Winter 1993

Women and Social Research at Bryn Mawr College, 1915-1940

Mary Ann Dzuback
Washington University in St Louis, madzubac@wustl.edu

Women and Social Research at Bryn Mawr College, 1915-1940

Published in *History of Education Quarterly* 33 (winter 1993): 579-608

In 1911 M. Carey Thomas, president of Bryn Mawr College, faced a golden opportunity. An alumna of the college had died suddenly, leaving Bryn Mawr its largest gift since Joseph Wright Taylor's initial endowment for the establishment of the college. Emma Carola Woerishoffer's unrestricted $750,000 donation provided Thomas unaccustomed freedom to expand Bryn Mawr's curriculum. In 1915 Thomas used a large portion of the bequest to establish the Graduate Department of Social Economy and Social Research for the training and certification of social workers and for the master's and doctoral education of social researchers. Bryn Mawr's department and program were unusual, as training schools for social workers were run largely by charity organization societies. The department's singularity was derived from its location within an academic institution and its determination to provide women the opportunity to pursue research in the social sciences.

This effort to link research and practice was rare, although the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy under Sophonisba Breckenridge and Edith Abbott shared a similar commitment. When the school joined the University of Chicago as the School of Social Service Administration in 1920, Breckinridge and Abbott walked "a fine line between the established social sciences and the friendly visitors" of the Charity Organization Society. The tension at Chicago was exacerbated by the gender distinctions marking the social science graduate departments staffed largely by men and the social service school staffed largely by women. Such distinctions did not exist within the Bryn Mawr faculty. At Bryn Mawr tension was evident between a graduate professional program and a liberal arts identity, but it lessened over time as the program established itself.[1]

Why Thomas supported this enterprise is an interesting question in itself; her attention to the department's needs was crucial to its survival in an institution devoted to graduate and undergraduate programs in the liberal arts and sciences. As a woman who had struggled to complete her own graduate training, she was profoundly committed to providing opportunities for women's graduate education at Bryn Mawr. At the same time, she felt obligated to expose women to as rigorous an education as they would receive at the best colleges and universities for men. Such a concern played a role in the establishment of the Phebe Anna Thorne Model School at Bryn Mawr in 1913, which provided a site for research in progressive education and psychology and for clinical training in teaching. In contrast to the field of education, social work training at that time did not yet enhance the professionalism of social workers or reflect strong academic grounding. Thomas's sister, Mary Grace Thomas

Worthington, who was involved in philanthropic activities in Philadelphia and Baltimore, apprised Thomas of the growing need for well-educated social workers and for women to move into public life to improve municipal services, perform charitable work, and reform institutions. Thomas was not averse to professional education for women; the question was whether it could be based firmly in academic disciplines. Yet another issue was Thomas's wish to honor Woerishoffer. After graduating from Bryn Mawr, Woerishoffer had spent the last four years of her life working in various social agencies as a volunteer and then an investigator of industrial problems. Taken together, all of these concerns led Thomas to want a program that fostered strong scholarship and high standards of professional preparation in the field of philanthropy and social service; to create such a program, she sought out Susan Myra Kingsbury.

This study explores how Thomas and Kingsbury, the department's first chair (1915-36), developed strategies to enable women to do academic research in the social sciences and to use their skills in social service and academic careers. The Bryn Mawr case, particularly the experiences of doctoral students and the faculty who worked with them, adds to the growing body of literature on women students and faculty in higher education, the institutions they created, and the impact they had on existing institutions. I have found a plurality of models of teaching and research conducted by women within the academic cultures that women created or modified, both at women's colleges and at coeducational universities. But the Bryn Mawr model was unusual precisely because it was located within a women's college and prepared women for professional work. None of the other women's colleges had doctoral programs, and most that developed social work programs did so after 1920, out of affiliations with charity organization societies' training schools. Their goal was not to prepare researchers, administrators, and academic social work educators, but to offer training programs for social workers.[2]

This study also analyzes the social science teaching and research fostered in the department. For women in the first half of the twentieth century, academic positions were difficult to obtain. Therefore, much of the past decade's work on women social scientists has explored women's research conducted in a variety of institutions, including museums, foundations, penal facilities, and government agencies. Yet some women successfully established themselves in academic institutions. The Bryn Mawr case illustrates how this was possible and challenges Margaret Rossiter's assertion that colleges merely provided an opening "wedge" for women, who, in turn, lacked strong support to pursue research in their fields. There is no question that women experienced far greater difficulty than men did in developing and maintaining research programs in universities and colleges, but women

academics were surprisingly creative and persistent in their efforts to overcome obstacles. Penina Migdal Glazer and Miriam Slater discerned four strategies among the professional women they examined: superperformance, subordination, separatism, and innovation. Social economy faculty exhibited both superperformance and innovation at Bryn Mawr. By employing interdepartmental connections to orient students to the relationships between social and economic problems, and by relying on a variety of faculty perspectives, the department offered students diverse models of scholarship in social work, social research, and social policy.[3]

Like other recent work on women researchers, this study challenges histories of the social sciences that ignore or minimize the contributions of women to social science scholarship and to policy-making. By focusing on the great men who shaped theory in the social science disciplines, such accounts have neglected the contributions made by women working at the boundaries of disciplines and applying their work to public policy. The application of research to policy and social reform was among Bryn Mawr's most significant educational goals. Bryn Mawr's program encouraged students and faculty to see themselves as professional social science scholars, whether they chose to work as administrators of social service agencies, researchers in government agencies, or academics.[4] (See table 1.)

Susan Ware has argued persuasively that the generation of women born in the 1870s, who attended college in the 1880s and early 1890s, not only pursued Progressive reform in the early twentieth century, but also continued through the 1920s and 1930s to seek social and economic change. Not content merely with gaining the suffrage, they worked for labor legislation, public support for widows and children, better working conditions for men and women, and other social and economic goals. They accomplished this work by maintaining extensive networks across government agencies, social welfare organizations, and voluntary associations. Kingsbury was of this generation; like her contemporaries, she supported the suffrage, but did not stop there. Under her influence, the Bryn Mawr women used their academic skills and positions to sustain their reform commitments. Many male social scientists had once had similar interests in social and economic reform, but they largely abandoned these in the 1920s in an effort to increase the "scientific" legitimacy of their work. The scholarship of Bryn Mawr's social economy faculty and graduates' contributed to private welfare initiatives and, in the 1920s and 1930s, to municipal and state policy efforts. Their story enriches the literature on the role of gender in defining the state's responsibility for public welfare in the United States. It also reveals how academic women took part in the process.[5]

The program provided students with a demanding social science curriculum, high standards for research, and professional preparation, as well as opportunities to explore the application of theory and research to policy and practice. Regular and visiting women faculty, representing the full spectrum of social research and social welfare fields, introduced students to research problems in the seminaries. Students were encouraged to take advanced courses throughout the college and, when necessary, to study at other institutions. While at Bryn Mawr, they were offered a variety of field research projects--in industry, labor organizations, social welfare agencies, prisons, settlement houses, community centers, and hospitals. Much of their research revolved around these experiences in conjunction with seminaries led by Kingsbury and other faculty. Their dissertations were published in the college's series in social economy and social research. In these ways, the program supported women as producers of knowledge.

Kingsbury's strategies in working with the program and its students enriched the curriculum. She offered herself and the other faculty and visitors as examples of female professional accomplishment. She actively sought women faculty. She made connections with institutions and agencies offering field research. She worked with President Thomas to institute and expand department scholarships and fellowships to support all doctoral and many master's and certificate students. She attentively supervised students in selecting their research problems and methods of investigation, in analyzing their data, in drawing their conclusions, and in publishing their dissertations. She ensured that the department accommodated the special problems that women faculty and students faced in pursuing professional careers and scholarship, including illness and death in families, sudden loss of income, and career difficulties that delayed completion of work. Finally, she gave advice, tempered by her own experience as a woman academic, and letters of reference to students who requested assistance in locating employment; she pursued whatever contacts she had to enhance their opportunities. Her care and concern often proved crucial for women faculty and graduates, who benefited from the program but faced significant difficulties as women pursuing professional careers as social science researchers and social welfare reformers.

