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Abstract
The obituaries of eminent psychologists represent a reflexive moment in which psychologists writing about other psychologists construct their oft-times beloved colleagues, mentors, and friends as gendered persons who have made important contributions to the discipline. They are therefore a useful site to study the normative prescriptions of gender and psychology. We conducted a discourse analysis of 82 obituaries of women and men that appeared in the American Psychologist between January 1979 and July 1997. We conclude that the predominant image of the successful psychologist remains the “male scientist” and the dominant image of psychology as a discipline remains the neo-positivist version of science. As a consequence, women’s contributions to the discipline are marginalized relative to those of men, and epistemological and theoretical controversies that might well lead to significant changes in disciplinary practices are “smoothed” over and ignored.

Although the object of psychology is people, a rarely explored topic is the applicability of psychological knowledge to psychologists themselves. Instead, the reflexive nature of the scientific enterprise within psychology is relegated to the status of a problem to be managed, requiring elaborate methodological safeguards to ensure that the psychologists’ self-understandings do not intrude into psychological research or practice (Morawski, 1994). Nevertheless, psychologists, including the most ardent objectivists (Coan, 1979), have frequently had an interest in the personal dimensions of their own and each other’s lives and research. For example, Jill Morawski (1992) has argued that both in public documents and private correspondence, psychologists during the age of theories (1890-1940) engaged in various self-reflexive writings which were closed to them in their formal theorizing. Because they kept these self-reflexive texts outside most of their public pronouncements, such texts were never examined in relation to their theoretical work. Yet, as Morawski (1992) pointed out, they had a lasting impact on their understanding of their subject matter and their laboratory practices. This paper will present one such occasion for self-reflexive practice, the writing of an obituary about one’s eminent colleagues.

Psychologists rarely present their private selves to the public. Occasionally, someone whose career has had a major impact on the discipline writes an autobiography (e.g., Skinner, 1984). In other cases, a psychologist may write an autobiography to make public the relationship between their life and the kind of psychology they practiced or wished to see (e.g., Brandt, 1982; Sarason, 1988). More commonly, biographies are written after the deaths of psychologists considered by their colleagues to have had an impact on the discipline (e.g., James, Watson, Skinner, and so on). Biographers, of course, make use of a variety of sources that are not public, for example, letters, unpublished papers, reminiscences from friends and family members — sources that form a framework within which to contextualize the individual’s contributions.

A more limited form of contextualization occurs within obituaries published for the deceased psychologist’s professional colleagues. Stylized and limited in extent, such obituaries are not critical reviews but instead serve to mourn the passing of a colleague who may have been a mentor or close friend of the obituary writer, and to remind the readers of someone whose contributions to psychology may have ceased years before their death. As respectful and relatively noncritical summaries of the deceased’s work, they necessarily do not offer the lengthy evaluation of the person and their work expected in a biography. Nevertheless, such obituaries make a broad professional contribution to the discipline. As “celebratory” histories (Danziger, 1994), they remind the reader of what has been accomplished within psychology. They signal that psychology has had its great minds who have contributed to the betterment of the discipline and society through their theorizing, research, and practice. Consequently, professional obituaries provide an informal history and evaluation of the discipline.

Precisely because obituaries are a form of literary genre, they are also occasions for the appearance and maintenance of cultural norms. This is especially the
case for expressions of gender-bound norms. We argue that the implicit use of gender-bound norms in discussing the deceased parallel the gender attribution processes so common in everyday life (Kessler & McKenna, 1978; West & Zimmerman, 1987). One component of these processes is the language used to refer to activities engaged in by women and men. Numerous studies of everyday language use suggest, for example, that many occupational labels are associated with men, men frequently being defined by what they do and women by their relationships with others (e.g., Lakoff, 1975; Smith, 1985). Some of the gender-related differences in language use are now less prevalent or have been modified in recent years due to the attention they have received and consequent changes in social norms. In certain cases, they have been eliminated as a matter of policy. For example, the publication guidelines of the American Psychological Association stress the use of nonsexist, inclusive language. Such changes in practice, however, do not address the broader consequences of discourse. For instance, one can avoid the generic "he" in one's writing but nevertheless, using other words, refer the social categories of female and male and the current relationship between them as natural and essential. Our interest was in the latter case. Specifically, how is the eminent psychologist constructed within the obituary genre where we have one or more psychologists writing about the life of a great one? How does gender figure into these constructions? What are the implications of these constructions for our understanding of psychology and women's contributions to the discipline?

Previous studies that have focused on the normative implications of obituaryss generally were aimed at studying gender bias. Three of these, all analyses of newspapers published in the United States, reported more frequent recognition of male deaths in obituaries and, on average, longer obituaries for men than for women (Kastenbaum, Peyton, & Kastenbaum, 1977; Maybury, 1995-96; Stillion & Shamblin, 1985). In the most recent of these, Maybury (1995-96) argued that these trends reflect a continuing devaluation of women's accomplishments. Similar conclusions were drawn in two further studies of obituaries of women and men managers appearing in German-language newspapers published in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland (Kirchler, 1992; Kirchler, Wagner, & Buchleitner, 1996). The success of men managers was attributed to their experience, knowledge, and intelligence; the success of female managers, at least since 1980 however, was attributed to their struggling for success by drawing on unstable characteristics like courage and commitment. Finally, one study involved a content analysis of obituaries appearing in the American Psychologist between 1979 and 1990 (Kinnier, Metha, Buki, & Rawa, 1994). The researchers identified ten value themes (defined as "belief[s] about a preferred mode of conduct or goal in life," p. 90), which they suggest reflect criteria of positive mental health. They ranged from "independent-minded" to "sense of humor/wit" but no gender comparisons were made because 87% of the deceased were male. Thus, the research on obituaries as a site for the construction of gender and professional identities has been limited.

We took as the starting point of our analysis the assumed gender of the eminent psychologists remembered in the obituaries and explored the impact of this "incorrigible proposition" (Kessler & McKenna, 1978) on the descriptions of the deceased and their lives as professional psychologists. We argue that, just as in daily conversation, this assumed gender has particular subtle or unconscious effects on the construction of the deceased and their lives — effects that may serve to marginalize women's contributions. Our analysis consisted of the obituaries published in the American Psychologist since they first appeared in January 1979 and ending with the July 1997 issue. Of the total number of obituaries published over nearly two decades, 41 (14%) were for women psychologists and 292 (86%) were for men. If we take as a conservative estimate of the number of women psychologists Stevens and Gardner's (1982) figure of one-third by the early 1980s, clearly the proportion of deceased women to men psychologists so honoured does not approach their participation rate within the discipline.

We note this difference only in passing; our analysis was not intended to explain it but rather to study the gendered and professional representation of those chosen.

Central to our argument is the notion that gender is constituted in and through discourse, a performance rather than essence, and unstable although frequently enacted in stylized ways (e.g., Butler, 1990). In acquiring language, we learn how to talk about ourselves, others, and our relations with them. We learn to do so using the categories that structure social life, a primary category being gender. But language is more than a system of representation; language is also a form of action or performance (e.g., Edwards, 1997; Edwards & Potter, 1992; Potter, 1996; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Bronwyn Davies (1989) provides an example of how discursive practices "act" — to both produce gender and constrain the possibilities for gendered persons. When an adult says to a child "good girl," a rather complicated set of
events takes place (pp. 13-14). First of all, the person to whom "good girl" is directed is positioned as a child and the speaker is positioned as an adult. Moreover, the child's behaviour is constituted as worthy of praise and in some way relevant to her gender. In effect, this simple phrase indicates to the child one way in which adults link being female and virtue. In our everyday social interactions and in a manner similar to this example, we position ourselves as female or male, position others as female or male, and are positioned by others as female or male (Davies & Harte, 1990). This positioning has widespread implications for further social practice (what we do and what is done to us) within the complex and far-reaching gender system (Connell, 1987). It constrains and simultaneously enables particular versions of the world.

