Placing Women in the History of Psychology

The First American Women Psychologists

Laurel Furumoto Elizabeth Scarborough

Wellesley College State University of New York College at Fredonia

ABSTRACT: This article presents an account of the first American women psychologists. The article provides data on the origins, education, marital status, and careers of the 22 women who identified themselves as psychologists in the first edition of American Men of Science. Further, it explores how gender shaped their experience in relation to educational and employment opportunities, responsibilities to family, and the marriage versus career dilemma. Illustrations are drawn from the lives of Mary Whiton Calkins, Christine Ladd-Franklin, Margaret Floy Washburn, and Ethel Puffer Howes. Sources used include archival materials (manuscripts, correspondence, and institutional records) as well as published literature. The article calls attention to the necessity of integrating women into the history of the discipline if it is to provide an adequate understanding of psychology's past.

Women psychologists have been largely overlooked in histories of the discipline. This is so despite the early participation and contributions of women to American psychology from its beginnings as a science. Here we offer a preliminary account of the first American women psychologists, describing them and the manner in which gender shaped their experiences.¹

As early as 1960, the history of psychology was identified as a "neglected area" (Watson, 1960). Watson's call for attention was followed by a dramatic surge of interest in historical scholarship (Watson, 1975). In subsequent years, history of psychology has developed as a vigorous specialty field. However, new scholarship has paid scant attention to women in the discipline. To date, work that has been done on women, whether presented in published sources or in delivered papers, has been limited in scope and descriptive rather than interpretive. It consists generally of efforts to identify some prominent women in previous generations and to provide information about their achievements (see Bernstein & Russo, 1974; O'Connell, 1983; O'Connell & Russo, 1980; Russo, 1983; Stevens & Gardner, 1982). Furthermore, the number of women mentioned in even the most recently published history of psychology textbooks is astonishingly small (see Goodman, 1983).

Omission of women from history is not unique to psychology. As Gerda Lerner (1979), an American historian well known for her work in women's history, pointed out, Traditional history has been written and interpreted by men in an androcentric frame of reference; it might quite properly be described as the history of men. The very term "Women's History" calls attention to the fact that something is missing from historical scholarship. (p. xiv)

Beyond calling attention to what is missing from the history of psychology, this article begins to fill the gap by sketching an overview of the lives and experiences of those women who participated in the development of the discipline in the United States around the turn of the century. First, we identify early women psychologists. Second, we describe the women and note some comparisons between them and men psychologists. And last, we discuss women's experiences, focusing on how gender influenced their careers.

Identifying Early Psychologists

In 1906 James McKeen Cattell published the first edition of American Men of Science (Cattell, 1906), a biographical directory containing more than 4,000 entries. This ambitious project provided for the first time a comprehensive listing of all individuals in North America who had "carried on research work in the natural and exact sciences" (p. v). Inclusion in the directory required that a person must have done "work that has contributed to the advancement of pure science" or be "found in the membership lists of certain national societies" (p. v). Cattell himself was a highly visible and influential member of the psychological establishment, centrally involved in founding and controlling the early direction of the American Psychological Association (APA). Not surprisingly then, among the national societies he surveyed was the APA, which in 1906 was 14 years old and had about 175 members.

The authors contributed equally; listing is in alphabetical order. We thank Michael M. Sokal especially for his extensive comments on a draft of the article.

This research was supported in part by grants from the Research Foundation of State University of New York and State College at Fredonia to Elizabeth Scarborough (Goodman) and from the Brachman-Hoffman Small Grant Program of Wellesley College to Laurel Furumoto.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Elizabeth Scarborough, Department of Psychology, State College at Fredonia, Fredonia, New York 14063.

¹ A comprehensive study of the lives, contributions, and experience of early women psychologists will be published by Columbia University Press under the title *Untold Lives: The First Generation of American Women Psychologists*.

Table 1
Characteristics of Women Psychologists Listed in American Men of Science, 1906