Kingsbury's considerable success at Bryn Mawr was shaped by her training, her previous work, her magnetism and her warmth. Born in 1870 in San Pablo, California, Kingsbury lost her father Willard when she was six. Her mother Helen, dean of women at the College of the Pacific, raised Susan and her brother. Kingsbury graduated with honors from this institution in 1890. During the next decade, she taught high school, tended to the

needs of her ailing mother, and managed to finish her master's degree in sociology at Stanford. After her mother died, she went to New York and studied for her Ph.D. in colonial economic history at Columbia University under Herbert Osgood. Research for her dissertation, "An Introduction to the Records of the Virginia Company of London" (1905), took her to London where she read Beatrice and Sidney Webb's social criticism and the statistical study of poverty in York by Seebohm Rowntree; their ideas inspired her interest in social research and reform. She taught history for a year at Vassar College, and then accepted a position as director of investigation at the Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education. When Thomas approached her about a position at Bryn Mawr in 1912, she was director of research at the Women's Educational and Industrial Union and professor of social economics at Simmons College.[6]

Although Kingsbury continued to edit a four-volume collection of the Records of the Virginia Company, published between 1906 and 1935 by the Library of Congress, her intellectual interests focused on contemporary social and economic problems and their impact on women and the household. Kingsbury argued that social and economic policymakers and social welfare workers needed a deep and broad understanding of both the causes and conditions of poverty and the circumstances of women workers and their families, which could only be realized if more rigorous methods of social research were developed. Her book, Labor Laws and Their Enforcement (1911), exemplified such rigor in exploring the development and enforcement of labor laws protecting women and children in Massachusetts. "Economic Efficiency of College Women," published in the Association of Collegiate Alumnae Magazine, urged colleges to acknowledge the social and economic forces that limited women's earnings and to stimulate women's entry into a broader range of professional occupations. Among these, she suggested in another paper, ought to be women's assumption, with men, of "the social responsibilities of the state." This is the body of work that caught Thomas's attention and led to Kingsbury's appointment at Bryn Mawr.[7]

Kingsbury's feminism, social conscience, and reliance on female networks were forged in the household headed by her working, professional mother and were nurtured in the educational and social institutions shaped by Progressive concerns for social welfare and women's new place in the capitalist industrial economy. An advocate of women's economic and political rights, she was also known as a warm and personable woman. She established contacts with a wide variety of institutions, including charity organization societies, philanthropic foundations, municipal welfare agencies, and in other colleges. Her energy and magnetism attracted young women to her circle. Hilda Worthington Smith, a Bryn Mawr graduate who returned in 1916 to head the Bryn Mawr Community Center

and shared a house with Kingsbury for a number of years, recalled that Kingsbury was "an energetic, stocky woman, vigorous in speech and gesture," who had an "enthusiasm for new ideas." Upon meeting her, Smith noted, Kingsbury "doesn't keep you stiffly at a distance . . ., but is friendly & 'like folks'." She filled the house with visitors, women and men, from all over the country, who discussed incessantly "the relief of suffering, the abolition of poverty & social justice."[8]

Kingsbury drove a hard bargain with Thomas in their negotiations regarding college resources allocated to the new Department of Social Economy and Social Research. Kingsbury, for example, refused an early offer of an associate professorship in the economics department because it meant a reduction in rank and status. Instead, she requested appointment as full professor and director of research in a new department, "research fellows," and "a publication fund and traveling expenses." Thomas was not unsympathetic to these requests; she had encountered sex discrimination while in pursuit of her doctorate at Johns Hopkins and Leipzig before she was allowed to complete it at Zurich, and in her early efforts to secure the presidency of Bryn Mawr. These experiences impelled her to create opportunities for both doctoral study and academic appointments for women at the college. She agreed to Kingsbury's stipulations in 1915, found adequate budgetary support, and braved a battle with alumnae and trustees over the notion that Bryn Mawr, known for its sound liberal arts education, was offering professional study. By containing the professional program in a graduate department, she allayed anxieties that the college would lose its liberal arts and sciences commitment. Further, she and Kingsbury agreed that the department should contribute to the development of an empirical knowledge base that would provide social welfare work with the "intellectual and learned" characteristics possessed by other professions, which Abraham Flexner proposed at the 1915 meeting of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections.[9]

Faced with the challenge of constructing a graduate and professional program out of whole cloth and the need to situate it adjacent to a liberal arts curriculum, Kingsbury cannily attended to the institutional culture that already existed at the college. She agreed with Thomas, for example, that the department would provide "advanced scientific training" in the investigation of social conditions, using "modern" methods in the social sciences, and drawing from the "departments of economics and politics, psychology and education." Social Economy and Social Research would, Thomas suggested, "become a very important and useful addition to the Bryn Mawr College graduate school." Kingsbury employed existing courses in other departments among the requirements for the program, and she encouraged students to study with the faculty in these departments. This move gave the

department some stability in the college. In addition, she designed the curricular program and patterned her own behavior to ensure that the students and faculty pursued research and professional careers.[10]

The program admitted students who had completed the B.A. and planned to study for up to two years to gain a certificate or a master's degree, or for three years for the doctorate. Faculty from other departments, including psychology and education, experimental psychology, political science, philosophy, biology, economics, art history, and English, offered seminaries for social economy students. Taken as a whole, the program reflected Kingsbury's firmly held epistemological concern regarding the nature and complexity of social problems. Bryn Mawr's treatment of social work was not limited to Mary Richmond's model of case work and friendly visiting. Nor did it use psychiatric social work to address individual problems across social classes, as did the Smith College graduate program. Bryn Mawr trained students to attend to the ways employment practices, working conditions, and social ills affecting families and individuals were shaped by larger socioeconomic forces and to think of their own and others' social science research as a means of understanding problems as well as addressing them. Preparation was offered in four areas: Social Case Work, Community Organization, Industrial Relations, and Employment Supervision and Industrial Management (added in 1918-19). The department sponsored six seminaries, three of which included practica, and five graduate courses each year.[11]

The seminaries drew students into diverse research opportunities. They were required to enroll in their first semester, and the topics changed from year to year, usually relating directly to faculty research. For example, Kingsbury's annual graduate seminary in social research shifted from married women in industry (1918-19), to community and industrial surveys (1919-20), to social and industrial problems (1920-21). The first topic grew out of a study of mothers in industry, based on a house-to-house survey of 11,073 families conducted in 1917-18 in six industrial sections of Philadelphia. Kingsbury and her students found that contrary to popular myth, most families in these working-class neighborhoods did not rely solely upon the father as chief wage earner. Mothers and children, and sometimes boarders, contributed to the income of 55 percent of the families studied. Of the women in industrial jobs, nearly 90 percent worked because the male head-of-household's industrial wages were inadequate. Most of the women also carried all of the responsibility for maintaining the home. In addition to one of Kingsbury's own papers, this graduate seminary supported two student dissertations.[12]

Seminaries explored labor organization, industrial organization, the family as a social institution, and races and peoples. Kingsbury taught an annual course in charity organization society principles and methods of case

work, and another in collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data for use in government offices, businesses, and social organizations. Other departments' graduate seminaries and courses included social education, educational methods and measurement, intelligence tests, economics, politics, municipal government, psychology, social psychology, political philosophy, and applied psychology. These focused primarily on the major literature in each field, on theory, and on ongoing research studies. The social economy department added new courses and programs over the years to respond to intellectual, social, economic, and political changes. In 1923 a course called Theoretical Sociology imparted new developments in the field. The seminary in social legislation expanded into a series of courses in public welfare administration, the history of social welfare, and social legislation in 1936. Lectures in medical and psychological problems brought in visiting faculty in 1937 to respond to the growth of psychiatric social work. In 1939 a seminary in public administration was added.[13]

Graduate students in social economy were expected to spend two-thirds of their time in course work and one-third in the field or in research. A different kind of seminary combined theory with seven to twelve hours weekly of observation and practice in institutions. For this, Kingsbury used research reports and class discussions to augment students' experiential training in such places as clubs, settlement houses, night school classes for immigrants, playgrounds, and health and recreation centers. Another practicum, "Social Relief", placed students in the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charities, the Red Cross, the Children's Aid Society, and the Municipal Court. The industrial supervision practicum placed students in local companies, including the American International Ship Company, the Atlantic Refining Company, Leeds and Northrup, and Midvale Steel and Ordnance. Required participation in the Social Economy Journal Club accentuated and enhanced the coherence of students' experiences. Kingsbury took principal responsibility for this activity, which met for two hours every two weeks. Students and faculty together reviewed current books and articles, criticized recent reports, surveys, and investigations, and presented research results of their own.

