

Published as Hegarty, P. (2011). Getting Miles away from Terman: Did the CRPS fund Catharine Cox Miles UnSilenced Psychology of Sex? *History of Psychology*.

### Abstract

Psychologist Catharine Cox Miles (1890-1984) is often remembered as the junior author, with Lewis Terman, of *Sex and Personality*. Written with CRPS support, *Sex and Personality* introduced the 'masculinity-femininity' personality measure to psychology in 1936. Miles has been overlooked by some historians and constructed as a silent, indirect feminist by others. Private letters show that Terman and Miles had different assumptions about the need for library research work to precede the empirical work for *Sex and Personality*. Miles 1935 chapter on "the Social Psychology of Sex" shows that her theoretical formulation of sex differed from Terman's in its emphasis on female embodiment, tolerance of sexual variability, respect for the emerging tradition of the sex survey, and its opinions about the determinants of marital happiness, and the variability of intelligence. Ironically, CRPS monies vired to Terman may have funded Miles' to develop this early formulation of the psychology of sex.

### Keywords

Catharine Cox Miles, Lewis M. Terman, Committee for Research on Sex Variants, Gender, Sexology

### Author Note

Many thanks Boyka Bratanova, Ilka Gleibs, Rob Nash, Mike Petit, Alexandra Rutherford, and Wade Pickren gave useful comments on earlier versions of this paper. Please direct correspondence to Peter Hegarty, Department of Psychology, University of Surrey, Guildford, GU2 7XH, UK, p.hegarty@surrey.ac.uk

As noted in the introduction to this special feature, the psychologist Lewis Terman figures uniquely in the history of the relationship between the Committee for Research on the Problems of Sex (CRPS) and American psychology. Jennifer Terry describes Terman and Miles' 1936 volume *Sex and Personality*, and the 'Masculinity-Femininity' personality test that it introduced, as pivotal to a distinctly 1930s view of the sexes as fluid.<sup>1</sup> *Sex and Personality* was one of two book-length contributions to the psychology of sex that Terman wrote in the 1930s with CRPS support, the other being a volume on marital happiness.<sup>2</sup> Later second-wave feminist critics identified *Sex and Personality* as a highly problematic text because it reified related assumptions that 'masculinity' and 'femininity' were opposites, that homosexuality was characterized by gender inversion, and that conformity to (heterosexual) gender norms was a marker of psychological adjustment.<sup>3</sup> While some 21<sup>st</sup> century psychologists continue to understand gender and personalities within this tradition, *Sex and Personality* has also recently figured heavily in critical histories of the intersection of American psychology and American sexology.<sup>4</sup> This short paper will focus on the junior

---

<sup>1</sup> Jennifer Terry. *An American Obsession: Science, Medicine and Homosexuality in Modern Society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1999. 20-21.

<sup>2</sup> Lewis M. Terman. *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.

<sup>3</sup> Anne Constantinople. "Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum?" *Psychological Bulletin* 80.5 (1973): 389-407; Miriam Lewin. "Psychology Measures Femininity and Masculinity, 2: From 13 Gay Men to the Instrumental-Expressive Distinction." *In the Shadow of the Past: Psychology Portrays the Sexes: A Social and Intellectual History*. Ed. Miriam Lewin. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984. 179-204.

<sup>4</sup> Peter Hegarty. "From Genius Inverts to Gendered Intelligence: Lewis Terman and the Power of the Norm." *History of Psychology* 10.2 (2007): 132-155; Henry L. Minton. *Departing from Deviance: A History of Homosexual Rights and Emancipatory Science in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002; Theo G. M. Sandfort "Sexual Orientation and Gender: Stereotypes and Beyond." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 34.6 (2005) 595-611. Terry, *op. cit.*

author in this collaboration; Catharine Cox Miles.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, while 'Terman and Miles' are often discussed in the same breath, I want to suggest that the CRPS monies vired to Terman may have funded Miles' *resistance* to his psychology of sex, first in person and later in print.