Name	Birth year	Subject of research*	Baccalaureate degree	Doctoral degree
Bagley, Mrs. W. C. (Florence Winger)	1874	Fechner's color rings	Nebraska 1895	Cornell 1901 ^c
Calkins, Prof. Mary Whiton	1863	Association of ideas	Smith 1885	Harvard 1895 ^d
Case, Prof. Mary S(ophia)	1854	None given	Michigan 1884	No graduate study
Franklin, Mrs. Christine Ladd	1847	Logic, color vision	Vassar 1869	Hopkins 1882d
Gamble, Prof. E(leanor) A(cheson) McC(ullough)	1868	Smell intensities	Wellesley 1889	Cornell 1898
Gordon, Dr. Kate	1878	Memory and attention	Chicago 1900	Chicago 1903
Gulliver, Pres. Julia H(enrietta)	1856	Dreams, subconscious self	Smith 1879	Smith 1888
Hinman, Dr. Alice H(amlin)	1869	Attention and distraction	Wellesley 1893	Cornell 1897
Martin, Prof. Lillien J(ane)	1851	Psychophysics	Vassar 1880	Gottingen 1898 ^c
McKeag, Prof. Anna J(ane)	1864	Pain sensation	Wilson 1895	Pennsylvania 1900
Moore, Mrs. J. Percy (Kathleen Carter)	1866	Mental development	Pennsylvania 1890°	Pennsylvania 1896
Moore, Prof. Vida F(rank)	1867	Metaphysics	Wesleyan 1893	Cornell 1900
Norsworthy, Dr. Naomi	1877	Abilities of the child	Columbia 1901	Columbia 1904
Parrish, Miss C(elestia) S(usannah)	1853	Cutaneous sensation	Cornell 1896	No graduate study
Puffer, Dr. Ethel D(ench)	1872	Esthetics	Smith 1891	Radcliffe 1902
Shinn, Dr. M(ilicent) W(ashburn)	1858	Development of the child	California 1880	California 1898
Smith, Dr. Margaret K(eiver)	1856	Rhythm and work	Oswego Normal 1883°	Zurich 1900
Smith, Dr. Theodate (Louise)	1860	Muscular memory	Smith 1882	Yale 1896
Squire, Mrs. C(arrie) R(anson)	1869	Rhythm	Hamline 1889	Cornell 1901
Thompson, Dr. Helen B(radford)	1874	Mental traits of sex	Chicago 1897	Chicago 1900
Washburn, Prof. Margaret F(loy)	1871	Space perception of skin	Vassar 1891	Cornell 1894
Williams, Dr. Mabel Clare	1878	Visual illusions	lowa 1899	lowa 1903

Note. Names are given as they appeared in the directory.

Although neither the title nor Cattell's preface suggests it, his directory of "men of science" did, in fact, include some women (see Rossiter, 1974). Among these women scientists, a group of 22 identified themselves as psychologists either by field or by subject of research (see Table 1). Our analysis is based on biographical information on these women, who constituted 12% of the 186 psychologists listed in the directory. It should be noted that omitted from the directory were five women who held APA membership in 1906: Elizabeth Kemper Adams, Margaret S. Prichard, Frances H. Rousmaniere. Eleanor Harris Rowland, and Ellen Bliss Talbot. Conversely, nine women were listed who did not belong to the APA: Bagley, Case, Gulliver, V. F. Moore, Parrish, Shinn, and Squire, plus McKeag and Williams (who joined after 1906). Presumably those who did not belong to the APA were included because they had made research contributions to the field. The group we are considering therefore omits a few women who clearly qualified for inclusion in American Men of Science (AMS) and includes some who never identified themselves with professional psychology. By focusing on the 22, however, we have designated a fairly complete group of early American women

psychologists for whom basic biographical information is available. This makes it possible to analyze certain aspects of their lives and compare them with their male cohort.

These women shared with men psychologists the experience of being pioneers in what Cattell called "the newest of the sciences" (Cattell, 1903a, p. 562). Women participated from the beginning in the evolution of the new discipline. They began joining the national professional association soon after it was formed in 1892 and presented papers at annual meetings. They published regularly in the fledgling journals, contributing original research, reviews, and commentaries. The group included several who were prominent and influential (e.g., Mary Calkins, Christine Ladd-Franklin, Lillien Martin, and Margaret Washburn) and others who were recognized by their peers as notable contributors (e.g., Kate Gordon, Milicent Shinn, and Helen Thompson). Included also, however, were women whose careers were short lived, ending with publication of their graduate research, as was

^a Major topics through 1906. ^b Positions listed in American Men of Science, first and third editions. ^c Doctoral study, no degree granted. ^d Doctoral program completed, no degree granted due to prohibition against women. ^e Program of study less than 4-year course.

² At some point after her marriage, Christine Ladd began identifying herself as Ladd-Franklin. In Table 1 in this article she is listed as Franklin.