Kingsbury used the Journal Club and the practica to extend students' thinking about the potential uses of research in making public and corporate policy. Like the networks of women who carried the Progressive reform agenda into policy-making of the 1920s, Kingsbury and her students fostered a professionalism that "embraced reform." Other Bryn Mawr departments helped. Marion Parris Smith's economics courses often focused on economic reform movements and legislation, Charles Fenwick's political science courses explored policy, and Agnes Rogers' education and psychology courses encouraged students to examine theory in relation to institutions

and practices of educators. Kingsbury urged students to cultivate connections with state offices, the YWCA, the YMCA, industry, and unions to interest powerful people in their projects. She disseminated information about their work to social organizations across the country. In an era when women were beginning to be acknowledged as professional experts in such areas as maternal and child welfare and the working conditions of women, Kingsbury prepared her students to contribute to policy-making.[14]

The associations Kingsbury and other faculty members established with the agencies for fieldwork were crucial for students. Whereas the Journal Club met to discuss research and policy, site-based research demonstrated how institutions might use the findings. The University of Pennsylvania Hospital was a fertile site for a 1915-16 class's study of the occupational causes of disease. At the Community Center of Bryn Mawr, Hilda Worthington Smith sponsored another class's house-to-house survey of the town to determine appropriate activities for the Center in 1918-19. The Schuylkill Branch of the YWCA requested students to investigate occupational activities of the mostly immigrant working women of nearby Manayunk; this study assisted in designing services for these and other working women. And, observing the transition of women into manufacturing industries, one class explored how women were faring in jobs previously occupied by men. By the early 1920s other studies were under way. One involved young working women without children in Philadelphia, and another investigated employed girls in Philadelphia continuation schools. The Women's Trade Union League cooperated with a historical study of workers in the shoe industry (focusing on Philadelphia), and the Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry used the results of a study of sweatshops in Philadelphia.[15]

Bryn Mawr's graduate program to prepare professional researchers and practitioners in social economy and social services represents what Andrew Abbott characterized as competing or diverse strains in the development of a profession. Few social work education programs had the extensive commitment to research exhibited by Bryn Mawr's. Most programs provided training in social case work technique and emphasized individual treatment of the poor, rather than the intellectual foundation in social science theory and scholarship that Bryn Mawr required of graduates. Similarly, few doctoral programs in the social sciences at the research universities promoted the cooperative research, resource sharing, and crossing of disciplinary boundaries that Bryn Mawr's did. Rather, social scientists within most institutions developed and maintained distinct disciplinary boundaries, research methodologies, and doctoral programs. Bryn Mawr's department offered the opportunity to cover both kinds of

ground: Kingsbury refused to divorce theory from policy reform, research from practice, and women from production of, and instruction in, new knowledge.[16]

In their effort to bridge these areas, Kingsbury and Thomas encountered skepticism that they had to overcome in order to maintain financial support for the program; they struggled continually to acquire funds for the department. The Woerishoffer bequest only paid for one full-time faculty member and some student fellowships. Kingsbury and Thomas pursued creative fund-raising, adding to the program when necessary to acquire financing. The War Work Council of the YWCA supported the program in Employment Supervision and Industrial Management to train women for supervisory positions in industry during World War I. Anne Bezanson, working on her Ph.D. in economics at Harvard, was appointed to take charge of the program, designing and teaching its two seminaries, two courses (one in statistics), and a practicum. Funding was reduced after the war was over. In 1920-21, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., agreed to contribute $100,000 to endow a teaching position and to provide other instructional support for maintaining the industrial management program. The gift helped, but did not save the department from financial woes. The establishment of the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers in 1921 enhanced the department's reputation; however it tended to draw money from donors who might otherwise have contributed to the department's graduate programs.[17]

The Summer School for Women Workers deserves brief mention here, primarily because it represents an extension of Kingsbury's and Thomas's interest in women and work. The school was Thomas's idea; it was organized to offer women workers the opportunity to leave work, attend classes, and live on the Bryn Mawr campus. Kingsbury assisted in the early stages by bringing together people from labor unions, social welfare agencies, women's organizations, and the academic world to help design the program, and she directed the school in its first year. Hilda Worthington Smith, who administered the school after 1921, aimed the program at two areas: practical study of English, including literature and composition; and economics. Other social science and humanities subjects augmented these. The goals of the school were to offer women with limited education the opportunity to study; to broaden the education of women workers beyond skill training to enable them to "help in the coming of social reconstruction"; and to create a place in which women's mutual understanding would grow across social class lines. The school maintained a close connection with the department and remained on the Bryn Mawr campus from 1921 to 1938, offering social economy students the chance to teach courses in economics, sociology, labor relations, and

other subjects. Soliciting funds for the school, particularly among sympathetic alumnae and labor organizations, was easier than raising money for the social economy department.[18]

Rockefeller and others (including M. Carey Thomas) continued to make small grants to the department, but when Thomas and Kingsbury tried to raise an endowment, applying to the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM) for a contribution, they failed. Despite Thomas's reassurances, Beardsley Ruml, head of the LSRM, feared the money would go to fellowships, rather than research. Ironically, this fear did not apply to the Chicago School of Social Service Administration and the Local Community Research Committee at the University of Chicago, or the Bureau of International Research at Harvard, or the Institute of Human Relations at Yale, or other social science research enterprises supported by the LSRM, because these research programs were administered by universities. The University of Pennsylvania's Industrial Research Unit in the Wharton School, which Anne Bezanson joined as research associate after leaving Bryn Mawr, is another case in point; it was supported primarily by Carnegie Corporation funds and occasional Rockefeller grants. Bryn Mawr's lack of access to philanthropic foundation money appears to have been due to the department's location in an elite women's college, rather than in a research university, and to its efforts to relate theory and practice in social economy and social work. The funding for social work schools came largely from charity organization societies in the 1910s, the Russell Sage Foundation, or the Julius Rosenwald Fund, as was the case with the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy until it moved into the university. The funding for social science scholarship, in contrast, came from the LSRM or the Carnegie Corporation in the 1920s and supported university-based work that contributed to theory building and to sophisticated survey and statistical research. The Bryn Mawr women pursued the latter, but usually in small-scale, local studies.[19]

The limited budget made for a modest program, particularly in comparison with research universities. By 1940, forty women had completed master's degrees in the department and sixteen had completed doctoral degrees. Of interest here are the women who pursued doctoral studies within the department, because these women's activities suggest the research culture that Kingsbury and her colleagues created in the social sciences at Bryn Mawr. Six women finished their degrees in the 1920s, and the other ten finished in the 1930s. Their experiences reflect the pattern Barbara Libby found for women receiving doctorates in economics in the 1920s and 1930s. She suggests that the production of female Ph.D.s moved to Radcliffe, the University of Pennsylvania, and Bryn Mawr from institutions including the University of Chicago, the University of Wisconsin, and Columbia, when older male

faculty who were supportive of women's graduate study retired. As the discipline of economics grew increasingly theoretical, and many academic women economists continued to use economics to understand social problems, women doctoral students joined these leaders in the study of social economy. They were following not only the interests of their mentors, but also the availability of academic positions in the women's colleges and university schools of social work. Further, they were maintaining a commitment to using their research for policy-making and reform. Kingsbury's program at Bryn Mawr is a classic example of this shift and probably contributed to it.[20]

Kingsbury was aware of the hurdles women faced in professional research careers--from lack of financial support for study and publication, to the family claim Jane Addams articulated so well, to the sheer effort required to persist in fields dominated by men. If one examines the quantitative studies of women academics in the first half of the twentieth century, the struggle to acquire the Ph.D. and enter the academic profession becomes quite clear. Given these constraints, the curricular program alone would not have accomplished Kingsbury's and Thomas's goal of creating a research culture within which women would gain the skills they needed to become academic scholars and social welfare researchers.[21]

Kingsbury, with Thomas's support, implemented a number of strategies to develop a department hospitable and encouraging to women's social science research. One was to offer herself as a role model of the academic professional. Kingsbury participated in professional organizations, helping to establish the American Association of Schools of Social Work in 1919, serving as vice-president of the American Sociological Society and on the executive committee of the American Economic Association, and regularly attending professional meetings and presenting her work. She also belonged to the American Association of University Women, working on committees and directing research on women in academic and professional employment. She pursued her own scholarly interests, completing a study of women in industry in 1920, and then moving into a new area--the examination of unemployment in prewar Russia and the Soviet Union, and of the status of women and the family in the Soviet Union. This study was the first extensive demographic analysis of social life under communism. In the 1930s, she published a content analysis exploring the ethics of the press in the United States.[22]

Kingsbury also exposed students to a variety of role models through visitors she invited and faculty she hired. The women and men she brought to Bryn Mawr came in different capacities. Many in the social welfare field, for example, visited Bryn Mawr simply to see Kingsbury, or to deliver a speech. When the visits occurred over the weekend, Kingsbury, who routinely invited students to her home for Sunday tea, utilized informal

gatherings to introduce them to such luminaries as Jane Addams, Lillian Wald, Frances Perkins, Grace Abbott, Alice Hamilton, and Jacob Billikopf. Kingsbury's most effective tactic was to seek women faculty for the department who also could offer viable professional models and alternative points of view on social science research and social policy problems. Graduate students conducted some seminaries, enabling them to work on dissertations and gain teaching experience. Kingsbury occasionally hired women with master's degrees, whose recent training in sociology or statistical analysis introduced students to the latest work in the field. In one instance, she hired a man, Hornell Hart. From 1924 to 1933 Hart enriched the department's program with his sociological and statistical training and with his long-standing commitment to using research to inform policy-making. Promising women with Ph.D.s also were appointed to the department. Their experiences demonstrate Kingsbury's commitment to providing time, assistance, and sometimes financial support for faculty research, while also presenting to students different faculty perspectives.[23] (See table 2.)