Like many women psychologists of the 'second generation' of American psychology, the details of Catharine Cox Miles' life could be better known.<sup>6</sup> Catharine Cox was born to Charles Ellwood Cox and Lydia Shipley Bean Cox on May 20<sup>th</sup>, 1890 in San Jose California. She was educated at Washburn School in San Jose from 1896-1907, and Stanford University from 1907-1912, receiving a BA in German in 1912 and an MA in 1913. She studied at Berkeley in 1912, at the University of Jena from 1913-1914, and at Berlin University in 1914. Cox was an assistant in physical education at Stanford from 1912-1913, and an instructor at the College of the Pacific from 1918-1920, where she was also Assistant Professor of German Languages and Literature. One of her precocious accomplishments is little known in the history of psychology. In 1919, Herbert Hoover, then Head of the American Relief Administration, invited a Quaker volunteer group, the American Friends Service Committee, to carry out relief work distributing food to war torn Central Europe. As part of this group, Catharine Cox served as District Director to the American Relief Administration for North-East Germany during 1920, earning medals for her work distributing milk to starving children and infants in Berlin.<sup>7</sup>

Cox returned to Stanford in 1920 and completed a PhD in 1923 under Terman's supervision. Her dissertation was published as the second of Terman's *Genetic Studies of Genius* book series; the only volume that was not an empirical report on the Stanford cohort of gifted children.<sup>8</sup> That dissertation exemplified the Galtonian use of historical documents to estimate the eminence and intelligence of dead people, and Cox named such research 'historiometrics.'<sup>9</sup> Using sources available in the Stanford library, she estimated the childhood IQ scores of 301 historical figures. Introducing her volume, Terman described her as ideally qualified to do this research 'by psychological training, scientific aptitude, natural interests, and command of foreign languages.'<sup>10</sup> Evaluations of Cox' historiometrics tend to be consistent with opinions about Terman's own theory of genius, giftedness and intelligence. Dean Simonton - himself a historiometrician - has described Cox' work as pioneering.<sup>11</sup> Hamilton Cravens' argued that Cox project would have been compromised by

---

<sup>5</sup> Consistent with her own usage, I refer to 'Catharine Morris Cox' for the period prior to marriage to Walter Miles in 1927, and 'Catharine Cox Miles' the period thereafter.

<sup>6</sup> For biographical details I have followed Robert R. Sears. "Catharine Cox Miles: 1890-1984." *American Journal of Psychology* 99.3 (1986) 431-433; Anna Miles Jones. Letter to Chairman of the Department of Psychology, Stanford University, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 1984. Folder 11, Box M 1199.26. Archives of the History of American Psychology. The Centre for the History of Psychology - University of Akron. See also the entry on Catharine Cox Miles on the feminist voices website. [www.feministvoices.com/catharine-cox-miles/](http://www.feministvoices.com/catharine-cox-miles/)

<sup>7</sup> "A birthright member of the Society of Friends (Quakers), she was deeply distressed by the starvation and suffering among German children that came as an aftermath of World War I, and she joined the American Friends Service Committee in its relief efforts. Herbert Hoover's Committee (Formerly for the Relief of Belgium) provided food, and for many months Catharine Cox and her associates distributed it in Berlin." Sears, "Catharine Cox Miles," *op. cit.* 431. See also the autobiographical account Catharine Morris Cox "Spirit of the mission" *The Friend, Sixth Month*, 30 (1921) 630-633.

<sup>8</sup> Catharine Morris Cox. *Genetic Studies of Genius: The Early Mental Traits of Three Hundred Geniuses* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (1926).

<sup>9</sup> For contrasting evaluations of 'historiometrics' see Benoit Godin "From Eugenics to Scientometrics: Galton, Cattell and Men of Science." *Social Studies of Science* 37.5 (2007) 691-728; Dean Simonton "The 'Other IQ': Historiometric assessments of intelligence and related constructs." *Review of General Psychology*, 13.4 (2009) 315-326.