Date of Marriage			Professional positions ^b		
	Husband	Children	1906	1921	
1901	William C. Bagley	2 sons, 2 daughters	Unemployed	Not listed	
,	•	Professor, Wellesley	Professor, Wellesley		
		Associate Professor, Wellesley	Not listed		
1882 Fabian Franklin	1 son, 1 daughter	Lecturer, Hopkins	Lecturer, Columbia		
	. •	Associate Professor, Wellesley	Professor, Wellesley		
1943	Ernest C. Moore	0	Associate Professor, Mt. Holyoke	Associate Professor, Carnegie Tech.	
		President, Rockford	Not listed		
1897 Edgar L. Hinman	1 daughter	Lecturer, Nebraska	Lecturer, Nebraska		
	•	Assistant Professor, Stanford	Private practice		
		Associate Professor, Wellesley	Professor, Wellesley		
1892 J. Percy Moore	1 son, 2 daughters	Head, Bardwell School	(deceased 1920)		
		Professor, Elmira	(deceased 1915)		
		Instructor, Columbia Teachers College	(deceased 1916)		
		Teacher, Georgia Normal	(deceased 1918)		
1908 Benjamin A. Howes	1 daughter, 1 son	Instructor, Radcliffe, Wellesley, Simmons	Unemployed		
		Unemployed	Unemployed		
		Director, New Paltz Normal	New Paltz Normal		
		Research Assistant, Clark	(deceased 1914)		
1891	William N. Squire	Unknown	Professor, Montana Normal	Not listed	
1905	Paul G. Woolley	2 daughters	Professor, Mt. Holyoke	Director Cincinnati Schools	
			Associate Professor, Vassar	Professor, Vassar	
1924	T. W. Kemmerer	0	Unemployed	Assistant Professor, Iowa	

true for Florence Winger Bagley and Alice Hamlin Hinman.

Besides being among the first psychologists, these women were also pioneers in another sense. They were in the vanguard of women seeking collegiate and even graduate education in the decades following the Civil War (see Solomon, 1985). The skepticism about women's mental fitness to undertake a rigorous course of studies at the college level had been quickly challenged by their academic successes. However, there were still those who argued against advanced education for women on the grounds that scholarly work would ruin their health or atrophy their reproductive organs, or both (see Walsh, 1977). Women who undertook higher education in the 19th century did so despite the widespread belief that it would make them unfit to fulfill the obligations prescribed by the widely accepted notion of women's sphere: piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity (see Welter, 1966).

The phrase "women's sphere," with its connotation of boundaries that limited a woman's activity, could result in personal anguish for those who challenged it. Kate Gordon (1905), one of the first psychologists, spoke of this in discussing women's education:

The question of woman's education is seductively close to the question of woman's "sphere." I hold it to be almost a transgression even to mention woman's sphere—the word recalls so many painful and impertinent deliveries, so much of futile discussion about it—and yet the willingness to dogmatize about woman in general is so common an infirmity that I am emboldened to err. (p. 789)

To pursue higher education was, for a woman, to risk serious social sanctions; to attempt this in a coeducational situation, which implied competition with men, was commonly considered to be personally disastrous (Thomas, 1908). And yet just this was necessary to gain the graduate training required for entry into the field of psychology.

Description of Early Psychologists

Each scientist listed in AMS had filled out and returned to Cattell a form that requested the following: name, title, and address; field; place and date of birth; education and degrees; current and previous positions held; honorary degrees and other scientific honors; memberships in scientific and learned societies; and chief subjects of research.

Thus, working from the entries alone, it is possible to examine comparative data on pertinent variables.

Women psychologists in 1906 can be described generally as Anglo-Saxon Protestants of privileged middleclass backgrounds. They were similar to men psychologists on most of the variables reported in AMS. Most were born in the Northeastern or Middle-Western United States, though some were Canadians and a few of the men were European born; several were born abroad as children of missionaries. The range of birth years was 1847 to 1878 for women (see Table 1) and 1830 to 1878 for men. The median age of the women in 1906 was 39.5, and the median age for men was 39. The median age at completion of the undergraduate degree for the women was 22.5, for the men 22. In their undergraduate study, the women followed a pattern similar to what Cattell identified for the entire group of psychologists he surveyed in 1903: dispersion across a wide variety of types and locations of undergraduate institutions (Cattell, 1903b). Ten of them had earned their degrees in four women's colleges (Smith, Vassar, Wellesley, and Wilson); the remaining 12 had studied at 11 coeducational institutions, both public and private (see Table 1).

All but two of the women (Case and Parrish) reported graduate work. Approximately one third had traveled to Europe to study at some time, and 18 had completed the requirements for the PhD by 1906 (see Table 1). Cornell University, unusual in that it was founded as a coeducational private institution in 1865, was the most hospitable and accessible graduate site for early women psychologists. Six of the group undertook their advanced study there. Cornell was a noted exception to the norm during this period because it not only admitted women as fully recognized students but also considered them eligible for fellowship support. Indeed, four of the women in this sample held the prestigious Susan Linn Sage Fellowship in Philosophy and Ethics: Washburn in 1893-1894, Hinman in 1895-1896, Gamble in 1896-1897, and Bagley in 1900-1901. The other two women who studied at Cornell received graduate scholarships: V. F. Moore in 1897-1898 and Squire in 1900-1901. (Three other women, omitted from the 1906 AMS, had also received PhDs in psychology from Cornell during this period: Ellen Bliss Talbot and Margaret Everitt Schallenberger were Sage Fellows in 1897-1898 and 1899-1900, respectively, and Stella Sharp held a graduate scholarship in 1897-1898.) For the men psychologists, however, Cornell placed a poor fifth as an institution for advanced study, running behind Clark, Columbia, Leipzig, and Harvard-each of which, however, denied women access to graduate degrees in psychology in the 1890s. The remaining 14 women who reported advanced work were spread across 11 different institutions.