Anne Bezanson is a case in point. Thomas and Kingsbury discovered Bezanson, a Canadian emigre, through her graduate work at Harvard. In 1917, Thomas offered her a two-year instructorship in social statistics and labor problems. Suggesting that the position would give Bezanson "an opportunity to teach and do research in a congenial field," the possibility of promotion, and the chance to work "almost entirely with a few graduate students," Thomas concluded that Bezanson would have time to complete her Ph.D. The fact that her Harvard professors were reluctant to lose Bezanson simply whetted Thomas's appetite for the appointment, and she raised the rank to associate (Bryn Mawr's equivalent to assistant professor), increased the salary offer, and released her from any requirements beyond conducting lectures, seminaries, and research work in the department. But after visiting the college, Bezanson refused the offer in order to continue her graduate work at Harvard. Thomas kept the position open; Bezanson took it in 1918. When she did not complete her dissertation by the beginning of her second year as she had promised, Kingsbury provided her a year's leave to do so.[24]

Bezanson proved to be a difficult colleague for Kingsbury. According to one assessment, she attracted students to the department with her more "scientific" approach to statistical research and "more modern standpoint" on industrial relations, which contrasted with Kingsbury's "social" or "welfare worker" point of view. Put more baldly, one student remembered that Bezanson thought the social economy teaching "phony." She found "real experts" in industrial research, including Alice Hamilton and Lillian Gilbreth, more worthy of her respect than Kingsbury. In addition to intellectual differences, Bezanson's "vigorous personality," "forthright" manner, and

"biting sense of humor," coupled with her extensive knowledge of factory work, may well have presented a threat to the genteel climate on the campus. Kingsbury and others observed to college administrators that Bezanson claimed a great deal of credit for the department's program and attempted to undermine Kingsbury's work. Faced with the decision regarding Bezanson's reappointment, Kingsbury was torn between the prospect of continuing to work with a contentious associate and losing a fine teacher and researcher in the department, but Bezanson decided not to return to Bryn Mawr in 1921. Instead, she took the research position in industrial relations at the University of Pennsylvania. Gladys Palmer, a Bryn Mawr doctoral student, followed her to Penn to complete her degree.[25]

Mildred Fairchild (Woodbury) presents another kind of case. A graduate of Bryn Mawr (Ph.D. 1929), Fairchild was Kingsbury's protegee. She spent 1929-30 as a research fellow at the American Russian Institute while Kingsbury was in Russia on sabbatical. After Kingsbury returned, she offered Fairchild an appointment as an associate in social economy. From 1930 to 1934, Fairchild devoted herself to research and writing, and some teaching. Kingsbury took Fairchild with her on her second trip to Russia in the summer of 1932. They coauthored Employment and Unemployment in Pre-War and Soviet Russia, which was presented at the World Social Economic Congress in Amsterdam in 1931, and The Factory Family and Women in the Soviet Union (1935). When finances permitted in 1934, Fairchild was appointed to an associate professorship in the department until Kingsbury's retirement in 1936, at which point she became director of the department. She published little after that, but consulted with various Pennsylvania public service offices regarding programs related to employment, child welfare, and labor and industry, and helped design the state's Woodbury Standard for Level of Public Assistance Grants in Pennsylvania. She clearly benefitted from the department's research ethos in the early years of her career and then, in the later period of her life, from its commitment to using research to understand public policy problems.[26]

Kingsbury's second tactic to maintain a research culture for women at Bryn Mawr was to obtain funds to support student research. Department and college fellowships and scholarships, based on academic performance, defrayed tuition and partial room and board for graduate students. All the women in doctoral study and many in other programs received these types of assistance. Kingsbury adamantly protected fellowships earmarked for research, in 1920 informing Thomas that "the one important reason for retaining [the Anthony Scholarship] as at present is to train a woman to be able to do and to do research in conditions affecting women." As important were alternative funding sources for projects reflecting contemporary problems: women and work from the 1910s,

industrial relations and wage issues in the 1920s, and municipal and state problems and policies in the 1930s. Again, cases illustrate how important these were to students. Fairchild, for example, applied for doctoral study to the University of Chicago and the University of Wisconsin as well as Bryn Mawr. She chose Bryn Mawr partly because the scholarships that Chicago and Wisconsin offered her were not "quite as good" as Bryn Mawr's Woerishoffer Fellowship. While planning her first year of courses, she informed Kingsbury that she wanted to specialize in industrial problems. Fairchild's work was supported for two years, at which point Kingsbury encouraged her to complete her requirements by studying at the London School of Economics and enthusiastically recommended her for an Association of American University Women (AAUW) fellowship to enable her to pursue this goal. Kingsbury even found the publisher for Fairchild's dissertation.[27]

Belle Boone Beard received both similar and different kinds of assistance. Beard began her graduate work in 1925, as Kingsbury's research assistant, with a two-year appointment. She received a Woerishoffer Fellowship in 1927, and a fellowship with the Judge Baker Foundation in 1928-29 that enabled her to continue her research into juvenile delinquency, guided by William D. Healy and Augusta F. Bronner. She spent a final year at Bryn Mawr on a Dodge Fellowship completing her requirements, was appointed associate professor of sociology and chair of the department of economics and sociology at Sweet Briar College in 1931, and finished her dissertation, a study of probation in the Juvenile Court of Boston, in 1932. Like other Bryn Mawr studies of the late 1920s and 1930s, it focused on the effectiveness of a government institution and the role of the state in social welfare. Kingsbury continued to promote Beard's research, writing recommendations for grants and critically assessing her proposals.[28]

A third strategy that Kingsbury used to promote women's research and professional development was to encourage connections with public and private agencies, some of which helped finance the research. Mabel Elliott, who was worried about finances when she came to Bryn Mawr, was sent for a summer to work at Sleighton Farm, an experimental reform institution for young women run by Kingsbury's friend, Martha Falconer, in Pennsylvania. Elliott's project was to perform a statistical analysis of the records and prepare interviews for the chief parole officer to use with inmates. Kingsbury thought Elliott could use the job to cover living expenses, earn extra income, and explore a thesis topic. Besides, the farm was in "a very charming spot, with beautiful buildings and a delightful atmosphere," as close to a "model" reform institution "as anything we have in the country." Elliott's study focused on the kinds of adjustments young women from the farm made to living on the outside. The research expenses and publication costs were partially financed by Pennsylvania's Department of Welfare.[29]

Other connections included Leah Feder's arrangement with the Russell Sage Foundation. Feder went to Bryn Mawr in 1931 with a dissertation topic already in mind. Joanna Colcord, director of the charity organization department of the Russell Sage Foundation, arranged a stipend for research and publication of Feder's dissertation, which focused on the history of unemployment relief in the United States, a timely topic during the depression. Feder studied the history of labor organization in Great Britain, the labor movement in France, economic depressions and trade unionism in the United States, and the relationship between social legislation in the United States and International Labor Organization positions on labor issues. Colcord and Kingsbury agreed to share supervision of Feder's dissertation; the final defense was conducted by Bryn Mawr faculty.[30]

Kingsbury's fourth means of maintaining a research culture hospitable to women was conscientious oversight of student work. This she manifested in two ways: demanding high standards of performance in dissertation research and writing, and attending to women students' particular personal problems. In Beard's and Feder's cases, this was evident in the extensive commentaries Kingsbury made on their dissertation drafts, demanding that Beard rewrite portions, and complaining that a draft Feder had sent her was so sloppy, that taking the time to read it had "rooked [her] own writing." Her supervision was also apparent in her admonitions to Feder, to stop doing research and get on with the writing. After much back-and-forth correspondence and consultation with other faculty, Kingsbury decided not to allow Mabel Elliott to take the degree at Bryn Mawr, because her thesis was indefensible as it stood; she doubted it ever could be defended at Bryn Mawr, in light of the prolonged period of repeated revisions. Kingsbury agreed with Anne Morrison (Sleighton Farm's director) that Elliott, in a number of chapters, made claims about the farm that were unsupported by her data. As faculty member Hornell Hart explained to Arthur Todd of the University of Minnesota when Elliott took a position there, Elliott had a "keen mind and a great deal of ability," but some of her work had been "close to the border line." Her dissertation revealed insufficient "mastery of the statistical technique involved." The department partially attributed this to problems with her family and the need to support herself, which left her too little time to study. Further, she had "personal reactions," presumably to criticism, which led to a "tendency to put the blame on other people, instead of taking responsibility herself."[31]