The construction of the female or male psychologist within the context of an obituary is not unlike psychologists' own constructions of themselves or their construction by others in other everyday contexts. Their construction as gendered persons does not end when they die, and through the ways in which they are remembered, contributes to an historical account of the ways in which women and men conform to or resist taken-for-granted notions of femininity and masculinity. Similarly, such accounts reflect the normative view of the successful, achieving psychologist and her/his accomplishments, pointing to the criteria by which we expect to be judged by our disciplinary peers. What we suggest then is that the obituary tells us as much about the normative process of writing an obituary, the readers of the obituary, and the dominant version of the discipline of psychology, as it does about the deceased person. Naturally, we include ourselves within the reader category; our readings of the obituaries are as constrained by the discourses circulating in contemporary Western culture as those of any other reader or the authors. Precisely because we share at least some level of cultural understanding among ourselves, the obituaries make sense and usually do not give rise to controversy.

For the purposes of this paper, however, we position ourselves as critical readers by adopting a discursive stance and attempting to examine that which the ordinary reader may take for granted. All three of us have been trained in conventional psychological discourse but have particular interest in theoretical alternatives, including a feminist framework for psychology. Consequently, in our analysis we focused on the discourses related to gender and psychology taken up in the obituaries, how they are taken up, and their consequences in terms of discursively reproducing gender norms and conventional psychological content or alternatively offering other possibilities.

Finally, we wish to clarify the status of the descriptions contained in the obituaries. In our analysis we treat these descriptions not merely as constructions or, in other words, fictions, but as accounts that have material force. We do not take issue with the choice of subjects for the obituaries, nor do we accuse the obituary writers of aiming to sensationalize or stereotype their subjects. Our point is that the form and language, that is, the rhetorical structure of an obituary, makes it highly susceptible to being written in a standardized form, a kind of "obituarese." As such it reflects cultural and social norms, while at the same time honouring the deceased. The material consequences of the practice of obituary writing is to reproduce those norms with particular consequences for both female and male psychologists. Our interest in the obituary descriptions was driven by an interest in these consequences.

Analytic Method and Materials
Our method of analysis was inspired by an approach to discourse analysis that has been developed to address questions stemming from the psychological tradition (Edley & Wetherell, 1997, 1999; Edwards, 1997; Edwards & Potter, 1992; Potter, 1996; Potter & Wetherell, 1987, 1995). We adopted the definition of discourse provided by Potter and Wetherell: "all forms of spoken interaction, formal and informal, and written texts of all kinds" (p. 7). Thus, we focused on a particular type of written discourse, the obituary, and specifically, on how the obituary writers described their subjects and the functions these descriptions served in depicting the eminent psychologists. In so doing, we drew on the notion of interpretative repertoires defined as "broadly discernible clusters of terms, descriptions and figures of speech often assembled around metaphors or vivid images" (Potter & Wetherell, 1995, p. 89). Potter and Wetherell (1995) also refer to them as "building-blocks" and "available resources" but also as "pre-eminently a way of understanding the content of discourse and how that content is organized" (p. 89). The focus, however, is "language use, what is achieved by that use, and the nature of the interpretative resources that allow that achievement" (p. 89).

In our case, it was necessary to adapt the analysis to our particular research circumstances. First, the analysis involved nonconversation text, that is, a written obituary. Second, our research materials were highly constraining in that they consisted of text written under circumscribed conditions. The goal of the obituary writer

---

2 Following Edley and Wetherell (1997, 1999), we are interested in both the constraining and enabling functions of discourse. This view draws on both "top-down" and "bottom-up" versions of discursive psychology and holds in tension the "central paradox" that "people are simultaneously the products and the producers of discourse (Edley & Wetherell, 1997, p. 206).
is to make a case for the classification of the subject as an eminent psychologist in a limited amount of space and following the conventions for such obituaries. The writer takes on this task anticipating the readership of their contribution — at a minimum all members of the American Psychological Association. So, in effect, the primary, intended function of the discourse is known in advance and our interest was in the specific ways in which the writer used language to make the case within the constraints of normal obituary language use. In effect, we approached the texts with three questions: (1) where are the boundaries around the category "eminent psychologist" drawn?, (2) how do they shift from case to case?, and (3) what are the particularities of a given case that coincide with the shifting boundaries? Thus, unlike other studies adopting a discursive approach, we propose a single interpretative repertoire — an undisputed ideal scientist/psychologist with respect to which all of the deceased were positioned by the writer. We came to this conclusion based on the single, marked, discernible pattern in the text and despite the variety of ways in which it was expressed. Third, discourse analysis is generally not used to compare groups as it is assumed that groups are themselves discursively produced. In our case, however, we could assume that the obituary writers would at least reproduce the gender classification of the deceased as female or male, if only in their use of feminine and masculine pronouns (we were not disappointed in this regard). Our interest was in how the writers would negotiate between gender discourses and the eminent scientist discourse.

The first step in the analysis then involved exploring the written text for patterns that constitute the eminent psychologist, adopting an analytic strategy that differs from content analysis in important ways. Our purpose was to explore the cultural discourses related to achievement and science drawn on by the obituary writers, and to facilitate the search for patterns in how the eminent scientist gets worked-up in the case of female and male deceased. Unlike content analysis, we assume that themes and categories can be worked-up and used in varied and contradictory ways depending on the writer's purpose. Also, the listing of descriptors is only a beginning. Their use in context is the primary site of analysis. Initially, we sorted each statement in each of the obituaries into those pertaining to the deceased's personal life and those pertaining to her or his professional life. Although our ultimate interest was in the entire obituary, given our initial aim to identify the eminent psychologist interpretative repertoire, we assumed that the material related to the deceased's professional activities would be most relevant. Professional statements included references to research and teaching, relationships with colleagues and students, and abilities, attributes or achievements specific to the professional context. Personal statements included references to activities, attributes or accomplishments outside the work context, and relationships such as friendships, marriage, and children. From the whole sentences we extracted key descriptive words which were organized according to broad themes. These constituted the "clusters of terms" for the eminent scientist repertoire. By re-contextualizing the broad themes within each obituary as a whole, identifying the precise choice of words in each case, and then studying the function of those words in constructing a version of the deceased as an eminent psychologist, we explored the shared features and differences among the women's and men's obituaries. We were open to the possibility of multiple interpretative repertoires — perhaps one for women and one for men — or different versions of the eminent psychologist associated with different theoretical traditions. As we have noted above, however, a single cultural ideal against which women and men, and indeed all psychologists, were measured made most sense.

