she was very bright.

EG: Yes.

SM: And I couldn't give her an A because she didn't do all the reading. But she got an A minus. And she's ^{taking} ~~taken~~ a Ph.D. with you.

EG: That's right. You know, I don't know that Babs has quite found her metier yet, at this point, but I know she's had . . .

SM: Well, I'm afraid she's had her problems, off the record, with her marriage, and I think it's going down the tubes.

EG: Yes, yes.

SM: But she's bright.

EG: Oh, she certainly is.

SM: And I was wondering what branch or what subject she was taking.

EG: I think she's still looking at lots of different options, trying different things out.

SM: Well, I don't think we can easily get around this question of what you call your Ph.D. But you can, you can say Social Ecology--stroke.

(End of Side A)

Now, we were talking, were we not, about what title you might give to a graduate degree in order to have a certain precision and also a respect of your . . .

EG: That's right. (laughter)

SM: (chuckling)

EG: Well, you know, let's also say that the time has come of a larger faculty to offer more differentiated graduate training in Social Ecology. You know, this is problematic for me to say, devoted as I am to the idea of interdisciplinary training. Do you want to change that, Sam?

SM: No, it's all right. It's going well.

EG: You know, this would not be an odd thing for you to hear, except for somebody who has been extolling the virtues of interdisciplinary education, which is what I started with, Sam. And we sort of had to work through in our hearts and heads what it means to still value and try to prompt students to--and if necessary, to bludgeon them--into getting training outside the narrow confines of a field, at the same time that we feel that it really is important to intensify the area of specific training. I put that very poorly. Let me backtrack a minute.

We first of all picked Ph.D. areas that are themselves interdisciplinary. Human Development is a good example. In other departments around the country, Cornell, Penn State, Harvard, for example, Human Development programs are often comprised of psychologists, anthropologists, sociologists, sometimes people in medicine. Likewise, Health Psychology draws on people with physiological training, with psychological training. Environmental Analysis and Design is a multi-disciplinary concoction. So, on the one hand, we

preserved in what we're putting forward. We've chosen very carefully new directions that retain our commitment to an interdisciplinary view of the world. At the same time, we think it is important to get our students onto these tracks and provide them with more focused training in the areas they've chosen.

SM: Now, you therefore don't know how it will work out in placement of your students in other institutions?

EG: We think it can only help.

SM: It should.

EG: After turning it around, it's hard to imagine that it won't help in recruitment. We have lost some excellent graduates. We've gotten some wonderful graduate students but we have lost some excellent prospects, and who have said to us straightforwardly, "I just think it's safer to get a Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology or (inaudible)."

SM: "You can't market me."

EG: That's right. "I worry," they say. "I'd love to come here but I think I can get as good a training at such and such a place and then I'll walk away with a Ph.D. in a field that people recognize and don't raise their eyebrows at." It's hard to fight that. I mean, we had our good retorts but they also were not entirely convincing retorts in some cases. I think this will help us, you know, without sacrificing some of the things . . .

SM: Your committee that's just finished and so on, will put a report out that will help you here?

EG: I'm not sure. We shall see. Now, we had a graduate review last year that I think . . .

SM: Well, that's the one I'm thinking of.

EG: Now, this year's was an undergraduate review.

SM: Oh, I see.

EG: Last year we had a graduate review which was very, very supportive.

SM: Well, that's what I want to hear.

EG: Yes, and very supportive of most of these new directions, with some questions about others.

SM: And you have worked out that graduate field nomenclature.

EG: That's right, that's right. Most of these now exist as so-called concentrations within Social Ecology but we're moving toward the free-standing Ph.D. in X, Y and Z at this point.

SM: Do you have any relations . . . Just a question that comes to my mind, you're in psychology, with our Psychology Department here?

EG: Well, you know, we don't have a Psychology Department. You'll have to hold your hat, but we have a Psychology major but not a Psychology Department.

SM: I know you have a major.

EG: Now the major is located in the School of Social Sciences, which does not have a Psychology Department. They have a

Cognitive Sciences Department. And that was both something that existed de facto but also something that was recently affirmed as their desire and only aspiration. That is to say, they did not want to pursue a Department of Psychology. They have a very specialized . . .

SM: (inaudible)

EG: Yes. You know, they have a very specialized, very high quality Cognitive Sciences group, so we don't have a Psychology Department on this campus.

SM: Well, once in awhile I'll bump into Joe White and he says, "I want to have a Clinical Psychology Department or Program."

EG: Yes, yes.

SM: Well, I thought to myself, "He's just barking up the wrong tree, isn't he?"