The women were somewhat older than the men by the time they completed their graduate studies, with a median age for the women of 31 compared to 29 for the men. The difference is not great, but given the close similarity to men on the other variables, it merits some attention. The two-year gap was not due to the women's prolonging their advanced degree programs. Once they began graduate study, they generally completed their course in good time. A notable exception is Julia Gulliver, who stated that in the time between her 1879 baccalaureate and 1888 doctorate (both from Smith College) she was "at home studying for my degree, in addition to many other occupations." She explained her reason for undertaking study at home: "It was the best I could do, as I could not afford to go elsewhere" (Gulliver, 1938). Gulliver was exceptional also in that she was the only woman in the group to hold a long-term appointment as a college president.

Seven women (Bagley, Gordon, Hinman, Norsworthy, Thompson, Washburn, and Williams) went directly to graduate study after college. Thirteen, however, reported delays ranging from 5 to 18 years between receiving the baccalaureate and the doctorate. During the hiatus, which averaged 11 years, all but three of the women (Gulliver, Shinn, and Squire) were engaged in teaching—primarily in women's colleges and public schools. Squire, who was married a year after her college graduation and widowed the following year, reported no occupational positions before her doctoral study.

The seven women who progressed without interruption from college to graduate study were a later-born cohort, with birth dates ranging from 1869 to 1878. Several factors may have been important in guiding their academic course and delaying the progress of the older women. Prior to the early 1890s, very few graduate programs in any field were open to women, and none of the institutions granting doctoral degrees in psychology admitted women as degree candidates. Thus, the older women had to wait for access, whereas the younger ones were able to move directly into a few available graduate study programs. Furthermore, the older women were not exposed to psychology as a scientific discipline during their college days. As the "new" psychology gained attention in the 1890s, however, it is possible that they learned of it through their teaching activities and saw advanced study as a way of satisfying their continuing intellectual interests or as a means of career enhancement. For some of the women, financial difficulties delayed their academic pursuits. Several taught before attending college as well as afterward to finance their education.

Despite the similarities they shared in several areas, the professional attainments of the women were diverse. Three patterns may be identified. Two of the 22 (Bagley and Shinn) reported no employment following advanced study. Twelve found a permanent place in higher education—seven held teaching or administrative positions at women's colleges, four at coeducational universities, and one at a normal school—and their careers show advancement through the academic ranks. The remaining eight found employment in a variety of positions, academic and applied, full and part-time. Their career paths were marked by frequent job changes, discontinuities in type of work, gaps in employment records, and little or no evidence of professional advancement. This pattern is associated, not coincidentally we believe, with marital status. Six of the eight women whose careers are characterized by discontinuity and lack of advancement were married. (Nine of the 22 did marry; all of those produced children, except the one who was widowed early and the two who married late in life. See Table 1.)

In considering the relation of gender to professional advancement, a comparison of the women with their male counterparts is relevant. Rates of employment within academia were tabulated for both groups. (Comparison is limited to academic institutions, because employment opportunities for psychologists during this period were restricted almost exclusively to that setting.) Counting each psychologist who was a college or university president or a full, associate, or assistant professor in the 1906 AMS. it was found that whereas 65% of the men occupied one of these ranks, this was true for only 50% of the women. A comparison of the two groups 15 years later, when most of the individuals were in their mid-50s, based on the third edition of AMS (Cattell & Brimhall, 1921), revealed a continuing gap. At that time 68% of the men and 46% of the women held a presidency or professorial rank. (See Table 1 for positions held by women in 1906 and 1921.)

All of the women who attained an academic rank of assistant professor or higher were unmarried. (Squire was a widow, and Thompson, listed in AMS 1906 as professor at Mt. Holyoke, had actually left that position when she married in 1905.) Furthermore, the institutions in which they found employment were predominantly women's colleges; and, finally, all but one of the women who held the position of college president or full professor did so within institutions for women. (Lillien J. Martin, who was listed as professor emeritus in the 1921 AMS, had held the rank of full professor at a coeducational university, Stanford, from 1911 until her retirement at age 65 in 1916.)