Kingsbury's high standards were tempered with compassion for the kinds of problems that women faced in pursuing professional study. It is important to note that, of the sixteen women receiving doctorates at Bryn Mawr between 1920 and 1940, only four married by 1939, and none of the four chose academic careers; they all went

into social service or government work. None of the six women who chose to work in academic institutions married by 1940; most colleges and universities did not hire married women, and the demands of research and teaching often conflicted with the demands of marriage and children. But these women did take responsibility for ailing parents and siblings, nieces and nephews, and responded to the various claims of their families. Kingsbury herself shared in the formal education and upbringing of her niece Helene, who attended the Shipley School in Bryn Mawr and traveled with Kingsbury in the summertime. When Elliott's father died, when Elliott required surgery, and when her position at Minnesota demanded all of her time, Kingsbury responded by providing research assistance and time off. When Elliott needed to work to support herself, Kingsbury helped her to find the position at Minnesota. She also encouraged Elliott to finish her doctorate at Northwestern University where she had received her master's degree in sociology. Mildred Fairchild delayed beginning her first summer's field research because her sister, who had recently lost a child, needed her in Nashville. Kingsbury held her fellowship for her. Beard's mother was ailing when she left Bryn Mawr for Sweet Briar; caring for her required all of Beard's spare time for two years. Kingsbury put no deadline on finishing her dissertation and responded immediately when Beard did have time to work on it and needed help with revisions.[32]

Kingsbury encouraged Bryn Mawr women to continue to view themselves as scholars, reformers, and policymakers after they left the college, by pursuing academic, government, or social service employment that would allow them to continue to do research and to use their expertise. She wrote recommendations, sought publishers for dissertations, and provided information about positions in other institutions, all particularly crucial for women scholars facing a limited field of employment. She also maintained contact with institutions, the universities of Pennsylvania and Minnesota, the southern and midwestern women's colleges, along with charity organizations and social work agencies, which tended to employ Bryn Mawr graduates. And she encouraged students and former students to maintain networks, so that often recent graduates assisted students with finding positions, or contributed in some way to their research efforts.

When Beard, for example, consulted her about taking the deanship at Lynchburg College, Kingsbury responded that Beard "would do awfully good work as a Dean," and that such an appointment could facilitate her move to a larger institution or a higher administrative position elsewhere. But, Kingsbury wrote, if Beard was "very anxious" to continue teaching, and "without doubt" she was "making a success of it," she needed to consider the caliber of both institutions, potential changes at Sweet Briar in economics and sociology, and which institution

would provide her "the best place to go from." Sweet Briar, because it was a women's college, probably offered more opportunity for advancement for a woman than did Lynchburg, a coeducational college, where men would most likely be given preference for higher administrative and faculty positions. Beard stayed at Sweet Briar, in the 1930s implementing Virginia's social security program as director of the state's Department of Public Welfare, and conducting research in the fields of child welfare, race relations, and gerontology before she retired in 1963.[33]

At Washington University Feder became so overwhelmed with the increased responsibilities the social work department required of her in 1934, and so discouraged about the salary cuts that were expected, she thought about leaving the university. Kingsbury reminded her that the depression had made academic jobs scarce, that she ought to stay put unless something was "definitely in view," and that openings came "constantly in southern colleges," if she wanted eventually to change institutions. Feder remained at Washington, was promoted when she finished her dissertation, and helped another Bryn Mawr student obtain a position there. Leslie Koempel's experience provides a similar illustration. Kingsbury helped her find a research position in the Bureau of Labor Statistics in Washington, D.C., in 1934-35 and at Skidmore in 1936. By 1938, she was at Rockford College.[34] These are but a few of the instances in which Kingsbury extended the critical support that sustained Bryn Mawr graduates in their teaching, research, and policy implementation and reform.

*****

Kingsbury's success in the Department of Social Economy and Social Research at Bryn Mawr was reflected in the women who pursued careers that relied on their expertise as researchers in the social sciences and social welfare. Kingsbury created a research culture in the department that straddled related areas: statistical ("scientific") research and professional social work. In a sense, she was urging women to explore both the male world of academic and government employment and the female world of social work and social welfare administration. The latter encompassed what Robyn Muncy calls "the female dominion", networks of women reformers, or what Seth Koven and Sonya Michel label a "maternalist" orientation toward policy. Many of these women focused their research and reform efforts on child welfare policy and were able to use their networks, their research findings, and their agencies to shape public policy at the municipal, state, and, with the establishment of the Children's Bureau, federal level. Others focused, as did Kingsbury, on women workers and women's occupations, again conducting empirical research and shaping policy in municipal, state, and federal offices. The Bryn Mawr department participated in this process by employing women professionals and educating social workers, social researchers, and

social work educators. For these women, research was a means of enhancing their authority as experts and professionals.[35]

The department's culture was a curious mix of strains in the social sciences of the 1910s and 1920s, a combination of social welfare concerns and empirical research. It reflected both earlier women Progressives' interest in reform and commitment to an activist state, and the increasing preoccupation of academic social scientists in the 1910s and 1920s with theoretically sound, methodologically verifiable statistical research. Kingsbury's attempts to balance science with social reform in students' experiences were evident in the visiting lecturers from various social service and government offices, and in the seminaries exploring social science research methods, some of which were led by recently trained Ph.D.s from the research universities. Kingsbury's faculty appointments indicate that she exposed students to three areas of modern social science: sociology and social welfare, government service, and professional academic social science scholarship.[36]

By locating and developing this professional culture at Bryn Mawr, she both protected this sphere for women and weakened it. Situated in an institution that already had a doctoral program and supported women as researchers, the stability of Kingsbury's enterprise enabled the faculty and students to make a respectable contribution to the body of knowledge shaping the interdisciplinary study of social economy and offering social agencies greater understanding of social and industrial problems. In effect, Kingsbury and Thomas created a safe enclave for women doing research in this field, and established the contacts with government, social service, and academic institutions that promoted the scholarship and service work of the department's students and faculty, often long after they left Bryn Mawr.[37]

Alternatively, their struggle to maintain financial stability for the program is indicative of both its weaknesses and of the difficulty of persuading donors to support women as researchers. Eleanor Dulles studied at Bryn Mawr as an undergraduate and graduate student before moving to the London School of Economics and Radcliffe to finish her Ph.D. in economics. She remembered that social economy students lived and studied separately from "the other stately graduate scholars" on campus. Despite the emphasis on serious study, "feminine feuds" and gossip marked life in the graduate dormitory in 1919-20. When Dulles wanted exposure to "new techniques of measurement and control" and research that was challenging "the whole body of thinking with respect to business cycles, monetary policy, labor economics, and social security," she chose London and then Harvard. Clearly, Bryn Mawr was a small institution with less to offer than Harvard and the other research universities, which

were well financed by endowments and philanthropic foundations. This meant that Bryn Mawr supported and protected women's doctoral study in social economy, but could not offer the rigor and range of theoretical work that research universities could.[38]

Kingsbury's differences with Anne Bezanson present a telling example of the tension between research emphasizing concerns about social welfare and the "scientism" propelling much of the newer work in social science. These differences also highlight some flaws in Kingsbury's leadership of the department. As Dorothy Ross argues, the rise of scientism in social sciences after World War I required that "natural scientific method dominate the practice of social science." As academic social science became more professional in orientation, social scientists framed their empirical research to generate theory about economic activity, while also distancing their scholarship from direct application and concerns with reform. By attempting to link empirical research with reform and practice, Kingsbury came into conflict with more recently trained professional economists like Bezanson. Despite her wide range of contacts, Kingsbury's relationships with students and faculty were circumscribed by the close community of Bryn Mawr and sustained at least in part by her magnetism and compassion. Bezanson clearly found the climate parochial, and chose, instead, the more cosmopolitan and professionally sophisticated University of Pennsylvania to direct her own research program.[39]

That stated, at a time when comparatively few women academic researchers were serving as professional role models in the social sciences, Kingsbury's leadership was notable. In this predominantly female institutional culture, women faculty had the opportunity to work with doctoral students. Faculty and their students were not willing to settle for acquiring and transmitting knowledge. They persisted in producing it after they left Bryn Mawr. By availing themselves of whatever research support they could find, some graduates used the resources open to faculty at the major research universities, such as Social Science Research Council fellowships and Guggenheim fellowships. Others found support from state and local agencies, women's organizations, and labor organizations. Book publications, journal articles, research reports for governmental agencies, studies for industry, and investigations for social service agencies were the products of the women researchers' efforts. Largely at the urging of Kingsbury and Marion Park, Thomas's successor as president of Bryn Mawr, the Social Science Research Council sponsored a conference to investigate the extent of support for social science research and teaching in the colleges in 1931. Many Bryn Mawr graduates continued their research throughout the 1920s and during the

depression, when women with Ph.D.s began to experience their greatest difficulty finding positions in academic institutions.[40]

Kingsbury's dual approach to social science was not without its own rigor. Her diligent oversight of students' statistical research, the quality of their methods, and the reasonableness of their analyses reflected her high standards. Her social welfare interests manifested her sincere concern for the effects of industrial capitalism on modern social and economic institutions and her interest in helping women find a place in these same institutions. In the end, she had a realistic understanding of their prospects, and urged them to explore all the options available to women scholars, in social service organizations, government agencies, and academic institutions. Above all, she did everything she could to encourage their continuing efforts to do research and contribute to social science scholarship. The Bryn Mawr women's experiences demonstrate a critical irony in the professionalization of academic social science in the decades after World War I. Whereas women like Beard, Feder, Koempel, Elliott, Fairchild, and Kingsbury herself used social science to legitimate their status in social welfare research and policy, the institutionalization of dominant forms of social science ("scientism") undermined and subordinated women social scientists and their research concerns, a process that was exacerbated by the reluctance of research universities to hire women in academic positions.