<sup>10</sup> Cox, *Genetic Studies*, *op. cit. vi.*

<sup>11</sup> Dean Keith Simonton. 'Qualitative and Quantitative Analyses of Historical Data.' *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 617-640.

the poverty of the holdings then available in the Stanford library.<sup>12</sup> In *The Mismeasure of Man*, Stephen Jay Gould noted Cox' limited success in getting psychologists to agree to estimates of the childhood IQ scores of the historical figures she had researched, and Cox' own caution in attributing IQ scores retrospectively on the basis of library sources.<sup>13</sup> Stronger critics of Terman's giftedness project have been less kind. Joel Shurkin described Cox' work as "one of the silliest experiments in the colorful history of social science."<sup>14</sup>

While historians of intelligence tend to treat Miles' work as an extension of Terman's, feminist histories offer different narrative possibilities. Miriam Lewin's critique of masculinity-femininity measures departs from *Sex and Personality*, but concludes with the opinion of Miles' daughter - Anna Miles Jones - that her mother's views were much closer to those of the androgyny feminists of the 1970s than could be gleaned from her writings.<sup>15</sup> Robert Sears' obituary similarly described Miles as part of a 'band of post World War I women. . . who were the models for many of today's professional psychologists.'<sup>16</sup> Morawski and Agronick conjectured whether Miles "may have been adopting strategies of silence and indirect action" to express feminist views.<sup>17</sup> Our understanding of Miles' place in the psychology of sex has most recently been developed by Reis' discussion of Miles' case history of an intersex patient.<sup>18</sup> In other words, several authors have suggested that Miles might have been more a more original noteworthy theorist of gender than her association with Terman tends to suggest.

By attending to Miles, I hope also to responds to Johnson and Johnston's call to get beyond "expectations of a 'familiar feminism' and a focus on oppression" in histories of women American psychologists of Miles' generation."<sup>19</sup> On at least three counts, those of us who have been influenced by familiar second wave feminism have failed to remember Miles with fidelity. First, Miles' chapter on 'The Social Psychology of Sex' in Murchison's *Handbook of Social Psychology* has been overlooked. When Agnes O' Connell and Nancy Felipe Russo introduced the 1991 special issue of *Psychology of Women Quarterly* on the history of women psychologists, they celebrated the fact that the 1985 *Handbook of Social Psychology* had contained a chapter on gender, erasing the memory of Miles' chapter written fifty years earlier.<sup>20</sup> Miles private life has also been poorly remembered. Johnston and Johnson expressed confusion about the number of children that Catharine Cox Miles mothered.<sup>21</sup> After her marriage to Walter, Catharine began to describe his three teenage children - Thomas, Caretta and Kirk - as her own. Catharine and Walter Miles had two other children together, Anna Mary and Charles Elwood, but Charles Elwood died at birth. Year later,

---

<sup>12</sup> Hamilton Cravens. "A Scientific Project Locked in Time: The Terman Genetic Studies of Genius, 1920s-1950s." *American Psychologist* 47:2 (1992) 183-189.

<sup>13</sup> Stephen Jay Gould. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co. (1981). 168

<sup>14</sup> Joel N. Shurkin *Terman's Kids: The Groundbreaking Study of How the Gifted Grow Up*. Boston, MA: Little Brown & Co. 1992. 68.

<sup>15</sup> See Miriam Lewin "Psychology Measures," *op. cit.*

<sup>16</sup> Sears, *Catharine Cox Miles, op. cit.* 432.

<sup>17</sup> Jill G. Morawski & Gail Agronick. "A Restive Legacy: The History of Feminist Work in Experimental and Cognitive Psychology." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15.4 (1991) 567-579. Quote appears on 571.

<sup>18</sup> See Catharine Cox Miles, "Psychological Study of a Young Adult Male Pseudohermaphrodite Reared as a Female' *Studies in Personality, Contributed in Honor of Lewis M. Terman*, ed. Quinn McNemar and Maud Merrill. New York: McGraw Hill. 1942; Elizabeth Reis. *Bodies in Doubt: An American History of Intersex*. Baltimore, MD: University of Chicago Press. 2009.

<sup>19</sup> Ann Johnson & Elizabeth Johnston 'Unfamiliar Feminisms: Revisiting the National Council of Women Psychologists.' *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34:2 (2010) 311-327. Quote appears on 312.