Brendan Marr

EG: Well, I feel he is. I was discussing this with Brenden Marr, the Dean at Harvard, Director of the recent review, not Joe's program in particular but clinical psychology programs and what they cost and what the methods are. And, essentially, I think his view is very well taken. Namely, it's questionable whether it's a good idea in a research oriented university to embark on a program that is going to produce mainly practitioners and where it takes an enormous amount of faculty input to provide the training necessary to produce a credentialed practitioner. Wouldn't these resources be better spent doing other things?

SM: Yes, yes, I understand that.

EG: And that's really my strong feeling.

SM: I understand. Well, you've really answered eight, "What is the future of Social Ecology at UCI?"

EG: Yes.

SM: I mean, it should become a school soon and I think it will. But it's really . . . Now, the last question, how do you see UCI's development over the next fifteen years? And do you realize that you're going to go to the twenty-first century?

EG: Hobbling and creeping, if necessary. (laughter)

SM: I figured it out. I'll be eighty-four if I make the year 2001.

EG: Sam, you surely will. You know, my father was eighty-seven. My father, whom you know, was eighty-seven yesterday.

SM: Bless him.

EG: And spent his eighty-seventh birthday taking a tango lesson in the morning and attending a class at UCI in the afternoon. You be sure you're doing the same thing. (laughter)

SM: Yes, right you are. Well, what do you think on the fifteen-year run? I see nothing but . . . Let me say that, as I look at it from the perspective of being Chair of the Academic Senate and History Department, that you're going to go along the way . . . you're going to get more FTE. You're going to have to add a wing onto your building. In some way, you've got to do something about that.

EG: Well, let me say something about both those matters. Yes, we are going to get infusions of FTE over the years. The Chancellor is very interested in these professional M.A. programs, the planning and facilities management programs, which, of course, are the most discrepant, in some respects, from what we've been doing all along. They represent, among other things--not only--but an effort to meet the campus' desires to make a larger statement in the professional training realm and to increase graduate student enrollments. We will get FTE presumably for those programs. I think it's a little more doubtful how stupendous our FTE growth is going to be in other areas, and that's a matter of some concern because I think to do our new programs successfully some additional resources are needed. We can manage . . .

SM: But don't you think, Ellen, that that is one of the values of your five-year, you know, assessments that are made, that are really good.

EG: Yes.

SM: The administration has to pay attention to an outside committee that comes in from Harvard, Yale and Columbia and they say, "You need this and you need that and, therefore, it's up to you, Mr. Chancellor . . ."

EG: Yes. Unfortunately, though, you know, it's a situation in which there are limits on resources and there are many claimants for these resources that are inadequate to meet

everybody's needs. So the question is what kind of priority the Chancellor and the future Chancellor, assuming Jack's retirement in the next several years, what kind of priority we're given.

I have retreated a bit from the campus, Sam, in the last several years as I've started up new research. And so I don't think my views on the next fifteen years would be particularly insightful or worth spending time on. I mean, clearly, we're growing. We have a very vigorous Chancellor. We have a whole new outlook on our relations with the business community. We are bringing in money and endowed chairs and so on at a rate that we never had before and, clearly, this is a growing enterprise. I'm not close enough to the centers of powers these days to give you informed views on where it's all heading.

SM: Well, that's a very, very clear answer. And I want to thank you, Ellen, for this good interview.

EG: Thank you, Sam.

SM: It's been very pleasant. Always a pleasure to see you. Ellen, we want to go on. You want to say in some of your accomplishments that you regularized the relationship with the other schools.

EG: Yes, as we were closing the interview, I had said to you that there's something else I wish I had said about what I think I was able to do during the years I was Director. When I took

on the job, we had been through a year of an interim director, or acting director, acting director Gil Geis, and then a year of an interim director, Arthur Boughey. Arthur was famous, or I should say infamous, for getting into arguments with people and, by the time I took on the Directorship, there was a legacy to be dealt with and to be overcome.

I heard subsequently--I can't vouch for the truth of this--that Arthur hadn't returned phone calls to other important campus figures in months and months and didn't reply to memos. I don't know whether this was true. I certainly had the impression that there had been a separation between the administration of Social Ecology and other deans. And I think one of the things I was able to do was to get Social Ecology back into the network. I remember, for example, that early on Howard Schneiderman invited me to come over and talk at a faculty meeting in Biological Sciences. I always got on well with the other deans and directors and I think that was an important part. I mean, these are not brilliant accomplishments, we don't get the bronze medal of honor for some of these activities, but they were really things that needed to be done.

SM: Exactly, and I'm sure you did it very well, very well. Thank you, Ellen.

END OF INTERVIEW