Mary Ann Dzuback, of Washington University, is author of *Robert M. Hutchins: Portrait of an Educator* (Chicago, 1991), and is working on a book about women academic social scientists.

This article is a revision of a paper presented at the History of Education Society meeting in Boston in October, 1992. The author thanks the following people for their assistance in locating sources and for their thoughtful criticisms of earlier drafts: Joyce Antler, Peter A. Best, Ellen Fitzpatrick, Lynn D. Gordon, Sarah Henry Lederman, Carolyn Rittenhouse, and the anonymous reviewers at the *History of Education Quarterly*.

Appendix I: Bryn Mawr Ph.D.s, 1915-1940

Name	Date	Employment, 1940	Policy Administration &
Belle Boone Beard	1932	Sweet Briar College	Virginia Department Public Welfare
Isabel Janet Blain	1938	Industrial psychologist	n/a
Gwendolyn S. Hughes (Berry)*	1920	Bureau of Statistics & Registration, AICP	Welfare Council, NYC
Agnes Mary Byrnes	1920	Hunter College	War Trade Board
Leah Hannah Feder	1929	Washington University	Charity organization,
Elizabeth Ross Foley	1937	Settlement house	Director
Jennette Rowe Gruener	1935	Boston University	Researcher, Children's Aid
Elizabeth Louise Hall	1929	Ottowa Welfare Bureau	Casework supervisor
Leslie A. Koempel	1937	Rockford College	FERA & Bureau Labor Statistics
Anne Hendry Morrison	1932	Pa. Emergency Child Health Committee	City & county home relief, NY & Pa.
Hazel Grant Ormsbee	1926	National Board, YWCA	International Institute, Ct.
Florence Hemley (Schneider)*	1939	NFBPWC**	Researcher
Ruth Enalda Shallcross	1938	NFBPWC**	National Research Director
Irmgard Worth (Taylor)*	1935	n/a	County Mother's Assistance Fund, Pa., 1930s
Amey Eaton (Watson)*	1924	National Council on	Mother's Assistance Fund, worker
Mildred Fairchild (Woodbury)	1929	Bryn Mawr College	Pa. Bureau of Employment,

*married; Fairchild married after 1940

**National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs

***The positions listed are samples of a few held by Bryn Mawr graduates

Appendix II: Faculty in Graduate Department of Social Economy and Social Research, 1915-1940

Name & Highest Degree	Dates of Service & Highest Rank
Anne Bezanson (A.M.)*	1918-1920 (associate**)
Gladys Boone (A.M.)	1920-1921 (instructor)
Alice Cheyney (Ph.D.)	1928-1929 (lecturer)
Neva Deardorf (Ph.D.)	1919-1930 (periodically; associate professor)
Eleanor Lansing Dulles (Ph.D.)	1928-1931, 1932-1935 (associate**, non-resident lecturer)
Hornell Hart (Ph.D.)	1924-1933 (professor)
Helen R. Jeter (A.M.)*	1922-1924 (instructor)
Angie L. Kellogg (A.M.)	1917-1919 (instructor)
Susan M. Kingsbury (Ph.D.)	1915-1936 (professor and chair)
Hertha Krause (Ph.D.)	1936-1963 (professor)
Dorothy M. Sells (Ph.D.)	1925-1930 (associate**)
Mildred Fairchild (Woodbury) (Ph.D.)	1929-1947 (professor and chair,1936+)

*Ph.D. after leaving Bryn Mawr

**Bryn Mawr's equivalent rank to assistant professor

1. Robyn Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform, 1890-1935* (New York, 1991), 81; see also Ellen Fitzpatrick, *Endless Crusade: Women Social Scientists and Progressive Reform* (New York, 1990), 166-200, on the School of Social Service Administration. For other accounts of social work education, in which Bryn Mawr is only rarely mentioned, see Roy Lubove, *The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965); John H. Erenreich, *The Altruistic Imagination: A History of Social Work and Social Policy in the United States* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1985); Clarke A. Chambers, *Seedtime of Reform: American Social Service and Social Action, 1918-1933* (Minneapolis, 1963); Esther Lucile Brown, *Social Work as a Profession* (New York, 1935); Leslie Leighninger, *Social Work: Search for Identity* (New York, 1987); James Leiby, *A History of Social Welfare and Social Work in the United States* (New York, 1978); Don S. Kirschner, *The Paradox of Professionalism: Reform and Public Service in Urban America, 1900-1940* (New York, 1986).

2. Barbara Miller Solomon, *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America* (New Haven, 1985); Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Alma Mater: Design and Experience in the Women's Colleges from Their Nineteenth-Century Beginnings to the 1930s* (Boston, 1984); Paula A. Treichler, "Alma Mater's Sorority: Women and the University of Illinois, 1890-1925," in *For Alma Mater: Theory and Practice in Feminist Scholarship*, ed. Paula A. Treichler et al., (Urbana, Ill., 1985); Geraldine Jonçich Clifford, ed., *Lone Voyagers: Academic Women in Coeducational Universities, 1870-1937* (New York, 1989); John Mack Faragher and Florence Howe, eds., *Women and Higher Education in American History: Essays from the Mount Holyoke College Sesquicentennial Symposia* (New York, 1988); Patricia Palmieri, "In Adamless Eden: A Portrait of the Academic Community at Wellesley College, 1875-1920" (Ed.D. diss., Harvard University, 1981); Penina Migdal Glazer and Miriam Slater, *Unequal Colleagues: The Entrance of Women into the Professions, 1890-1940* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1987), ch. 2; Lynn D. Gordon, *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era* (New Haven, Conn., 1990); and Polly Welts Kaufman, ed., *The Search for Equity: Women at Brown University, 1891-1991* (Hanover, N.H., 1991). Smith, for example, offered a program in psychiatric social work, beginning in 1919, and eventually expanded it into a graduate program, but did not offer the doctorate; Simmons affiliated with the Boston School of Social Work, but did not sponsor it until after 1915. See Glazer and Slater, *Unequal Colleagues*, ch. 5, on Smith;

and Lubove, *The Professional Altruist*, 118-56, and Brown, *Social Work*, for descriptions of social work programs by the 1930s.

3. Rosalind Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (New Haven, Conn., 1982); Fitzpatrick, *Endless Crusade*; and Ellen Fitzpatrick, "Caroline F. Ware and the Cultural Approach to History," *American Quarterly* 43 (June 1991): 173-98; Susan Ware, *Beyond Suffrage: Women in the New Deal* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981); Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*. Margaret W. Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940* (Baltimore, Md., 1982), ch. 1; Glazer and Slater, *Unequal Colleagues*, 211-22; superperformance included hard work, exceptional ability, and avoidance of marriage; innovation involved developing new approaches to careers.

4. Thomas L. Haskell, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority* (Urbana, Ill., 1977); Mary O. Furner, *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905* (Lexington, Ky., 1975); Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge, 1991); Martin Bulmer, *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research* (Chicago, 1984); Barry D. Karl, *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics* (Chicago, 1974); David M. Ricci, *The Tragedy of Political Science: Politics, Scholarship, and Democracy* (New Haven, Conn., 1984); and Jean M. Converse, *Survey Research in the United States: Roots and Emergence, 1890-1960* (Berkeley, Calif., 1987). Haskell and Furner focus on nineteenth-century leaders. Women did not enter social science doctoral programs in significant numbers until the turn of the century; therefore, it is not surprising that Haskell and Furner ignored women's contributions in their studies. But, from reading the other works, one could conclude that women had virtually no role in social science theory, research, and education in the first half of the twentieth century, with the minor exceptions of Edith Abbott and Sophonisba Breckenridge, mentioned by Bulmer and by Ross. Mary Jo Deegan, *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892-1918* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1988), raises important questions about the ways the historians have explored the development of the social sciences in the United States.