<sup>20</sup> Agnes N. O'Connell and Nancy Felipe Russo. "Women's Heritage in Psychology." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 15.4 (1991) 495-504.

<sup>21</sup> Elizabeth Johnston and Ann Johnson. 'Searching for the Second Generation of American Women Psychologists.' *History of Psychology* 11:1 (2008) 40-72.

Catharine's daughter Anna recalled to Robert Sears that her mother was "much affected by this unhappy event."<sup>22</sup> However, the miscarriage has been often overlooked; Neal Miller's obituary of Walter Miles mentions that Walter and Catharine had only one child.<sup>23</sup> Finally, we historians have even forgotten to reproduce the sign of her name faithfully. We have often spelled it as *Catherine*, rather than *Catharine*, a careless error that annoyed Miles during her own lifetime.<sup>24</sup>

### *The Story of Miles and Terman*

Like many women psychologists in the 'second generation, Miles became a clinician rather than an academic upon completing her PhD. She worked as Director of the California State Bureau of Juvenile Research at Whittier, CA from 1923 to 1925, and as a Psychologist at the Central Mental Hygiene Clinic, Cincinnati OH from 1925-1927. As Johnson and Johnston note, Lewis Terman encouraged the careers of several bright female students and research assistants, including Miles.<sup>25</sup> In 1922, Terman first had the idea to study 'masculinity' among his cohort of gifted children,<sup>26</sup> in part because of a persistent fear that the difference that gifted boys embodied could be interpreted as effeminacy.<sup>27</sup> Brokering his previous collaboration and ongoing friendship with CRPS chairman Robert Yerkes, Terman secured grants from the National Research Council's Committee for Research on Problems of Sex in 1925 and 1926 for \$1,500 and \$2,900 respectively for the "Development of Tests of Masculinity-Femininity Traits in the Non-Intellectual Aspects of Mentality." He was granted \$21,000 between 1927 and 1933 for the study of "sex differences in non-intellectual mental traits."<sup>28</sup> In March 1927, Terman wrote to Catharine Cox that "my masculinity-femininity study is getting to be about the most interesting thing I have ever tackled. I wish you were here to work with me on the thing."<sup>29</sup> As a reminder of the limited opportunities experienced by women psychologists, Terman added that he had recommended Cox for a faculty position at Minnesota "but I suppose there is the old question whether a woman will be given a fair chance at it."

In April, Terman wrote to Cox that the anticipated 'three big volumes on the order of Genetic Studies of Genius' and 'Volume 1 would probably summarize the literature, both scientific and general.'<sup>30</sup> However, one month earlier, Terman had proposed to the CRPS that the research assistant's time would be spent extending the Masculinity-Femininity test, and checking its constancy and the influence of age on MF scores. The "qualitative analysis of sex differences" and "summary of literature" were here described as "postponable, if necessary."<sup>31</sup> Cox may have come to Stanford expecting to spend more time in the library,

---

<sup>22</sup> Anna Miles Jones. Letter to Chairman, *op. cit.*

<sup>23</sup> Neal E. Miller, "Obituary: Walter R. Miles (1885-1978)," *American Psychologist*, 35:6 (1980) 595-596.

<sup>24</sup> Rather than list examples, let me simply admit to making this unthinking mistake myself. Peter Hegarty. "More Feminine than 999 Men out of 1,000:' The Construction of Sex Roles in Psychology.' *Gender nonconformity, race and sexuality: Charting the connections*, ed. Toni Lester. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press. (2003). 62-83. On Catharine Cox Miles annoyance about the misspelling see Anna Jones. Letter to Chairman, *op. cit.*

<sup>25</sup> Johnston and Johnson, "Searching," *op. cit.*

<sup>26</sup> Terman & Miles, *Sex and Personality*, *op. cit.* 11.

<sup>27</sup> Peter Hegarty. 'From Genius Inverts,' *op. cit.*

<sup>28</sup> Sophie D. Aberle & Corner, G. W. *Twenty Five Years of Sex Research: History of the National Research Council Committee for Research in Problems of Sex 1922-1947*. Philadelphia, PA: W.B. Saunders Company (1953). 129.