The analysis included all obituaries for women psychologists published between January 1979 and July 1997 (n = 41) and an equal number of obituaries of men psychologists published during the same time frame, yielding a total of 82 obituaries. We selected the men's obituaries on the basis of two criteria. First, we matched each deceased woman with a deceased man who had lived during roughly the same life span (i.e., similar birth and death years). Second, we matched the gender of the obituary authors. For example, if the obituary of a deceased woman had a woman author, it was matched to an obituary of a deceased man with approximately the same birth and death years and also written by a woman. Altogether, there were 24 obituaries written by female authors, 44 written by male authors, and 14 written by a combination of female and male authors. Life-span matching of the deceased permitted the analysis to be sensitive to any cultural changes over time, either in the way gender is constructed or in the construction of psychology as a discipline, and given our interest in reflexivity, we wanted to include a balance of female and male voices as authors of the obituaries to ensure as much diversity as possible in these same constructions.

3 Our analysis does not involve a direct comparison of the obituaries according to the gender of the author(s). Within a discursive framework there are no grounds for such a summary comparison. This is not to say the gender of the writer is irrelevant but rather that we are not in a position to predict any straightforward effects of their gender. The authors themselves were multiply positioned as psychologists of a particular gender, social class, ethnicity, etc., writing an obituary about a friend, colleague, and/or mentor (also a psychologist positioned in a particular way in terms of gender, social class, ethnicity, etc.), and thus there is no simple way to
Analysis and Discussion
THE EMINENT SCIENTIST
Beginning with the lengthy list of key descriptor words used in statements referring to the professional activities of the deceased, we organized the words into the following gross categories: (1) leadership, (2) innovation, (3) superior intellect, (4) legacy, (5) reputation, (6) commitment, (7) influence on others, (8) energy, (9) humane characteristics, (10) scientist role, and (11) miscellaneous (see Appendix B). We also distinguished between those words used to describe both female and male deceased and those used to describe a deceased of only one gender. The descriptor words themselves appeared one or more times within a particular obituary or across different obituaries. As we expected given other discursive studies (e.g., Potter & Wetherell, 1987), there were a very large number of descriptor words employed. We include Appendix B precisely to emphasize the point that language use in obituaries is highly flexible and varied despite the constraints of obituary writing to which we have already referred. Not surprisingly, the obituary writers attribute characteristics to the leaders in the field of psychology that are similar to the characteristics associated with leadership in the professional research literature of psychology (e.g., Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). Furthermore, these leaders are described as scientists in a manner that is consistent with the dominant version of science within psychology, that is, they are “objective,” “search for truth and meaning,” and “scientific.” Thus, the constructions of the leaders within psychology that were worked-up in the obituaries are in line with other broad discourses circulating in the culture (in this case, discourse on leadership and scientific discourse).

In examining the variety of particular descriptors associated with each broad category, we noted greater variety in the descriptors used in the obituaries of the deceased men compared to those for the women. Indeed, for two of the categories, superior intellect and legacy, the deceased women were described only in terms used for both women and men. In contrast, there were a number of descriptors used only for the deceased men. This general pattern of language use is only noticeable at this level of analysis — it is not the sort of discursive work that can be detected from a close analysis of an individual obituary. Yet, it allows us to say something about cultural understandings linking eminence and gender. The greater variety associated with the descriptions of eminent men as intelligent and leaving a legacy may work to construct them as unique and differentiated from other eminences in this regard; the descriptions of the eminent women, on the other hand, were marked by greater similarity. To the extent that eminence is a distinctive form of social positioning, constructing an eminent woman as lacking distinctiveness from others in regard to specific characteristics associated with eminence, works to undermine their social positioning as eminent.

The terms used selectively to describe one gender or the other sometimes serve to draw attention to the gender of the deceased either explicitly (e.g., “founding father,” “father figure,” “grandmother,” “woman of vision”) or implicitly through their association with dominant versions of gender in Western cultures (e.g., “strong independence of thought” and “solitary” in the case of a male scientist; “intuitive” and “modest” in the case of a female scientist). Ironically, two specific areas where the women were described with greater variety than the men were humane characteristics and the scientist role. The descriptors grouped under humane characteristics included so-called expressive qualities that have been associated with the traditional Western versions of femininity (e.g., “caring,” “accepting and empathic,” “kindly manner”), and therefore it is not surprising that the women were so positioned in more varied ways compared to the men. On the other hand, it can be argued that the scientist role is not a position that naturally includes women, and yet, the women were being honoured for their scientific contributions, thereby requiring that a more explicitly documented case be made to support the legitimacy of this honour (e.g., Keller, 1985). The relatively greater variety in the descriptors employed emphasize the woman scientist’s qualifications above and beyond the normal. Both of these anomalies represent a form of “narrative smoothing” (Spence, 1986) where the written narrative account is constructed in a manner that brings the case into conformity with public standards. In the former case, the public standard is socially constructed femininity, and in the latter case, it is the normative definition of the scientist.

Studying the use of the descriptors within the context of the obituary accounts, the fit between the eminent
scientist and masculinity is underscored by the use of two devices: (a) maximization (Potter, 1996) and (b) words and phrases that subtly link hegemonic masculinity and scientific accomplishment. For example, John Rothney (1906-1987):

Rothney is remembered by his colleagues and students for his persistent thrust of seeking substantiation for statements made and for the interventions counselors use. It was his premise that there was too much that was done "on faith" without "evidence" as to its effectiveness. He was concerned with effectiveness over time and in daily living. He spent many hours working with young people, challenging students and being a critic. He was one of the pioneers in school counseling, dedicated to helping young people get a constructive start in life. His follow-up research efforts over time, a model for practicing counselors and counseling psychologists is a legacy for all to admire. (Farwell, 1989, p. 843)

This excerpt can be read smoothly as the description of a great person, containing words and phrases that identify qualities and achievements expected from the scientific leaders of our discipline. Moreover, the description is amplified beyond the ordinary or average not only by the specific choice of words but also by the lengthy listing of characteristics — "seeking substantiation for statements," "it was his premise," "spent many hours working," "challenging students and being a critic," "one of the pioneers," "dedicated," "a legacy for all to admire." Notably, the list of rememberings begins with "his persistent thrust," a choice of phrase that clearly positions him in a masculine domain. A more subtle connection with the traditional and masculinist version of science (Keller, 1985) is the reference to his rationality — the seeking of evidence and the concern with effectiveness. Almost a decade later, we find the same devices in the obituary of Thomas Marshall Ostrom (1986-1994):

On May 7, 1994, only days away from losing his battle with cancer, Tom Ostrom's remarkable scientific and personal career received an unprecedented recognition. Colleagues and friends gathered to celebrate ... their career and personal associations with an outstanding colleague, mentor, and friend ... As a recognized pioneer in the modern era of social cognition, Ostrom sought repeatedly to integrate theoretical and methodological advances in cognitive psychology with classic research problems in social psychology. In a key 1981 paper, "The Organization of Social Information," Ostrom successfully overthrew the previously unquestioned assumption that ... Tom's passionate prose ... has become standard reading in social cognition courses. Ostrom's research sophistication and contributions were recognized in his appointment to important leadership positions. ... The combination of personal warmth and intellectual stimulation at the event captured the characteristics that make Thomas Marshall Ostrom an unforgettable and unique figure in the second half of 20th-century psychology. (Brock, Greenwald, & Sherman, 1995, p. 942)

Again, the language used serves to highlight the extreme nature of this eminent psychologist's accomplishments: "remarkable," "unprecedented," "outstanding," "sophistication," "recognized," "important," and "an unforgettable and unique figure in the second half of 20th-century psychology." Although not tightly packed in one paragraph, their regular appearance throughout the text offers continual reminders to the readers. The reference to a successful overthrow positions Thomas Ostrom as a worthy combatant within the scientific enterprise characterized by such masculine metaphors. Thus, as in the case of John Rothney, gender discourse is woven together with the discourse of scientific excellence.