5. Ware, *Beyond Suffrage*; Linda Gordon, ed., *Women, the State, and Welfare* (Madison, Wisc., 1990); and Gordon, "Social Insurance and Public Assistance: The Influence of Gender in Welfare Thought in the United States, 1890-1935," *American Historical Review* 97 (February 1992): 19-54; Seth Koven and Sonya Michel, "Womanly Duties:

Maternalist Policies and the Origins of Welfare States in France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, 1880-1920," *American Historical Review* 95 (October 1990): 1076-1108, and Koven and Michel, eds., *Mothers of a New World: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States* (New York, 1993). Theda Skocpol, *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992), explores the political pressure women's organizations brought to bear by the 1920s in state and federal policies protecting women and children. Kathryn Kish Sklar, "The Historical Foundations of Women's Power in the Creation of the American Welfare State, 1830-1930," in *Mothers of a New World*, ed., Koven and Michel, 75-78, explores the diminution of women's organizational power in the 1920s, and the consequent loss of momentum in instituting the welfare state. I have found evidence that many women conducting social science research in academic institutions maintained a commitment to reform and acted on this commitment in state and municipal agencies in the 1920s and 1930s.

6. Toba Kerson, "Susan Myra Kingsbury", and Florence Peterson and Frederica de Laguna, "Susan Myra Kingsbury," both in Susan M. Kingsbury Papers, Bryn Mawr College Archives (hereafter BMCA); Amey E. Watson, "A Tribute to Susan M. Kingsbury," *Bryn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin* (hereafter *BMAB*) 20 (February 1950): 12-13. Mildred Fairchild Woodbury, "Susan Myra Kingsbury," in *Notable American Women, A Biographical Dictionary, 1607-1950*, ed. Edward T. James *et al.* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), 3: 335-36, and Bruce Keith, "Susan Kingsbury (1870-1949)," in *Women in Sociology: A Bio-Bibliographical Sourcebook*, ed. Mary Jo Deegan (New York, 1991), 217-24, for one of the most complete short descriptions of her early life and her work. Curiously, Keith claims that Mary Simkhovitch Kingsbury was Susan's sister; the Woodbury account does not mention her, and I have found frustratingly little in the Bryn Mawr papers or elsewhere.

7. Susan M. Kingsbury, "A Comparison of the Virginia Company with the Other English Trading Companies of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* 1 (1906): 161-76, for an excerpt of the dissertation. Susan M. Kingsbury, "Standards of Living and the Self-Dependent Woman," in *The Economic Position of Women* (New York, 1910), 72-80; Susan M. Kingsbury and May Allinson, *A Trade School for Girls: A Preliminary Investigation in a Typical Manufacturing City, Worcester, Mass.*, United States Bureau of Education Bulletin, no. 17 (Wash., D.C., 1913), and Susan M. Kingsbury and Mabelle Moses, *Licensed Workers in Industrial Home Work in Massachusetts: An Analysis of Current Records under the Auspices of the Bureau of*

Research, Women's Educational and Industrial Union, Massachusetts State Board of Labor and Industries, Industrial Bulletin, no. 4 (Boston, Mass., 1915); Charles E. Persons et al., *Labor Laws and Their Enforcement, with Special Reference to Massachusetts*, ed. Susan M. Kingsbury (New York, 1911); Susan M. Kingsbury, "Economic Efficiency of College Women," *Association of Collegiate Alumni Magazine* (February 1910): 1-20; Susan M. Kingsbury, "The Education of Women as Measured in Civic and Social Relations," *Proceedings of the Second Pan American Scientific Congress*, vol. 4 (1915-1916), (Washington, D.C., 1917), pt. 1, 410 (quote).

8. Hilda Worthington Smith, "The Remembered Way," p. 415, file 136, box 20, and Journal, December 1915, book 22, and 6 March 1919, book 24, box 4, Hilda Worthington Smith Papers, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College. Kingsbury established Bryn Mawr's Community Center, a variation on the social settlement, to provide some field experience for students; Smith ran it until 1919; from 1919 to 1921, Smith was dean at Bryn Mawr; in 1921 she was appointed head of the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers.

9. Thomas to Kingsbury, 28 March 1913, reel 126 (quote), and Thomas to Kingsbury, 26 March 1912, reel 123, M. Carey Thomas Papers, BMCA. Edith Finch, *Carey Thomas of Bryn Mawr* (New York, 1947); Marjorie Housepian Dobkin, ed., *The Making of a Feminist: Early Journals and Letters of M. Carey Thomas* (Kent, Oh., 1979); Cornelia Meigs, *What Makes a College? A History of Bryn Mawr* (New York, 1956); and Barbara Bradfield Taft, "More Steeply to the Heights: The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences," in *A Century Recalled: Essays in Honor of Bryn Mawr College* , ed. Patricia Hochschild Labalme (Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1987), 135-43. "Department of Social Research," *BMAB* 11 (April, 1917): 23, on alumnae and trustee distress. Abraham Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession?" *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction* (1915), 579.

10. M. Carey Thomas, "New Professorship in Social Research," *The College News* (March 18, 1915), 2.

11. Bryn Mawr College, *Carola Woerishoffer Graduate Department of Social Economy and Social Research* (hereafter *GDSESR*), *Graduate Courses in Industrial Supervision to Meet the War Emergency Demand* (Bryn Mawr, Pa.,1918); Bryn Mawr College, *GDSESR, Announcements, 1919-1920* (Bryn Mawr, 1919); *GDSESR of Bryn Mawr College, 1915-1925,* BMCA. See also Dolores Griffin Norton, "Harkening to Uncommon Drums: The Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research," in *A Century Recalled*, 145-160; Lucy West to Katherine Lower, 9 August 1982, School of Social Work and Social Research Papers [SSWSR], BMCA; Cornelia Meigs, "History of

the Carola Woerishoffer Department of Social Economy and Social Research," file 2 box 1, Mildred Fairchild Woodbury Papers, BMCA.

12. Agnes Mary Hadden Byrnes, *Industrial Home Work in Pennsylvania* (Harrisburg, Pa., 1923); Gwendolyn Salisbury Hughes, *Mothers in Industry: Wage-earning by Mothers in Philadelphia* (New York, 1925).

13. Susan M. Kingsbury and Mildred Fairchild, "The Carola Woerishoffer Department," *BMAB* 25 (December 1944): 5-8.

14. Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*, xiv, for quote.

15. Susan M. Kingsbury, "Brief Historical and Statistical Account of the Carola Woerishoffer Graduate Department of Social Economy and Social Research," n.d., ca. 1924, box 7, Marion Edwards Park Papers, BMCA.

16. Andrew Abbott, *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor* (Chicago, 1988). On social work programs, see Elizabeth Kemper Adams, *Women Professional Workers: A Study Made for the Women's Educational & Industrial Union* (New York, 1921); and Brown, *Social Work*. On academic social science, see Alexandra Oleson and John Voss, eds., *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920* (Baltimore, Md., 1979); Jarausch, ed., *The Transformation of Higher Learning*; Henrika Kuklick, "Boundary Maintenance in American Sociology: Limitations to Academic 'Professionalization'," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 16 (July 1980): 201-19. There were exceptions, of course--the Local Community Research Committee at the University of Chicago and the Institute of Human Relations at Yale, both of which received Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial funds for cross-disciplinary research; see Martin Bulmer and Joan Bulmer, "Philanthropy and Social Science in the 1920s: Beardsley Ruml and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, 1922-29, " *Minerva* 19 (Autumn 1981): 347-407.

17. On the finances: Kingsbury to Thomas, 10 June 1920, reel 162, Thomas Papers; Thomas to Marion Edwards Park (her successor), n.d. (ca. 1922); Thomas to Mr. Wing (trustee), 29 September 1922; Emma Bailey Speer to John D. Rockefeller, 23 February 1923; Kingsbury, "Brief Historical and Statistical Account"; all in box 7, Marion Edwards Park Papers, BMCA.

18. On the school, see Rita Heller, "Blue Collars and Bluestockings: The Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers, 1921-1938," in *Sisterhood and Solidarity: Workers' Education for Women, 1914-1984*, ed. Joyce L. Kornbluh and Mary Frederickson (Philadelphia, 1984), 107-45; and Florence Hemley Schneider, *Patterns of*

Workers' Education: The Story of the Bryn Mawr Summer School (Washington, D.C., 1941), 67, for quote. Most of the workers came from industrial and textile factories; some from domestic work and some from clerical occupations were accepted. The one educational requirement was some grade school and the ability to read and write English. Ages ranged from eighteen years to thirty-five. Emma Bailey Speer to Marion E. Park, 26 March 1926, box 7, Park Papers, BMCA, on fund raising.