<sup>29</sup> Lewis Terman. Letter to Catharine Cox, March 2, 1927. Lewis Terman papers (SC 038) Stanford University Archives.

<sup>30</sup> Lewis M. Terman. Letter to Catharine Cox, April 19, 1927. Lewis Terman papers (SC 038) Stanford University Archives.

<sup>31</sup> Lewis M. Terman. Letter to Earl Zinn, March 26, 1927. Lewis Terman papers (SC 038) Stanford University Archives.

but Terman had brokered her time toward the achievement of other ends. Cox returned to Stanford and held a position as Terman's Research Associate from 1927 until 1932 on an initial salary of \$3,600 per annum, funded by the CRPS.<sup>32</sup> Two part-time research assistants – E. Lowell Kelly and Quin McNemar worked under her direction. Catharine married Walter in a Quaker ceremony near the Stanford campus within weeks of arriving to take up her appointment, and the couple remained at Stanford until they left for Yale in 1930.

During the period 1927-1930, much of the empirical work reported in *Sex and Personality* was completed, including Kelly's studies of 'passive male homosexuals' which occupied so much of the ultimate volume. However, the *writing* of the volume lagged behind schedule. Terman wrote to Yerkes in May 1931 to apologize for the delay and to promise to finish the book - with Miles' help – but unaided by further CRPS grants.<sup>33</sup> The Progress Report submitted to the CRPS for the year 1932-33 describes Miles "analyzing test results for many groups of subjects so as to show the relative influence of various factors in the scores obtained."<sup>34</sup> By 1935, *Sex and Personality* remained unfinished, and Terman wrote to Yerkes again, to explain the delay. An earlier telegram from Terman to Yerkes had mentioned 'joint author difficulties,'<sup>35</sup> which Terman unpacked in this letter. According to Terman's letter, the researchers had attempted to tackle too much at once, so that "many sections of the book were completed, but many others were left half done." The problem had been a result of giving Miles too much responsibility early on and "when I attempted to tighten the reigns during the last year or two that she was here, the results were anything but pleasant."<sup>36</sup> Terman alluded to "numerous disagreements," "misunderstandings" and meetings with Miles that "were mostly futile and always left her, and sometimes myself also, very upset emotionally."<sup>37</sup> The matter between them appeared to hinge on the different emphases they placed on theoretical versus empirical work in elucidating the meaning of the 'masculinity-femininity' construct:

As much as two or three years ago she had planned the first draft of a section of the work large enough to make a volume of 300 to 400 pages. It was my best judgment that the material treated did not warrant more than 75 to 100 pages and that her time for a year or more had been spent ill-advisedly.<sup>38</sup>

In other words, it appears that while Miles' scholarship and her background as a Germanist had equipped her to work effectively as Terman's historiometrician, those same skills lead her to different conclusions from Terman as to how to best research the psychology of sex.

Miles training as a Germanist may have informed her skepticism about some of *Sex and Personality's* conclusions; she highlighted concerns about Kelly's understanding of the German literature on homosexuality to Terman shortly after she left Stanford for Yale.<sup>39</sup> Approximately one-third of *Sex and Personality* was devoted to studies of 'passive male homosexuals,' that Kelly had recruited. These 'passive male homosexuals' are the most

---

<sup>32</sup> Robert Swain to Catharine Cox, September 2, 1927. Folder 11, Box M 1147. Archives of the History of American Psychology. The Centre for the History of Psychology - University of Akron.

<sup>33</sup> Lewis M. Terman. Letter to Robert Mearns Yerkes, May 13, 1931. Lewis Terman papers (SC 038) Stanford University Archives..

<sup>34</sup> Lewis M. Terman. Report to the CRPS. July 20, 1933. Lewis Terman papers (SC 038) Stanford University Archives.

<sup>35</sup> Telegram from Lewis M. Terman to Robert M. Yerkes, January 25<sup>th</sup>, 1935. Lewis Terman papers (SC 038) Stanford University Archives.