Concerning employment, then, there was a definite "women's place" for women psychologists: teaching at undergraduate institutions for women. However, there is no indication that these women were restricted to what has been labeled "women's work," as was the case for women in other sciences (see Rossiter, 1982, Ch. 3). An article assessing the status of American psychology in 1904 noted that the field had become differentiated into a host of subfields including—besides experimental psychology—educational, comparative, and a wide variety of other specialty areas (Miner, 1904). The women were active in virtually all areas. Furthermore, the women's research interests spread across the breadth of the discipline in a pattern not discernibly different from that of the men. (See Table 1 for major research interests of the women through 1906.)

To summarize, the first women psychologists were similar in age and training to their more numerous male colleagues. However, when we evaluate the professional development of these women over a 15-year span, it is clear that they were less likely to achieve professional status equivalent to that of the men. When high professional status was attained, it was held exclusively by unmarried women who were employed for the most part in colleges for women.

Women's Experience

Although the women psychologists as a group fared less well professionally than the men, three did receive stars in the first edition of AMS, placing them among the 1,000 scientists whom Cattell had identified in 1903 as the most meritorious in the country (Cattell, 1903a). They were Mary Whiton Calkins (1863-1930), Christine Ladd-Franklin (1847-1930), and Margaret Floy Washburn (1871-1939), who ranked 12th, 19th, and 42nd among 50 starred psychologists. Three other women among the unstarred psychologists in 1906 received stars in subsequent editions of AMS: Ethel Dench Puffer (Howes), Lillien Jane Martin, and Helen Bradford Thompson (Woolley). Here we focus primarily on the three who were most prominent, showing how gender influenced their lives. As they are the best known women of the period, there are a few secondary sources that provide additional biographical information for them (e.g., Boring, 1971; Furumoto, 1979, 1980; Goodman, 1980; Hurvich, 1971; Onderdonk, 1971).

The first three of psychology's eminent women shared several common experiences and in these ways may be considered prototypes for those who, by entering a male-dominated profession, challenged the cultural stereotype that defined women's sphere. Each encountered institutional discrimination in pursuing the PhD. Each experienced limited employment opportunities. Each had to confront the marriage-versus-career dilemma. And each wrestled with family obligations that conflicted strongly with career advancement.

Ladd-Franklin, Calkins, and Washburn began their graduate studies as "special students" at Johns Hopkins, Harvard, and Columbia, respectively. Their "special" status reflected the female-exclusionary policies of these institutions, policies that were waived only partially for them. Ladd-Franklin was admitted because a prominent Johns Hopkins mathematics professor, having been impressed by professional work she had already published, interceded for her. Calkins secured the privilege of attending seminars at Harvard on a petition from her father. accompanied by a letter from the president of Wellesley College (where she was a faculty member). Though both Ladd-Franklin and Calkins completed all requirements, each was denied the doctorate. Washburn would probably have met the same fate had she remained at Columbia. She was advised, however, to transfer to Cornell, where she was eligible for both a degree and a fellowship. There she studied under E. B. Titchener and in 1894 became the first woman to receive a PhD in psychology. Ladd-Franklin was granted the degree in 1926 (44 years after earning it), when Hopkins celebrated its 50th anniversary. Calkins was offered the PhD under the auspices of Radcliffe College in 1902 for work she completed in 1895, but she declined the dubious honor of that arrangement worked out for women who had studied at Harvard.

Employment for women in psychology was almost totally limited to the women's colleges and normal schools. Thus, Calkins spent her entire career at Wellesley College, and Washburn taught first at Wells College and then at Vassar for 34 years. Exclusion from the research universities, then the centers of professional activity, necessarily limited the women's research activities as well as their interaction with the leading figures in the emerging field of psychology. There were, however, personal advantages for faculty at the women's colleges. Recently completed research on the Wellesley College professoriat provides a richly illustrated portrayal of faculty life that concurs with material we have collected on the women psychologists.

Patricia Palmieri's (1983) study is a collective portrait of the women at Wellesley College who had been on the faculty there for more than five years and held the rank of associate or full professor by 1910. These women came mainly from closeknit New England families notable for the love and support given to their bright daughters. Among that group, described as "strikingly homogeneous in terms of social and geographic origins, upbringing, and socio-cultural worldview" (p. 197), were five of the 22 psychologists, including Mary Calkins.