19. W. S. Richardson to Marion Park, 26 May 1924, box 7, Park Papers; Thomas to Park, 14 May 1924, reel 28, and Kingsbury to Thomas, 12 January 1925, reel 53, Thomas Papers; Arthur Woods to Marion Park, 8 April 1925, box 7, Park Papers; see also Thomas to Manning, 18 February 1930, reel 34, Thomas Papers, on some General Education Board administrators' belief that Bryn Mawr was "too small and too expensive"; all in BMCA. When Martha Chickering, head of the program in social work at the University of California at Berkeley, applied to the Rockefeller Foundation for support in the 1930s, the grant was denied, but the Heller Committee on Research in Social Economy got a one-year grant for research into California's labor market; see Chickering, "Training for social work . . .," file 716, box 1936, and John Van Sickle to Robert G. Sproul, 5 January 1938, file 471 box 1938 ; Presidents' Papers (Sproul), University Archives, Bancroft Library, University of California at Berkeley. Fitzpatrick, *Endless Crusade*, 166-200, on Chicago and shifts in social science research; and Lela B. Costin, *Two Sisters for Social Justice: A Biography of Grace and Edith Abbott* (Urbana, 1983), on the Chicago case.

20. Barbara Libby, "Women in Economics before 1940," *Essays in Economic and Business History* 3 (1984): 273-90.

21 21. Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull-House, with Autobiographical Notes* (New York, 1910), 94; Ella Lonn, "Academic Status of Women on University Faculties," *Journal of the American Association of University Women* 17 (January 1924): 5-11; Emilie J. Hutchinson, *Women and the Ph.D: Facts from the Experiences of 1,025 Women Who Have Taken the Doctor of Philosophy since 1877* (Greensboro, N.C., 1929); Jessie Bernard, *Academic Women* (University Park, Pa., 1964); Lucille Addison Pollard, *Women on College and University Faculties: A Historical Survey and a Study of Their Present Academic Status* (New York, 1977), 155-91; Patricia Albjerg Graham, "Expansion and Exclusion: A History of Women in American Higher Education," *Signs* 3 (Summer 1978): 759-73; Patricia M. Hummer, *The Decade of Elusive Promise: Professional Women in the United States, 1920-1930* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1979); Susan Boslego Carter, "Academic Women Revisited: An Empirical Study of Changing

Patterns in Women's Employment as College and University Faculty, 1890-1963," *Journal of Social History* 14 (Summer 1981): 675-99. Carter reexamined the data that Bernard and Graham used in their studies and found that contrary to their conclusions, patterns of women's academic employment show that, while women's employment at female colleges declined during the 1930s, it increased in the research oriented land grant universities. Bryn Mawr consistently employed women faculty in the social sciences throughout the period. Margaret Rossiter (*Women Scientists*) was among the first to articulate the kinds of strategies professional women used.

22. Susan M. Kingsbury, "Relation of Women to Industry," in *The Problem of Democracy: Papers and Proceedings, Fourteenth Annual Meeting, American Sociological Society, 1919* (Chicago, 1920), 14: 141-58, and "Social Process in Russia," in *Social Process: Papers Presented at the Twenty-sixth Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society* (Chicago, 1933), 27: 68-79; Kingsbury with Mildred Fairchild, *Employment and Unemployment in Pre-War and Soviet Russia: A Report Submitted to the World Social Economic Congress, Amsterdam, 23-29 August, 1931* (The Hague, 1931); and *Factory Family and Woman in the Soviet Union* (New York, 1935); Kingsbury with Hornell Hart, *et al., Newspapers and the News: An Objective Measurement of Ethical and Unethical Behavior by Representative Newspapers* (New York, 1937). Susan M. Kingsbury, *Economic Status of University Women in the U.S.: A Report of the Committee on Economic and Legal Status of Women, American Association of University Women in Cooperation with the Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor* (Washington, D.C., 1939).

23. Hart's father worked for the Russell Sage Foundation. Hart finished his Ph.D. at Iowa State University, worked with Helen Thompson Woolley in the 1910s, taught at Iowa State, and did statistical research in juvenile delinquency, parole rehabilitation, and family intelligence using I.Q. scores for data before shifting to sociological method and theory. He left Bryn Mawr in 1933 for a position in ethics at Hartford Theological Seminary; in 1938, he took a professorship in sociology at Duke University. On Hart: Faculty files, Duke University Archives.

24. Thomas to Bezanson, 10 April 1917 (quote), and 12 June 1917, reel 137, and "Memorandum of Arrangement for Miss Bezanson's Work," reel 169; Thomas Papers, BMCA. Bezanson received her doctorate from Radcliffe in 1929.

25. Helen Taft to Thomas, 10 December 1919, and Taft to Thomas, 19 February 1920 (quote), reel 162; Thomas Papers, BMCA. Eleanor Lansing Dulles, *Chances of a Lifetime: A Memoir* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1980), 76, on Bezanson's personality and knowledge.

26. "Mildred Fairchild Woodbury"; Obituary, *Philadelphia Inquirer* (12 February 1975): 4-B; SSWSR, BMCA. *The Needs of Children in the World* (Geneva, 1956) was her last major publication. Woodbury married late in her career.

27. Kingsbury to Thomas, 7 October 1920, reel 162, Thomas Papers, BMCA. Mildred Fairchild to Kingsbury, 24 May 1925 (quote); Kingsbury to Fairchild, 22 July 1926; Kingsbury to Agnes Rogers, 24 December 1927; Student files, SSWSR, BMCA. Mildred Fairchild, "Skill and Specialization: A Study in the Metal Trades," *Personnel Journal* 9 (June 1930 and August 1930), for her dissertation.

28. Belle Boone Beard, *Juvenile Probation: An Analysis of the Case Records of Five Hundred Children Studied at the Judge Baker Guidance Clinic and Placed on Probation in the Juvenile Court of Boston* (New York, 1934). For example, Kingsbury to Richard Shryock, 27 January 1936; Student files, SSWSR, BMCA.

29. "Mabel Agnes Elliott"; Kingsbury to Elliott, 12 August 1924 (quote); Student files, SSWSR, BMCA. Mabel A. Elliott, *Correctional Education and the Delinquent Girl: A Follow-Up Study of One Hundred and Ten Sleighton Farm Girls* (Harrisburg, Pa., 1928).

30. Leah Feder to Kingsbury, 30 September 1930; Kingsbury to Feder, 6 November 1930; Colcord to Kingsbury, 11 February 1931; "Preliminary Examination in Labor Organization," 27 February 1932; Student files, SSWSR, BMCA. Leah Hannah Feder, *Unemployment Relief in Periods of Depression: A Study of Measures Adopted in Certain American Cities, 1857 through 1922* (New York, 1936). Feder had studied at Bryn Mawr from 1917 to 1919, worked for the Charity Organization Society in New York in the 1920s, and was teaching at Washington University when she applied to Bryn Mawr.

31. Kingsbury to Feder, 5 July 1933; 18 August 1933; and 29 August 1933 (quote); Kingsbury to Beard, 10 May 1932; Hornell Hart to Elliott, 25 February 1928; Hart to Arthur Todd, 7 March 1928 (quotes); Kingsbury to Todd, 21 March 1928; Kingsbury to Martha Falconer, 17 March 1928; Student files, SSWSR, BMCA.

32. Student files, SSWSR, BMCA, have considerable correspondence between Kingsbury and students about these problems.

33. Kingsbury to Beard, 29 January 1934, Student files, SSWSR, BMCA. Beard's papers are at Sweet Briar College Archives and Lynchburg College Archives.

34. Feder to Kingsbury, 1 September 1933, 21 February 1934, 11 May 1934; Kingsbury to Feder, 26 February 1934 (quote), 27 August 1934; see also Koempel file; Student files, SSWSR, BMCA.

35. Fitzpatrick, *Endless Crusade*; Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*; Koven and Michel, eds., *Mothers of a New World.* The Women's Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics were but two sites for women researchers from the 1910s through the 1930s.

36. Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*, 45-46; Gordon, "Social Insurance and Public Assistance," 36-40, on these characteristics of women's research and social service activity.

37. On women and professional culture, see Joyce Antler, "The Educated Woman and Professionalization: The Struggle for a New Feminine Identity," (Ph.D. diss., State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1977), 1-20; Joan Jacobs Brumberg and Nancy Tomes, "Women in the Professions: A Research Agenda for American Historians," *Reviews in American History* 10 (June 1982): 658-77; and Nancy Cott, *The Grounding of Modern Feminism* (New Haven, Conn., 1987), 217. Kathryn Kish Sklar's "Hull House in the 1890s: A Community of Women Reformers," *Signs* 10 (Summer 1985): 658-77, examines women reformers' sources of power, in using both separate female institutions and male-dominated institutions of higher education, politics, and labor organizations. The Bryn Mawr case presents interesting parallels.

38. Dulles, *Chances of a Lifetime*, 75, 94, 87; these distinctions were reduced after President Park appointed a graduate dean and housed all the graduate students in one dormitory in 1929.

39. Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science*, 390-470, on the emergence of scientism in American social science.

40. Robert T. Crane to Marion E. Park, 2 November 1931, box 28, Park Papers, BMCA, on the conference. Libby, "Women in Economics before 1940," 275. See also Barbara Libby, "Women in the Economics Profession, 1900-1940: Factors in Their Declining Visibility," *Essays in Economic and Business History* 8 (1990): 121-30.