<sup>36</sup> Lewis M. Terman. Letter to Robert M. Yerkes, Feb 5<sup>th</sup>, 1935. Lewis Terman papers (SC 038) Stanford University Archives.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> Catharine Cox Miles. Letter to Lewis M. Terman. December 12, 1930. Folder 11, Box M1171. Archives of the History of American Psychology. The Centre for the History of Psychology - University of Akron.

obvious embodiment of the 'fluidity' of gender among people with the same biological sex in the book.<sup>40</sup> Kelly, Terman, and McNemar went to considerable trouble to re-weight the items on the questionnaire so that they distinguished not males from females, but heterosexual men from homosexual men. Terman had also attempted, in vain, to generate a sample of lesbians for the book, but *Sex and Personality* also contains a short study comparing "Homosexual women vs. women of high-school and college education," clearly attributed to Miles' authorship.<sup>41</sup> While lesbian and gay researcher' contributions were routinely erased in sexology at this time,<sup>42</sup> Miles acknowledged Jan Gay by name, the lesbian researcher who had secured the cooperation of the women described in this short study.

In other words, the writing of *Sex and Personality* was more marked by tensions and disagreements than previous accounts of it have recognized. However, in addition to that text and the private letters exchanged between its authors, there is further evidence that Miles' thinking on the psychology of sex became distinct from her male collaborators on this project. Historians of social psychology are in the habit of reading successive handbooks of social psychology as evidence for shifts in the objects of knowledge that make up the field; O' Connell and Russo's enthusiasm about the inclusion of a chapter on gender in the 1985 handbook is a case in point.<sup>43</sup> Robert Farr has described Murchison's 1935 *Handbook of Social Psychology* as part of the disavowed pre-scientific past of social psychology. But Farr wrote little about the *Handbook's* longest chapter on 'The Social Psychology of Sex' authored by Catharine Cox Miles, beyond the fact that it centred on test scores and that Miles had been Terman's student.<sup>44</sup> In contrast, an awareness of the tensions between Miles and Terman suggest a reading of 'The Social Psychology of Sex' for the differences between Miles' views and those of the men she left behind in Stanford.

Four points of difference stand out. First, the chapter emphasized female embodiment. Miles describes the distinction between sexual and asexual reproduction, genes, hormones, and the biology of menstruation, conception, and birth. Consistent with her own background in physical education, her review of empirical sex differences attends to physical education as much as to mental abilities. Miles brought Clelia Mosher's work to the attention of a wider audience, particularly noting Mosher's findings that exercise 'may largely reduce if not eliminate menstrual discomfort and disability.'<sup>45</sup> Miles described childbirth as an "important activity...probably as important psychologically and socially as it is biologically." She noted that it was customary for women to have four weeks of leave after birth but that "lactation and nursing care continue ... for weeks or months afterward." While Miles described these activities as "thoroughly enjoyable," "obviously the routine involved is not readily compatible with other routines, especially the industrial."<sup>46</sup> Rather than essentialize female embodiment as the explanation for economic inequality, Miles located the double-binds that women experienced in society. "There is no biological tragedy of woman... but because society does not willingly permit women to be both workers and mothers there is a sociological

---

<sup>40</sup> For discussion of the construction of sexuality in *Sex and Personality*, see Hegarty, "From inverted geniuses," *op. cit.*, Minton *Departing, op. cit.* Terry *An American Obsession, op. cit.*

<sup>41</sup> Terman and Miles, *Sex and Personality*, 577-579.

<sup>42</sup> Minton *Departing, op. cit.*

<sup>43</sup> See particularly Frances Cherry *The 'Stubborn Particulars' of Social Psychology: Essays on the Research Process*. London: Routledge, 1995; Ian Lubek and Erika Apfelbaum "A critical gaze and wistful glance at *Handbook* histories of social psychology: Did the successive accounts by Gordon Allport and successors historiographically succeed?" *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 36:4 (2000) 405-428; Peter Hegarty. "Getting Dirty: Psychology's History of Power." *History of Psychology* 10.2 (2007): 75-91.