Palmieri emphasized community as a central theme that "illuminates the history of academe as it was writ by women scholars, outside the research universities so commonly thought to be the only citadels of genuine intellectual creativity" (1983, p. 196). She drew a sharp contrast between the experience of the academic women at Wellesley and that of men at the research universities. She characterized the male academic of the period as an isolated specialist, whereas the female academic lived within a network of relationships:

These academic women did not shift their life-courses away from the communal mentality as did many male professionals; nor did they singlemindedly adhere to scientific rationalism, specialization, social science objectivity, or hierarchical association in which vertical mobility took precedence over sister-hood. (Palmieri, 1983, pp. 209-210)

There were, as Palmieri noted, costs as well as benefits associated with the creation and maintenance of a community such as the one she described. For example, there were tensions surrounding the question of commitment to social activism versus institutional loyalty. In one instance, when a prominent faculty member was terminated by Wellesley College because of her pacifist views during World War I, Mary Calkins felt compelled to offer the trustees her resignation because she herself held the same views; her request, however, was refused (Trustees Minutes, 1919). Finally, to remain a member of the Wellesley community, a woman had to forego marriage and motherhood, for Wellesley, like other institutions of higher education in that era, did not consider it acceptable to include married women on its faculty.

Personal relationships were particularly important for each of psychology's first three eminent women; gender and marital status were crucial in determining how these relationships interacted with career. For Ladd-Franklin, marriage and motherhood precluded professional employment. The accepted view in the late 19th and early

20th century was that, for a man, the potential for professional accomplishment was enhanced by marriage. For a woman, however, marriage and career were incompatible. Thus, an educated woman was faced with what was then termed the "cruel choice." A friend of Ladd-Franklin, with whom she had discussed the marriage-versuscareer dilemma plaguing women, expressed the sentiment of the time:

As human nature stands and with woman's physical organization to consider, . . . she ought to be taught that she cannot serve two masters, that if she chooses the higher path of learning and wants to do herself and her sex justice, she must forego matrimony. (Ridgely, 1897)

Whether or not Ladd-Franklin herself agreed with this verdict, she nevertheless was subject to the strong social sanctions against women's combining of marriage and career. She never held a regular faculty appointment.

For Calkins and Washburn, the "family claim" an unmarried daughter's obligations to her parents—was paramount. Calkins maintained very close ties with her family, living with her mother and father in the family home near Wellesley College for her entire adult life. In 1905 she was offered a unique career opportunity, which she confided to her brother Raymond:

We go on a walk and she tells me of her brilliant offer from Barnard and Columbia, to be Professor of Psychology with graduate classes from both colleges. A very perplexing decision, involving as it would, the breaking up of her Newton home, hard for mother and father. (R. Calkins, 1905)

As Calkins later explained in a letter to her graduate school mentor, Hugo Munsterberg, her reason for refusing to consider the offer hinged on what she perceived to be her family's best interests. She wrote:

The deciding consideration was a practical one. I was unwilling to leave my home, both because I find in it my deepest happiness and because I feel that I add to the happiness of my mother's and father's lives. They would have considered transferring the home to New York, but I became convinced that it would be distinctly hurtful to them to do so. (M. W. Calkins, 1905)

Like Calkins, Washburn was particularly close to her parents and felt a strong sense of responsibility for them. Her situation is another example of how the obligations of a daughter might impede professional advancement. As an only child, Washburn clearly acknowledged the demands that the family claim held for her. In 1913 she wrote to Robert Yerkes, to resign responsibility as review editor for the *Journal of Animal Behavior*:

I doubt if anyone else on the board is teaching eighteen hours a week, as I am. I simply must cut down my work somewhere. If I am ever to accomplish anything in psychology, it must be done in the next five years, for as my parents get older, I shall have less and less command of my time. (Washburn, 1913)

Significantly, the work that she considered her most important contribution was published not long after, as *Movement and Mental Imagery* (Washburn, 1916).

The early women psychologists who remained unmarried and both developed their scholarly careers and lived their lives within the context of the women's colleges shared a common set of experiences. Those who chose to marry, however, as did Ladd-Franklin, constituted another group, whose experiences were similar to each other but different from the unmarried women. None of the married women had regular or permanent academic affiliations. Their career patterns tended to be erratic and without signs of advancement. Even if an individual was able to reconcile the duties and obligations of the domestic and professional roles, her status as a married woman rendered her ineligible for consideration as a candidate for an academic position. Christine Ladd-Franklin, married and without a regular academic appointment, nevertheless managed to continue some scientific work and to earn a star in AMS; most who chose to marry were not as fortunate.

Another one of those who married was Ethel Puffer. We use her experience to illustrate the keenly felt conflict between marriage and career that bedeviled this group. It is worth noting that Puffer and Calkins had several things in common. Besides their Protestant New England heritage, their first-born status in their families, and their undergraduate education at Smith College, they both did their doctoral work in the Harvard Philosophy Department with Hugo Munsterberg as thesis advisor. We suggest that the choice for marriage by Puffer and for career by Calkins contributed to their quite different professional attainments.