In the women's obituaries, the contradiction between scientific achievement and femininity is communicated through what is not said. The women are described as accomplished but there is relatively little maximizing language. In addition, their construction as women works to minimize their accomplishments and shifts the focus to a consideration of their normalcy with respect to standards of femininity. For example, Juanita Hingst Williams (1922-1991):

On February 11, 1991, Juanita H. Williams, a pioneer in the field of psychology of women, died of cancer in her home. Just one year earlier (February 10, 1990), friends, colleagues, and her editor gathered to celebrate her professional life upon her retirement ... Despite a climate of hostility and ignorance, she launched the program in June 1972 and became its first director. Her taciturn toughness was the key to overcoming resistance to what many saw as a radical change. Today, the program, considered a model by many, flourishes. ... She was a many-faceted person. In addition to a full career and rich family life (she was survived by nine grandchildren and five brothers and sisters), she was active in the community and in her profession ... As a stalwart defender of women's rights, teacher, scholar, mentor, leader, family member, and jogger she did them all with impeccable grace. (Kimmel, 1992, p. 1676)

A comparison with the excerpts from the John Rothney and Thomas Ostrom obituaries is interesting, both for the similarities and the differences. For both Juanita Williams and Thomas Ostrom a celebration is mentioned, both were pioneers, and both were associated with change that has been long-lasting. Although Juanita
Williams's "tactful toughness" was "the key" to bringing about change, the passive verb construction does not attribute the successful overcoming of resistance to her actions (Tom Ostrom, on the other hand, "successfully overthrew"). Also, the program "flourishes" today, but unlike John Rotheny there is no explicit mention of Juanita Williams leaving a legacy. Furthermore, qualities that might be associated with masculinity are modified in accordance with normative standards of middle-class, Western femininity. Juanita Williams was "tough" but in a "tactful" way, and her "stalwart" defense of women's rights was accomplished "with impeccable grace." Finally, her connection to family was sufficiently important to mention it twice within the same paragraph and to describe it as "rich" (in both men's cases the last sentence of the obituary reads "... is survived by ..."). The family link gives Juanita Williams the credential of having been a normal woman despite her other, unconventional pursuits.

Another example is Marcia Guttentag (1952-1977):

That death came on November 4, 1977, to Marcia Guttentag was especially hard for her colleagues and friends to believe and accept. She was a woman of unusual energy and vitality and was at the height of her powers when she died. This distinguished scholar in social-clinical psychology and activist for human rights ... Although her professional career was brief, she authored or edited 13 books, 20 chapters in books, 15 monographs, and more than 50 papers. The vigor and importance of Marcia's research and writing are testified to by the fact that both are still actively influencing the field. ... Marcia was ever the activist. She vigorously insisted on strict moral, professional, and personal standards. Her writings, her speeches, her direct action, and her unyielding concern in people encouraged concern for others and helped improve standards of human interaction. ... Marcia had irresistible visions for improving the life of all. She was optimistic, gentle, enthusiastic, volatile, and excited by the creative. With all of her commitments to others, she also maintained

strong family ties ... Her scholarship, her leadership, her dedication, and her caring will ensure that the memory of Marcia Guttentag will survive for generations to come.

(Derner, 1980, pp. 1158-1159)

As in the case of Juanita Williams there is little use of the discursive device, maximization. Marcia Guttentag was "distinguished" and her productivity is emphasized by a quantitative listing of her published output. Otherwise, however, she is described as extreme in terms of "energy and vitality," "moral, professional, and personal standards," "interest in people," and "visions for improving the life of all." Reference to her scientific accomplishments is juxtaposed with references that characterize her as feminine: "ever the activist" and reference to her social activist interests follows a lengthy description of positions held and research interests; "gentle" precedes and takes the edge off other emotional characteristics attributed to her — "enthusiastic," "volatile," and "excited"; "strong family ties" were maintained in the face of "her commitments to others"; and "her caring" is the final summary descriptor in a list of what she will be remembered for. In the end her status as a normal woman is asserted despite her having also been a productive scientist.

Thus, it is not the case that men were simply constructed one way and women another. Constructing these scientists as simultaneously women and men, the eminent scientist repertoire competes with gender talk in the case of the women and complements in the case of the men. To draw on a visual and feminine metaphor, the women's lives were narrated as a patchwork quilt and the men's lives as a seamless bolt of cloth. One particular way in which gender difference was marked in the obituaries was the positioning of the deceased within social relationships. It is to the analysis of this aspect of the obituaries that we now turn.

**SCIENTISTS ARE ALSO SOCIAL BEINGS**

Talk about relationships was particularly noticeable in the women's obituaries; we have already given the specific example of family relationships in the two cases presented so far. Overall, there were many references to relationships and the importance of relationships in their lives. In many cases their warmth, caring and supportiveness were stressed. These were presented as straightforward descriptions of the deceased and exceptions to the normative pattern were duly noted. In contrast, when similar qualities were mentioned in the men's obituaries they were often juxtaposed with his more "instrumental" scientist qualities, that is, they humanize the distant, objective scientist. Within the "eminent scientist" interpretive repertoire we have referred to the relevant decontextualized descriptors as
“humane” characteristics. In this analysis we contextualize these characteristics and focus on their function in relation to the overall image of the deceased that is created by the obituary. For example, Mary Cover Jones (1896-1987):

played a central role in the design and conduct of the studies and published more than 100 articles based on the longitudinal data. Among these is a highly regarded, innovative series of studies on the behavioral correlates and long-term consequences of early and late physical maturing. In the latter years of her life, her research dealt with developmental antecedents of drinking behavior, again using the longitudinal data in original and creative ways. Mary more than anyone, held the study together by establishing caring relationships with the participants, whom she regarded as “partners in the study of human lives.” She became their beloved friend, confidante and counselor, as well as a careful and respected researcher.” … Mary was always articulate (and often poetic) about how much her life had been enriched by her work and her relationships with the participants in the longitudinal studies, but she was too modest to acknowledge that she played a critical role in shaping and guiding the field of developmental psychology. (Mussen & Eichorn, 1988, p. 818)

The text moves smoothly from Mary Cover Jones’s professional achievements to the important role of relationships in her life, so important that despite the honours conferred by others and her prolific publication record (“more than 100 articles”), she herself emphasized these relationships (with her research participants no less) and her personal enrichment; the obituary writers must point out her contributions to the discipline.

The eminent women who were not described as relationship-oriented in a normative manner required some explanation for their deviance. This is most explicit in the case of Anna Freud (1895-1982):

… Anna became his [her father’s] alter ego. There can be no doubt that such a close tie served to fixate her on her father, so that she never married and never had children of her own. In 1925 a female friend, Dorothy Burlingham, arrived in Vienna. An American woman with four children, Burlingham had left her husband to live in Europe and eventually came to live with Anna. The friendship soon ripened; they bought a house together near Vienna and remained intimate for the rest of their lives. … What the nature of the relationship was between Anna and Dorothy no one can say. Perhaps it was homosexual, perhaps not. But what is certain is that there was never any man in Anna’s life other than her father. Because everybody is so secretive about matters pertaining to her personal life, the paradox remains that the daughter of the founder of the sexual revolution seemingly never had a sex life of her own. She became wholly devoted to her career. (Fine, 1985, p. 231)

Anna Freud’s failure to marry and have children is attributed to her being fixated on her father. The writer concludes that she “seemingly never had a sex life of her own” after raising the possibility that she had a homosexual relationship with Dorothy Burlingham, another woman with a deviant background regarding relationships (she left her husband). He excuses his speculations based on “everybody’s secretiveness,” a discursive move aimed at avoiding responsibility for any disagreement the reader may have with his telling of the story of Anna Freud’s life. Her deviance on the relationship side, rendered understandable at least in psychoanalytic terms, is then linked in an unproblematic way with her professional activities. The author simply ends this passage by stating that she became devoted to her career (another psychoanalytic interpretation of her life).