<sup>44</sup> Robert Farr, *The Roots of Modern Social Psychology*. London: Blackwell, 1996. 87-96.

<sup>45</sup> Catharine Cox Miles "Sex in Social Psychology," *A Handbook of Social Psychology* ed. Carl Murchison Worcester, MA: Clark University Press, 1935. 683-797. Quote appears on 697.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.* 699.

one."<sup>47</sup> In contrast to Miles account of female embodiment, Johnson and Terman's review of the sex differences literature, published four years later, continued to describe female bodies as essentially unbalanced. Johnson and Terman did not mention Miles chapter in their review, but concluded instead that the 'endocrine balance' and 'mental homeostasis' were unstable in women and that 'violent' feminism had obfuscated the rational study of sex differences in psychology.<sup>48</sup>

Second, consistent with her fears about Kelly's misunderstanding of the German sexology literature, Miles' chapter was appreciative of the emerging tradition of the 'sex survey.' In addition to Mosher's work, she cited studies published in the previous two decades by American researchers such as Exner, Hamilton, Davis, and Dickinson and Beam.<sup>49</sup> During the 1920s, the CRPS were reluctant to fund research on human sexual behavior, but Miles cited work that had been denied official CRPS funding, including Hamilton's book on marital happiness.<sup>50</sup> Miles was particularly enamored of "the great study by [Katharine Bement] Davis (1929)" in which 2, 200 women had been surveyed about their sex lives. demonstrating "the presence in normal women of many of the forms of sex experience and practice that had previously been thought characteristic only of men and of abnormal women," including extra-marital heterosexuality, homosexuality, and auto-eroticism.<sup>51</sup> By referencing Davis work positively, Miles allowed for natural sexual variation without invoking the psychologist's habitual urge to abnormalize it, a point that Kinsey would develop further, much to Terman's great annoyance.<sup>52</sup>

Miles' views on sex can be differentiated from Terman's not only with regard to their tolerance of forms of sexuality other than the marital heterosexual ideal, but also with regard to their psychology of marital happiness itself. Miles assistant, E. Lowell Kelly had been unhappily married in the late 1920s. He interpreted the literature available to him at that time as arguing that women's sexual satisfaction was the sine qua non of marital happiness, and that a women's sexual satisfaction was very much her husband's responsibility.<sup>53</sup> Kelly thought instead that personality compatibility was more important than good sex to a happy marriage, and he and Terman began to discuss research on marital happiness after Kelly completed his PhD in 1930 under Walter Miles' supervision. Terman received \$8,500, and Kelly \$11,500, from the CRPS to respectively pursue cross-sectional and longitudinal research on marital happiness.<sup>54</sup> The most developed return on this investment was

---

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.* 696.

<sup>48</sup> W.B. Johnson & Lewis M. Terman. "Some Highlights in the Literature of Psychological Sex Differences published since 1920." *The Journal of Psychology*, 9, 327-336.

<sup>49</sup> For a history of the sex survey genre see Julia A. Ericksen. *Kiss and Tell: Surveying Sex in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

<sup>50</sup> George V. Hamilton. *A Research in Marriage*. New York: Albert and Charles Boni, Inc, 1929. The CRPS did not fund Hamilton's research on marriage officially, but arranged for its sponsorship by the Bureau of Social Hygiene. See Adele E. Clarke, *Disciplining Reproduction: Modernity, American Life Sciences, and the Problems of Sex* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

<sup>51</sup> Miles "Sex" *op. cit.* 757. Katherine Davis *Factors in the Sex Lives of Twenty-Two Hundred Women*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1929

<sup>52</sup> Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy and Clyde E. Martin. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders and Company, 1948; Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, and Paul Gephart. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders and Company, 1953. For Terman's negative appraisal of Kinsey's research see Lewis M. Terman. "Kinsey's 'Sexual Behavior in the Human Male': Some comments and criticisms." *Psychological Bulletin* 45:5 (1948) 443-459.