After completing her doctoral study in 1898, Puffer held concurrent positions in psychology at Radcliffe and Simmons College in Boston and also taught at Wellesley. Her book *The Psychology of Beauty* was published in 1905. In August 1908 she married an engineer, Benjamin Howes, at which point her career in psychology halted. A letter dated April 29, 1908, from the president of Smith College highlights the negative impact that choosing to marry had on a woman's academic career:

Dear Miss Puffer: If you really are disposed to think seriously of the position at Barnard I am sure it would be well for your friends in Cambridge to recommend you to President Butler, although I fear the rumor which reached me concerning your engagement may have also affected the recommendation which I myself sent, and that a candidate has already been selected to present to the trustees of Columbia at their next commencement. (Seelye, 1908)

A few years after their marriage, Ethel and Benjamin Howes settled in Scarsdale, New York, where in 1915 and 1917 (when Ethel was in her 40s) two children were born: Ellen and Benjamin, Jr. During this decade, she also found time to do organizational work for the suffrage movement and the war effort.

In 1922, Ethel Howes turned 50. World War I was over, the vote was won, and her two children were of school age. In that year, she publicly addressed the inherent contradiction facing women who attempted to combine a career and marriage. Her typed notes for two articles that appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* (Howes, 1922a, 1922b) highlight her own struggle and conflict. In the excerpts presented here, we retain the capital letters

Howes used for emphasis. The notes begin: "The basic inhibition still operating to suppress the powers of women is the persistent vicious alternative—MARRIAGE OR CAREER—full personal life vs. the way of achievement" (Howes, undated). Howes reasoned that even if every woman were granted the right to marry and go on with her job, a major problem remained. It was how to reconcile the demands of a career with those of being a mother, for most women who married would have children. Success in a career demanded concentration, and this meant "long sustained intensive application . . . [and] freedom from irrelevant cares and interruptions" (Howes, undated). Such concentration, she maintained, was precisely what was unavailable to a woman who was a mother.

The incompatibility between having a successful career and being a successful mother led Howes to advise married women "EXPLICITLY TO FOREGO THE CAREER." She regarded aspirations to a full-fledged career as unrealistic and advised married women to "TRANSCEND THE WHOLE NOTION OF A CAREER, WITH ITS CONNOTA-TIONS OF COMPETITION, SUCCESS, REWARDS, HONORS, TITLES" (Howes, undated). In her view, this could be done by contracting the scope or modifying the type of professional work; finding opportunities in "borderline subjects," in a "fringe of special research," or in consulting, criticizing, and reviewing. The accommodation to marriage and parenthood that Howes envisioned as necessary for educated women, then, called for an adjustment of professional activity and goals that men have not, until very recently, even had to consider—much less adopt.

Conclusions

What do we conclude concerning the first American women psychologists and how gender shaped their personal and professional experiences? First, they were similar to American men psychologists on basic demographic variables such as family and geographic origins, age, and social class membership. They were similar to the men in some aspects of their educational experience. They held equivalent degrees but were restricted in the number and types of institutions where both baccalaureate and graduate studies might be undertaken. The women diverged from the men most obviously in the area of career advancement.

Second, these women demonstrated three career patterns: no career beyond the doctorate, continuous careers restricted mainly to teaching in women's colleges and normal schools, and interrupted or disjointed careers with lapses in employment or shifts in employment setting and type of work. Of those women who pursued careers, the unmarried group followed the continuous pattern, whereas the married women displayed the interrupted pattern.

Third, certain gender-specific factors profoundly affected the women's experience: exclusion from important educational and employment opportunities, the responsibility of daughters to their families, and the marriage-versus-career dilemma. These factors are illustrated in

the lives of the women discussed here—Calkins, Washburn, Ladd-Franklin, and Puffer.

Acknowledging the early women's presence and their experience is a first step toward placing women in the history of psychology. Integrating women into that history is necessary if we are to achieve a more complete understanding of psychology's past.