For some of the eminent men, their professional achievements and “expressive” personal qualities were also presented side by side in a manner that at least superficially bears some resemblance to the case of Mary Cover Jones. For example, Bernard N. Kalinkowitz (1915-1992):

was renowned for the extent to which his extraordinary intelligence was matched by the exceptional qualities of his integrity, warmth, wit, and gentleness. He was a primary force in shaping the field of clinical psychology as we know it today — a pioneer … Bernie was prochoice in every sense. He was always sensitive to people who were vulnerable or distressed; exploitation was an anathema to him, and money and power held no allure. He valued community service and egalitarian principles. … Respected for his superior intelligence, analytic mind, and courage, Bernie was a master teacher and consultant to various boards and organizations. And, he was beloved. His kindness was legendary; he made time for everyone and found something to encourage in each individual. He was devoted to his students to a degree that extended far beyond the usual responsibilities of teacher or program director, giving of himself personally. … Most of all he loved his family … Clinical psychology has lost a founding father; we have lost a cherished program director, teacher, mentor, advocate, and friend. We have been left an honorable legacy. (Lesser & Tucker, 1994, p. 438)

Although one could reasonably argue that neither his professional achievements nor his relationship orientation are privileged in this account, nonetheless, unlike Mary Cover Jones who is simply “naturally” relational,
Bernard Kalinkowitz’s relationships are founded on egalitarian principles and values making them the rational outcome of his character. Nonetheless, the writers clearly construct him as an exception in this regard: “extended far beyond the usual” and “renowned.”

More commonly, the obituary writers treated the eminent men’s involvement in relationships as reflecting their humane side as distinct from their scientist side. This point is emphasized in cases where there is an obvious juxtaposition of the man as scientist and the man as human being. For example, Philip Ewart Vernon (1905-1987):

one of Britain’s eminent scientist-scholars, earned universal respect for his many contributions to educational and differential psychology and psychometrics. His unremitting devotion to scholarly work throughout a long and distinguished career was interrupted only by death ... A tall, ramrod figure, gray hair, and austere mien, virtually incapable of chitchat, he seemed ill at ease with strangers, who often mistook his laconic manner for aloofness. Actually it was social shyness and what The Times called his ‘legendary introversion.’ His friends discovered beneath this persona a gentle and sterling quality of character that evoked admiration and affection. His travels and social life were fortunately aided and abetted by Dorothy, whose lively sociability complemented his reserved nature, making friends and facilitating Philip’s interaction with those who shared his interests. (Jensen, 1989, p. 844)\(^5\)

The writer constructs Vernon, the scientist, as someone who finds interpersonal relationships challenging but is nonetheless a social being and the recipient of others’ affection. To be “incapable of chitchat” is understandable for someone so intellectually gifted and scientifically oriented, and social shyness does not mean that he is unlikeable or has no interest in interpersonal relationships. Furthermore, we almost expect such a figure to have deficiencies in the realm of social relations; social ineptness being consistent with popular conceptions of the scientist — at least where that scientist is a man (for example, the absent-minded professor).

Finally, we consider professional relationships: Collaboration was mentioned frequently and a number of the deceased had “special” collaborative relationships with a partner. Most often collaboration with others was simply stated as one component of their professional activities, for example, Perry London (1931-1992): “Although Perry published more than 150 articles and books, collaborated with vast numbers of colleagues and students...” (Rosenhan et al., 1993, p. 1088). This makes sense within an academic context where academic institutions and professional associations routinely evaluate living scientists’ contributions as individual achievements whether or not they were part of a collaborative effort. Given this cultural context, obituaries of deceased scientists would be expected to reflect the same assumptions. In some exceptional cases, however, there was greater elaboration of the individual’s collaborative efforts. Interestingly, only in the case of some of the women was “good” collaboration stressed as an important achievement in its own right. For example, Clara Mayo (1931-1981) was described in the closing paragraph of her obituary as “a complete teacher, an indefatigable colleague, and a collaborator par excellence” (LaFrance, 1983, p. 113). Although several similar constructions were employed in the women’s obituaries, collaboration with others was never described as a praiseworthy activity in itself in the men’s obituaries. Thus, professional collaborations involving women were constructed as normal and indeed valued, a positive view that is consistent with a cultural view of women as expressive and relationship-oriented.

In only one woman’s case was collaboration presented as a problem in the professional context:

Carolyn Wood Sherif’s work during this period with Muzaffer Sherif represented a collaborative effort in the truest sense. Both rejected attempts by others to characterize one or the other as the senior author, and even in the case of single-authored works, the cooperative element was an essential ingredient. Because of the extent of her participation in producing An Outline of Social Psychology, Muzaffer Sherif urged her to let him list her as co-author. Despite the Sherifs’ openness about the cooperative nature of their

---

5 These accounts reproduce the gender-related distinction between the relationship orientations associated with an ethic of care and an ethic of rights and responsibilities that entered psychological discourse in the 1980s (e.g., Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Gilligan, 1982) as well as the conventional definition of gender as expressiveness (in the case of women) and instrumentality (in the case of men; e.g., Brannon, 1999). This is noteworthy because it illustrates how the psychologist obituary writer draws on the same discourse as these psychologists theorizing about gender.

6 References to an individual’s physical appearance were relatively rare and only occurred in the obituaries of eminent men. One particularly striking example is Fred Simmons Keller (1899-1996) who “was a Hollywood casting director’s model by League professor. Standing in front of a class with his snow-white hair and white lab coat, Keller radiated a cosmopolitan and persuasive charm” (McGill, 1997, p. 748). The irony, of course, is that in other social contexts women’s success is often measured according to how closely they are positioned to cultural standards of physical beauty. Yet, in the evaluation of their professional success within the obituaries, there is silence on the matter of their physical appearance.
work, Carolyn Sherif’s contributions frequently went unrecognized because of Muzafer Sherif’s eminence. (Shaffer & Shields, 1984, p. 176)

The collaboration between the Sherifs was not only true but the “truest” possible. Implied by this choice of words is the falseness of some collaborations, that is, for this wording to make sense we must assume that sometimes authorship may not honestly reflect an individual’s contribution to the work. The first sentence anticipates the injustice described in the last sentence of the paragraph and asserts the correctness of viewing the work as part of Carolyn Wood Sherif’s achievements. The use of maximizing language formulates this as an extreme case (Potter, 1996). In addition, a three-part list presents a counter-argument to the position taken by others who attributed her work to her husband: it was a true collaboration, even single-authored works involved a “cooperative element,” and her husband at times “urged her to let him list her as a co-author.” Such a list functions to establish the generality and normative nature of the collaboration as described (Potter, 1996). Furthermore, both the last part of the three-part list and the opening of the last sentence deflect blame for the lack of recognition away from her husband. He recognized her extensive “participation” and was open about their collaboration. This passage constitutes a considerable amount of discursive work focused on establishing the legitimacy of the deceased’s accomplishments and the unfairness of her lack of recognition. Clearly, in this case collaboration had been constructed by others as grounds for discounting the deceased’s eminence; the obituary writers offered a strong, alternative account.