<sup>53</sup> E. Lowell Kelly. Letter to May Seagoe, September 22, 1967. Archives of the History of American Psychology. The Centre for the History of Psychology - University of Akron. On the emphasis on sexual pleasure in the marital advice literature of the 1920s see Jessamyn Neuhaus "The Importance of Being Orgasmic: Sexuality, Gender and Marital Sex Manuals in the United States, 1920-1963." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 9.4 (2000): 447-73.

<sup>54</sup> Aberle and Corner, *Twenty five years*, *op. cit.*

Terman's 1938 book *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness*.<sup>55</sup> Therein, Terman persistently argued against the idea that husbands should endeavour to pleasure their wives, describing good married sex as 'a lily that has already been sufficiently gilded.' Terman further described married women who did not experience regular orgasms as 'inadequates' with a 'lack of zest, vigor or colorfulness of personality.'<sup>56</sup> Those theoretical conclusions, which tended to locate the causes of disappointing marital sex in women's bodies, were very underdetermined by Terman's correlational data.<sup>57</sup> In her 1935 chapter, Miles gave equal weight to intellectual, social, and physical adjustment as determinants of marital happiness. She emphasized the importance of all three factors to both partners, allowed that deficits in any one of these areas could be compensated in the other two, while concluding that "[i]n general, the essential compatibility is built of all three."<sup>58</sup>

Fourth and finally, Miles thinking on sex difference in intelligence had moved miles away from the position developed at Stanford after her departure. Stephanie Shields has described the 'variability hypothesis' that men's intellectual abilities are more 'variable' than women's; a hypothesis that divided early 20<sup>th</sup> century American psychologists of the intellect roughly along gendered lines,<sup>59</sup> and which was revived in 1936 by McNemar and Terman.<sup>60</sup> A year earlier, Miles described Helen Thompson Woolley and Leta Stetter Hollingworth as initiating a new period of experimental research on sex differences. Throughout the chapter, she described *mean* differences between women and men, and between girls and boys. But she advised her readers away from 'the knotty problem of variability.'<sup>61</sup> Miles thinking remains relevant today as psychologists continue to debate whether it is best to debate the 'variability hypothesis' by focusing on the full range of human intelligence, or to focus on the 'upper tail' of the ability distribution. The problem remains knotty.<sup>62</sup>

In conclusion, while Miles was most definitely a Terman student, and there are many similarities between the writings of these two, differences also emerged between them which ought to be remembered. I have argued that Miles and Terman moved farther apart, not only geographically, but also conceptually, over the period when *Sex and Personality* was being written. At the beginning of that project, Terman told the CRPS that library research and the literature review was not essential to the research, but he told Catharine Cox that she would be involved in doing just such work. Ironically, through funding her position as Terman's research assistant at Stanford, the CRPS afforded Miles the research time to plan "the first draft of a section of the work large enough to make a volume of 300 to 400 pages." While Terman once thought Miles ideally suited to historiometrics 'by psychological training, scientific aptitude, natural interests, and command of foreign languages' he was less positive about her second extensive period spent in the Stanford library, and echoes of the differences between them are evident in Miles large chapter on the Psychology of Sex.

---

<sup>55</sup> Terman, *Psychological Factors*, *op. cit.*

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 247, 407.

<sup>57</sup> Harry Hollingworth. "Review of Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness." *Psychological Bulletin*, 36:3 (1938): 191-197.

<sup>58</sup> Miles, "Sex," *op. cit.* 756.

<sup>59</sup> Stephanie A. Shields "The Variability Hypothesis: The History of a Biological Model of Sex Differences in Intelligence." *Signs* 7.4 (1982): 769-797.

<sup>60</sup> Quinn McNemar and Lewis M Terman. "Sex Differences in Variational Tendency." *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 18.1 (1936): 1-66.

<sup>61</sup> Miles, "Sex," *op. cit.* 747.

<sup>62</sup> For a contemporary theory of women and men's involvement in science that considers hormones and the knotty variability question see Stephen J. Ceci, Wendy M. Williams, & Susan M. Barnett. 'Women's Underrepresentation in Science: Sociocultural and Biological Considerations.' *Psychological Bulletin* 135:2 (2009) 218-261.