REFERENCES

- Bernstein, M. D., & Russo, N. F. (1974). The history of psychology revisited: Or, up with our foremothers. *American Psychologist*, 29, 130-134.
- Boring, E. G. (1971). Washburn, Margaret Floy. In E. T. James (Ed.), Notable American women, 1607-1950: A biographical dictionary (Vol. 3, pp. 546-548). Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Calkins, M. W. (1905, June 18). Letter to H. Munsterberg. (From the Hugo Munsterberg Papers, Boston Public Library, Boston, MA)
- Calkins, R. (1905, May 28). Entry in log. (From papers held by the Calkins family)
- Cattell, J. M. (1903a). Homo scientificus Americanus: Address of the president of the American Society of Naturalists. Science, 17, 561– 570.
- Cattell, J. M. (1903b). Statistics of American psychologists. American Journal of Psychology, 14, 310–328.
- Cattell, J. M. (Ed.). (1906). American men of science: A biographical directory. New York: Science Press.
- Cattell, J. M., & Brimhall, D. R. (Eds.). (1921). American men of science: A biographical directory (3rd ed.). Garrison, NY: Science Press.
- Furumoto, L. (1979). Mary Whiton Calkins (1863-1930): Fourteenth president of the American Psychological Association. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 346-356.
- Furumoto, L. (1980). Mary Whiton Calkins (1863-1930). Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 55-67.
- Goodman, E. S. (1980). Margaret F. Washburn (1871–1939): First woman Ph.D. in psychology. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 69– 80
- Goodman, E. S. (1983). History's choices [Review of History and systems of psychology and A history of western psychology]. Contemporary Psychology, 28, 667–669.
- Gordon, K. (1905). Wherein should the education of a woman differ from that of a man. School Review, 13, 789-794.
- Gulliver, J. H. (1938, March 1). Letter to E. N. Hill. (From the Smith College Archives, Northampton, MA)
- Howes, E. P. (undated). Notes for "Accepting the universe" and "Continuity for women." (From the Faculty Papers, Smith College Archives, Northampton. MA)
- Howes, E. P. (1922a). Accepting the universe. Atlantic Monthly, 129, 444–453.
- Howes, E. P. (1922b). Continuity for women. Atlantic Monthly, 130, 731-739.
- Hurvich, D. J. (1971). Ladd-Franklin, Christine. In E. T. James, J. W. James, & P. S. Boyer (Eds.), Notable American women, 1607-1950:

- A biographical dictionary (Vol. 2, pp. 354-356). Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Lerner, G. (1979). The majority finds its past: Placing women in history. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Miner, B. G. (1904). The changing attitude of American universities toward psychology. Science, 20, 299-307.
- O'Connell, A. N. (1983). Synthesis: Profiles and patterns of achievement. In A. N. O'Connell & N. F. Russo (Eds.), *Models of achievement: Reflections of eminent women in psychology* (pp. 297–326). New York: Columbia University Press.
- O'Connell, A. N., & Russo, N. F. (Eds.). (1980). Eminent women in psychology: Models of achievement [special issue]. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5(1).
- Onderdonk, V. (1971). Calkins, Mary Whiton. In E. T. James, J. W.
 James, & P. W. Boyer (Eds.), Notable American women, 1607-1950:
 A biographical dictionary (Vol. 1, pp. 278-290). Cambridge, MA:
 Belknap Press.
- Palmieri, P. A. (1983). Here was fellowship: A social portrait of academic women at Wellesley College, 1895–1920. History of Education Quarterly, 23, 195–214.
- Puffer, E. D. (1905). The psychology of beauty. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Ridgely, H. W. (1897, February 15). Letter to Mrs. Franklin. (From the Franklin Papers, Columbia University Library, New York, NY)
- Rossiter, M. W. (1974). Women scientists in America before 1920. American Scientist, 62, 312-323.
- Rossiter, M. W. (1982). Women scientists in America: Struggles and strategies to 1940. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Russo, N. F. (1983). Psychology's foremothers: Their achievements in context. In A. N. O'Connell & N. F. Russo (Eds.), Models of achievement: Reflections of eminent women in psychology (pp. 9-24). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Seelye, L. C. (1908, April 29). Letter to Ethel D. Puffer. (From the Morgan-Howes Papers, Schlesinger Library, Cambridge, MA)
- Solomon, B. M. (1985). In the company of educated women. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Stevens, G., & Gardner, S. (1982). The women of psychology. (Vols. 1-2). Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.
- Thomas, M. C. (1908). Present tendencies in women's college and university education. Educational Review, 35, 64–85.
- Trustees minutes. (1919, May 9). Minutes of the Trustees meeting. (From the Wellesley College Archives, Wellesley, MA)
- Walsh, M. R. (1977). Doctors wanted: No women need apply. New Haven, CT. Yale University Press.
- Washburn, M. F. (1913, October 24). Letter to R. M. Yerkes. (From R. M. Yerkes papers, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, Hartford, CT)
- Washburn, M. F. (1916). Movement and mental imagery: Outlines of a motor theory of the complexer mental processes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Watson, R. I., Sr. (1960). The history of psychology: A neglected area. American Psychologist, 15, 251-255.
- Watson, R. I., Sr. (1975). The history of psychology as a specialty: A personal view of its first fifteen years. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 11, 5-14.
- Welter, B. (1966). The cult of true womanhood, 1820–1860. American Quarterly, 18, 151–174.