In the case of the men, when collaboration was mentioned in any detail, the relationship invariably had a “special” nature that is nonetheless consistent with being a man and a scientist. For example,

Harold Armen Goolishian, pioneer family psychologist and dean of the social constructionist movement in family therapy ... Harry’s death marked the end of a prodigious career as theoretician and innovator of psychotherapy, a master teacher, an ambassador for psychology and family therapy, and a unique and gifted conversationalist. ... With this social constructionist approach, Harry saw therapy as collaborative storytelling and himself as a therapeutic conversationalist, helping people develop new meanings and new stories about their lives by facilitating open dialogue. ... In his acceptance speech for this last award ... Harry was, as always, true to his theory. Asking a long list of close colleagues and collaborators to stand during his speech, Harry wrote, “This is an award for which I am just a vehicle and only a very small piece of what is being recognized here tonight. ... It is you who are the co-recipients of the high honor and recognition that this award represents ...” (McDaniel & Gergen, 1995, p. 292)

The quote from the acceptance speech, which was delivered shortly before his death, serves to emphasize the consistency of his life and his theory. An explicit association is drawn between the deceased’s collaborative endeavors and his theoretical viewpoint on psychology, a theoretical position not necessarily shared by others in the discipline. His participation in collaborative activities is constructed as exceptional but grounded in theory.

Another example is Fred Simmons Keller (1899-1996):

Keller seldom worked alone ... Shortly after the war ended, Keller was ready to launch his new lab course when he learned that Volkman and Reese were leaving to take jobs elsewhere. He then turned to another young department member, William N. Schoenfeld. Thus began a unique collaboration lasting nearly 18 years. Keller and Schoenfeld published their Principles of Psychology in 1950. It remains a landmark in the field. The two authors complemented each other almost perfectly.

Keller was a visionary and the more facile writer. Schoenfeld developed quickly as a powerful analyst. ... Keller and Schoenfeld were friendly but not personally close. They teamed up successfully ... (McGill, 1997, p. 743)

While quite a different example in its particulars, this case is similar to Harold Goolishian’s in that the collaboration is constructed within the norms of masculinity and science. Harold Goolishian’s collaborations were described as the rational outcome of his theory. Fred Keller’s 18-year collaboration is also described in rational terms; it was based on complementary contributions by the two collaborators and “friendly but not personally close” relations. Thus, although “unique,” both men are described as otherwise following the norm.

Focusing on the ways in which relationships, both personal and professional, are worked up in the obituaries reproduces gender differences. Family relationships are given different meanings in the lives of eminent women and men, a point that is not likely to be controversial given the historical association between women and responsibility for family work. Differing constructions of professional collaborations further link the deceased with their gendered constructions as persons. This serves to render the men’s accounts consistent with ideals of the eminent scientist as lone contributor. By emphasizing the interpersonal in the case of the women, they are constructed farther away from the ideal and sometimes as having deviant priorities — their scientific approach is an extension of their relationship-orienta-
tion in everyday life. Next, we turn to the construction of the psychological enterprise itself.

AND PSYCHOLOGY?
We argued earlier that the obituaries afford the obituary author with two opportunities: first, to describe an eminent colleague/friend/mentor — personal descriptions that largely conform to the cultural norms for gender and science; and second, for self-reflexivity — they may also be read as what psychologists (as obituary writers) recognize as the discipline's achievements and possibilities. In the case of the latter, the obituaries constructed a version of psychology that is as highly stylized and stereotypic as the accounts of the individual eminent psychologists. Here we touch briefly on four areas: (a) the relationship between "basic" research and the application of scientific knowledge, (b) theory, (c) the "larger" project of psychology, and (d) psychology as a scientific practice.

Basic research/application. The obituary writers almost invariably reproduce the dichotomy — basic knowledge/scientific research versus application of that basic knowledge/practice — as though these were two distinctive, natural categories. Only with extra effort can the gap be bridged and, indeed, some of the deceased are described as working explicitly toward that purpose. For example, Ronald O. Lippitt (1914-1986):

His legacy to social science consists of ....; and other, lesser known work published in hundreds of articles, chapters, and books. All of this work had the same aim as his first study — to better human life through social science. Perhaps Ron's greatest contribution is the example he set by his steadfast dedication to making social science useful. Despite his eventual divorce from academic social science, Ron remained enthusiastic about its potential. He thrived in his role as linchpin between social science and social practice. (Gold, 1988, p. 398)

On the one hand, we have "academic social science" and, on the other hand, "social practice," the application of social science knowledge outside the academy. Although the knowledge created through psychological research is by its very nature about human experience, it is not assumed to be immediately applicable to people's everyday lives. Instead, it requires professionals to translate it into a practical form: Ronald Lippitt was a "linchpin," holding the two together.

Theory. Across the obituaries, the discussion of the place of theory within psychology suggests a certain ambivalence and almost invariably minimizes its importance. For example, Zygmunt A. Piotrowski (1904-1985):

His profound interest in truth made him at times seem a naive realist. Although he wrote many epistemologic articles, he could also say that we only need theories when we lack facts. He was fond of pointing out that the invention of the telescope did far more for astronomy than did theories. (Bricklin & Bricklin, 1987, p. 262)

Thus, according to the obituary writers, Zygmunt Piotrowski privileged observation and defined it as a non-theoretical activity. His realism only seems to be "naive." Besides, despite writing "epistemologic articles," he put facts ahead of theory. Finally, the observable facts made possible by the telescope are constructed not only as important but as distinct from theory. Only in a small number of cases is theory placed in a prominent position within the research process. For example, Charles Spiker (1925-1993):

was a founder of the field of experimental child psychology, and so successful were his efforts that the qualifier experimental is now largely redundant. ... He believed that theory construction is an essential ingredient for scientific progress. His own research was highly focused, programmatic, and theoretical. (Cantor, 1994, p. 812)

Many of the obituaries, however, especially those for the women, are marked by the absence of talk about theory — perhaps theory, like philosophy, is seen as a male endeavour and not always relevant within a scientific psychology.

The larger project of psychology. With some frequency, the famous psychologists are described as having goals that contribute to the common good. For example, Clara Mayo (1931-1981):

Her primary goals, as always, was to understand and alleviate prejudice, sexism, and racism. ... Clara Mayo was committed to intellectual adventure and social justice, and in that she saw no contradiction and no end. (LaFrance, 1989, p. 113)

Here, the common good is particularized as "social justice," a term whose definition is no less negotiable than that of the former. The writer, however, anticipates that some might consider "social justice" and "intellectual" pursuits to be incompatible. Clara Mayo at least saw no contradiction. Unspoken is any reference to objectivity, defined as lack of bias within dominant neo-positivist versions of psychology, a stance that might lead some to criticize a commitment to social justice as a form of bias. However, Clara Mayo's deviation from this standard is implied. She is represented as an exceptional case relative to the ideal conduct for scientists but she was by
no means exceptional among the other distinguished women. Two points can be made here. First, women psychologists historically have faced discrimination in both overt and more subtle forms and thus, from first-hand experience, have learned that the enterprise of science is not entirely value-free. Second, as part of their critique, feminist psychologists have noted that psychological research traditionally was not objective, and have suggested that traditional definitions of objectivity are intrinsically problematic and set a standard for psychological research that is unattainable anyway (see Carolyn Wood Sherif's obituary for a clear illustration of both points; Shaffer & Shields, 1984, p. 176). One example of service to the common good from among the men's obituaries is Theodore Newcomb (1903-1984) whose obituary ends with a quote from his memorial service: "As a social scientist he was committed to a search for the truth, and as a human being, to the pursuit of the good. And in Socratic fashion he identified the good with the true" (Douvan, 1986, p. 1381). Here what is true and what is good are explicitly connected, and it is implied that psychological truths will necessarily be good. Thus, there need be no concern for moral questions, a position that contradicts the one taken up by the author of Clara Mayo's obituary.

**Psychology as scientific practice.** The version of psychology as science that is worked up in the obituaries is very stereotypical. Despite epistemological and methodological crises within the discipline, the feminist movement and other liberation movements, post modernism and other recent developments in psychology most rely on a standardized account of good scientific practice. Good scientific practice includes being "endlessly open to revise his thoughts and his techniques"; "analyzing and synthesizing mammoth amounts of data" (Zygmont A. Piotrowski; 1904-1985; Bricklin & Bricklin, 1987, p. 262); subjecting psychological concepts "to the rigor of operational definition and empirical test" (Robert R. Sears; 1908-1989; Cronbach, Hastorf, Hilgard, & Maccoby, 1990, p. 663); developing "as rigorous a research design as circumstances permitted" (Ronald O. Lippitt; 1914-1986; Gold, 1988, p. 398); "insistence on data in preference to inference" (Starke R. Hathaway; 1903-1984; Dahlstrom, Meehl, & Schofield, 1986, p. 835); the design of "ingenious experiments" (Donald O. Hebb; 1904-1985; Beach, 1987, p. 187); and using "standardized administration, careful recording, and response scoring" in psychological measurement (Marguerite R. Hertz; 1899-1992; Kessler, 1994, p. 1084).

The idea that psychologists can know psychological facts that are somehow objectively true representations of psychological reality is produced in two ways; first, in accounts that talk about data as separable from interpretation and, second, in accounts stating that certain research findings are enduring truths or contribute to progress in moving closer and closer to psychological truth. An example of the first is provided in Floyd Allport's (1890-1978) obituary: "He argued clearly and convincingly that the language of data should not be confused with the language of metaphorical concepts" (Katz, 1979, p. 352). The endurance of research findings either as truths of continuing relevance in and of themselves or as pieces of a puzzle still being worked on is illustrated in the case of Fred S. Keller (1899-1996) who "also wrote or co-authored more than 80 research articles, most of them as fresh today as when they appeared" (McGill, 1997, p. 744). A version of good science as progressively uncovering universally applicable, enduring truth is maintained in these accounts.

Thus, the account of psychology as science offered in virtually all the obituaries was the hegemonic version with which all participants in the psychological enterprise are familiar. Its importance here is as a discourse constraining the possibilities for eminence within psychology.

**Conclusion**

In our analysis of the obituaries of distinguished psychologists, we have argued that the image of the successful psychologist is still predominantly the image of the male scientist. Consequently, successful women psychologists are constructed in this same image. Two discourses resist the easy incorporation of women into the representation of woman psychologist as male scientist — gender discourse which constructs women and men as different biologically, psychologically, and socially, and feminist discourse which challenges the norms of masculinist science and proposes alternative possibilities. The discourse of gender differences is founded on the assumption of two and only two sexes/genders that are essentially different; the specific characterization of those differences vary with time and place. In Western cultures, one dominant version of "woman" includes characteristics such as passive, emotional, and being more interested in relationships than success — qualities that do not match the job description of the scientist who relentlessly pursues the truth through objective methods. Although other versions associated with varying race, social class, and disability have been identified (e.g., Brannon, 1999), none of these equip women with the qualities of the successful professional. Feminist discourse, on the other hand, provides a space for the generation of knowledge through intimate acquaintance with the object of study and thus an alternative to what has historically been considered to be good scientific method (e.g., Belenky et al., 1986). Women who take up this discourse find themselves at best positioned at the
margins of normative science.

Thus, women who wish to succeed as psychologists and aspire to recognition by their peers tread a complicated path. The gender discourse serves to marginalize their contributions by virtue of feminizing and softening the narrative line of their lives. Feminist discourse puts them clearly outside the mainstream—they may be honoured as tokens or curiosities but not as full members of the scientific community. Changing disciplinary practices and the establishment of new norms, or at least the recognition of the value of alternative approaches, might result in women psychologists receiving the same degree of recognition as their male counterparts.

A second line of argument concerns the construction of psychology as scientific practice within the obituaries. Our analysis suggests that the version of science upon which normative psychological practice rests continues to be the neo-positivist version of science which has been the subject of intense debates. Perhaps this model remains dominant because the normative version of the discipline and its practitioners are very successful in ignoring or incorporating controversy. It could also be that in obituaries, where psychology is secondary to the life of the individual under consideration, authors rely on a taken-for-granted rhetoric of psychology that is relatively uncritical. Whatever the case may be, the obituaries' version of psychology contains little evidence of theoretical controversy or alternative practices.

We have argued that obituaries are themselves a rhetorical accomplishment, one which says as much about the culture of those who write and for whom they are written as about the subject of the obituary. We do not mean to suggest that obituaries are only rhetorical accomplishments. Language users, however, cannot step outside the practices of culture lest they are prepared to be misunderstood. And these practices, including those "excavated" through our analysis of the obituaries in the American Psychologist, reveal the inescapably gendered lives of psychologists.
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Résumé

Les notices nécrologiques de psychologues éminents représentent un moment de réflexion où les psychologues écrivent au sujet d'autres psychologues et dépeignent leurs collègues, leurs mentors et leurs amis, qui sont souvent des êtres chers, comme des personnes sexuées ayant apporté des contributions importantes à la discipline. Par conséquent, les nécrologies représentent des textes utiles pour l'étude des prescriptions normatives en matière de sexe et de psychologie. Nous avons réalisé une analyse du discours de 82 nécrologies de femmes et d'hommes qui ont été publiées dans la revue American Psychologist de janvier 1979 à juillet 1997. Nous avons conclu que l'image prépondérante du psychologue accompli demeure l'"homme scientifique" et que l'image dominante de la psychologie à titre de discipline demeure la version positiviste de la science. Par conséquent, les contributions des femmes à la discipline sont marginalisées par rapport à celles des hommes et les controverses épistémologiques et théoriques qui pourraient produire des changements sont aplanies et passées sous silence.
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APPENDIX A

Obituaries Included in the Analysis in Alphabetical Order by Gender

FEMALE DECEASED

Jeanne Block          Marguerite R. Hertz          Lillian Gertrude Portenier
Lorraine Bouthilet    Jane Hildreth            Marilyn K. Rigby
Psyche Castell        Josephine R. Hilgard      Anne Roe
Norma Estelle Cutts   Thelma Hunt              Pauline S. Sears
Helen Bohmer Daly     Maud Merrill James       Georgene H. Seward
Tamara Dembo Daly     Mary Cover Jones          Carolyn Wood Sherif
Barbara Snell Dohrenwend Jean Walker Macfarlane Adrienne J. Smith
Sarah Carolyn Fisher  Karen Machover           June Louin-Tapp
Anna Freud            Clara Mayo               Thelma Gwinn Thurstone
Beatrix Tugendhat Gardner Myrtle B. McGraw      Leona Elizabeth Tyler
Susan Walton Gray     Helen Margulies Mehr     Julia Randall Vane
Marcia Guttenstag     Helen Howard Nowlis       Barbara Strudler Wallston
Florence Halpern      Harriet Easterbrooks O’Shea Juanita Hingst Williams
Edna Heidbreder       Helen Peak

MALE DECEASED

Floyd H. Allport      Joseph McVicker Hunt      Zygmunt A. Piotrowski
Albert Francis Ax     Bernard N. Kalinkowitz    Sidney Leavitt Pressey
Bruno Bettelheim      Fred Simmons Keller      Joseph Banks Rhine
Harold E. Burtt       Otto Klineberg           John W. M. Rothney
Launor Franklin Carter Heinrich Klüver         Robert R. Sears
Richard S. Crutchfield Robert Ward Leeper      Saul B. Sells
Edward E. Cureton     Ronald O. Lippitt        Carroll Leonard Shuttle
Stuart Golann         Perry London             Nathan W. Shock
Harold A. Goolishian  Nathan MacCoby            Charles C. Spiker
Harry Frederick Harlow Donald W. MacKinnon      George Dinsmore Stoddard
Starke Rosecrans Hathaway C. Roger Myers         John Walter Thibaut
Robert J. Havighurst  Theodore M. Newcomb      Philip Ewart Vernon
Donald Olding Hebb    T. Ernest Newland        W. Edgar Vinacke
Karl Florien Heiser   Thomas Marshall Ostrom

APPENDIX B

The “Eminent Scientist” Interpretative Repertoire

leadership

female and male. founder, pioneer, pioneering, leader, (visible) leadership, among the first, pioneering spirit, one of the founders, one of the co-founders, shaper, one of the first

male. remarkable leadership skills, first successful demonstration, among the few, grandfather, important leadership positions, one of the handful, founding father, father figure, founding member, charter member, break ground, central role, primary (major) force, builder, main architect, definer, landmark studies or paper or career, seminal research

female. grandmother, standard setter, intellectual impetus, leading figure, many firsts, one of the originators, leadership positions or roles, accomplished a lot of firsts, cornerstone

innovation

female and male. novel, innovative, innovations, creative, original, ingenuity, imaginative, insightful, insight, innovator, nonconformity, independent

male. distinctive, unique abilities, unique figure, vision, visionary, strong independence of thought, provocative (sometimes), (man) ahead of his time, foresighted
female. intuitive, risk taker, boundary crosser, not constrained by conventional boundaries, woman of vision, create new visions, worked nor thought in linear ways

superior intellect

female and male. critical thinker, acumen, intelligent, analytic intellect, well-informed, knowledgeable, encyclopedic knowledge, gifted, gift(s), scholarly, scholarship, scholar, remarkable scholar, gifted scientist, great scientist

male. outstanding intellect, extraordinary intelligence, considerable intellect, avid scholar

legacy

female and male. legacy, impact (profound and lasting), influenced, influential, influencing, influentially, very influential, widely influential

male. lasting effect, unforgettable, work widely cited, left an enviable intellectual heritage

reputation

female and male. prominent, famous, eminent, distinguished, (great, important, major, outstanding, remarkable, significant, stellar, excellent, well known, many) accomplishments or career accomplishments or contributions or work or achievement, extraordinary, remarkable, important, importance, (spectacularly) successful, respect, respected, esteemed, beloved, loved, admired, admiration, exemplary, (national, leading) expert

male. sophisticated and ingenious (research), research sophistication, great, greatest, noted author, substantial research reputation, lasting reputation, substantive major works, impressive, considerable attainments, important place in history, talents recognized, worldwide respect and recognition, cherished, productive, published consistently, effective, prolific, prodigious, masterful, exceptional, a Hollywood casting director's model Ivy League professor, icon, top-notch, renowned, excelled, strong research and publication record, numerous books or articles or publications, cosmopolitan and persuasive charm, frequently consulted, appreciated, exciting, exceptional, revered, idol

female. strongly felt presence, brilliant, brilliance, authority in, recognized authority

commitment

female and male. dedication, committed, devotion, commitment

male. deep sense of responsibility, tireless passion for research, undaunted, consumed by his work, passionate prose, inner conviction, passion, persistence

female. pushed and persisted, involved, interested, engagement

influence on others

female and male. help, helpful, assist, supported, supportive, encouraged, encouragement, inspired, inspiring, stimulator, stimulating, mentor, role model, service, serve

male. gave of himself personally, made time for everyone, advocate, moved many

female. model for women

energy

female and male. vigorous, vigour, high level of energy, energy

male. active

female. exuberance, dynamo, enormous drive, lived fully, spirit, fighting spirit

"humane" characteristics

female and male. generous, generosity, patient, patience, understanding, affection, concern, caring, gentle, nurtured

male. affection, sensitive to people, soft touch, accepting and empathic, human warmth, personal warmth, inextinguishable optimism, authentic, approachable

female. healing, soothing, friendship, friend, tact/subtle, kindly manner, ability to relate to children, humane, balanced blend of kindness and firmness, humanistic bent, sympathy, compassion,
compassionately involved, tactful toughness, warmth, humility, clinical sensitivity, welcoming, trusted, honesty

"scientist" role

**female and male.** objectivity, empirical, data-based, objective, empirical and quantitative evidence, researcher, research psychologist, truth, fairness

**male.** search for truth and meaning, cautious, empirical scientist, problem solver, open, open to ideas, less interested in studying the child per se than in searching for the basic laws of learning

**female.** scientific, scientific integrity, dedication to truth, scientist, supremacy of evidence, rationality, decisiveness, rigorous, thorough, careful, orderly, organized, mathematical, efficiency, competent, clear thinking

miscellaneous

**female and male.** co-author, collaborator, cooperative ability to collaborate, in collaboration with, unique collaboration, organizer (skilled), directness, direct, articulate, articulate lecture style, long career, long service, instrumental, integrity, high standards, highest standards

**male.** active in civic and community affairs, valued community service, prochoice in every sense, valued egliaritarian principles, isolated, solitary, prone to self-doubt, chronic insecurity, dean of, [but] demanding, high expectations, longevity, (outspoken, impatient) and occasionally combative rhetoric, impatience, ambassador, exacting, opinionated, did not suffer fools easily, brusque manner, facilitating, theoretician, theorist, administrative and interpersonal skills, sometimes made enemies, frank, courage, challenging, challenged, extraordinary or enthusiastic or magnificent or master or legendary teacher, shaped [students], quest, mission

**female.** grace, shared, justice seeker, leader for peace and justice, commitment to peace, social conscience, unpolitical, followed her husband, range of scholarly work, professional woman, professional, feminist, showed her mettle, checkered series of research interests, "velcro quality" research efforts, managed to grow professionally, firm taskmaster, very proud of her contributions, took pride in her contributions, had doubts, therapeutic contributions, modest, psychologist, openness to mentorship of others, exemplified, strict disciplinarian, calm, dignified, catalyst, pride, belief in own brightness and creativity, diligence, reluctant participant in change, skilled and graceful writer, popular teacher, popularity as a teacher, keen interest in students, teacher, capable, skill, full career, classical languages scholar, enriched