

2005

Creative Financing in Social Science: Women Scholars and Early Research

Mary Ann Dzuback

Washington University in St Louis, madzubac@wustl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/wgss>

 Part of the [Other Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dzuback, Mary Ann, "Creative Financing in Social Science: Women Scholars and Early Research" (2005). *Women, Gender & Sexuality Studies Research*. 36.

<https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/wgss/36>

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Women, Gender & Sexuality Studies at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Women, Gender & Sexuality Studies Research by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

4. Creative Financing in Social Science: Women Scholars and Early Research

Mary Ann Dzuback

The significance and impact of creative financing in the social sciences is evident in the development of the social science disciplines. One case in point is anthropology. American anthropology was fundamentally shaped by the work of Franz Boas and his students, who themselves became leading scholars in their fields. Adequate funds for travel—as well as money to develop collections, pay informants, and publish findings—proved essential, and much of the funding came from individual donors. One donor, herself an anthropologist, was Elsie Clews Parsons. Women anthropologists in the Southwest simply would not have been able to produce scholarly research at the pace they did without Parsons's help. Ruth Benedict, Ruth Bunzel, Esther Goldfrank, Gladys Reichard, Ruth Underhill, Dorothy Keur—as well as Boas himself and other male anthropologists—completed work supported by Parsons. She enabled countless others to conduct fieldwork by financing field schools for the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe and stipulating that women receive places as researchers in them.¹

Parsons followed a tradition of women philanthropists who had been supporting social reform for decades before the turn of the twentieth century, often using their wealth to widen women's access to higher and professional education. These philanthropists offered material support coupled with encouragement, or patronage. For example, under the tutelage of M. Carey Thomas, Mary Garrett made a major bequest to the Johns Hopkins University for the establishment of a medical school on condition that women as well as men be admitted as students. Olivia Sage supported the Russell Sage Foundation's pro-

gram of social research and social reform. Phoebe Apperson Hearst contributed to a number of buildings and programs on the campus of the University of California that benefited male and female students.²

The creative financing (given and received by women) explored in this chapter enabled women to further their work as principal investigators and as social science scholars who could define the scope of their own projects. This material support also influenced education within institutions and helped produce external scholarly publications, shaping programs and policies within and among institutions. Colleges might provide time and library materials for women's scholarship, but they rarely offered the necessary financial support to the extent that philanthropists did.

Analyzing strategies women used to gain financing for their research projects helps us to understand the nature and impact of the research those strategies produced. Financing for women's research in higher education comes from three kinds of sources: fellowships, private sponsorship, and foundations. Funds from these sources overlapped within institutions and time periods and influenced scholarship in different ways; however, I will discuss them in the order in which they first became available to social science researchers.

The first option, fellowships, included woman-generated support through organizations. For example, many women graduate students applied for fellowships from the Association of Collegiate Alumnae (later the American Association of University Women or AAUW). This kind of support was available throughout the twentieth century, but became somewhat less significant as women found limited access to more prestigious fellowships, like those from the Social Science Research Council, in the 1920s and 1930s. However, because most university graduate fellowships were granted to male students, AAUW fellowships continued to provide crucial support for women pursuing graduate study, as did fellowships provided by women's colleges for their graduates. Both the individual scholar and her academic advisor's expertise and interests shaped the research funded by these fellowships, although the questions pursued tended to fall squarely within those valued by the leading scholars in the disciplines—in part to assure the legitimacy of the research, in part to obtain male support for it, and in part to suggest that women could apply as much painstaking rigor as men did in dominant research areas. Yet AAUW and college fellowships offered some autonomy to women scholars in pursuit of doctorates, enabling them to explore graduate programs in the United

States and abroad and to begin research on projects that emerged from their undergraduate work.³

The second source of financing developed for faculty women; individuals and families supported both short-term projects and ongoing research. This kind of patronage began as early as the turn of the century and continued over the next five decades, but—like fellowships—it became a less salient and respected source of support as the large foundations increasingly sustained academic social science research beginning in the 1920s. Nevertheless, private support was critical for much of women scholars' work in the first half of the twentieth century. Before 1920, such funding enabled women to complete graduate work and pursue research that they chose as significant. Between 1920 and 1940, as philanthropic funding increased but focused on men's projects in research universities that employed few women scholars, funding from individuals continued to be essential for women scholars. Studies financed in this way tended to be shaped by the scholar herself, in conjunction with the giver's concerns (often similar or shared) and with the program goals and emphases of the researcher's home institution. Such autonomy allowed women to pursue their work even when prominent male social scientists and foundation officials did not consider their questions and methods central to the developing disciplines. Parsons's support of anthropology, for example, furthered disciplinary research that was still considered marginal in many institutions, particularly in its focus on North America. Thus, patronage by individuals helped to shape emerging science disciplines and women's contributions to them, despite the relatively smaller scale of funds involved.⁴

The third source of philanthropic support for women was the large foundations. For example, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial focused on developing social science inquiry at research universities. However, most women faculty of the period had appointments at the women's colleges, not research universities; moreover, the principal investigators of research projects typically were men well connected in the academic world, where women struggled against marginalization as scholars. Despite these problems, women obtained access to some of these foundation funds as staff and faculty associated with university research institutes and in social work and home economics graduate programs. Projects financed in this way and involving women tended to be shaped by the rare woman scholar entrusted with administration or by male faculty who invited women students and colleagues to con-

tribute to the larger effort. Women at the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago had access to Rockefeller funding for dissertation and other projects in the 1920s and 1930s, but this was atypical. Such funding, which granted both stature and the stamp of high-level disciplinary academic approval, was key to promoting particular questions and research methodologies in the social sciences and in particular institutions.

Each of these funding sources helped shape both the focus of scholarly research and the ways it was conducted by women social scientists in the first half of the twentieth century. Although I will touch on the fellowships and foundation research funds that women provided, sought, and received, this chapter will emphasize “creative financing” women obtained by tapping into less institutionalized sources. If we only examine the large foundations that financed social science research in the first third of the twentieth century, we miss two important aspects of the development of the social sciences. One is the ways that women academics used their networks of friends and colleagues to garner financial support for their efforts to influence social and economic research and (less directly) local, state, and national policymaking. The other aspect that might be missed is the large body of often interdisciplinary, grounded research that academic women conducted into the kinds of problems they considered important and the often subtle ways they contributed to theoretical and empirical formation of the disciplines. Without creative financing, much of the most interesting and valuable work women social scientists accomplished would have been nearly impossible—there simply was no other source of funding for it.⁵

The personal characteristics of women academics in this period may have affected their ability to secure creative financing: before the 1940s, most were white, middle-class, and Protestant. They came from small-town, urban, and occasionally rural families. They typically had parents who had completed some formal education, up to or including college, and at least one parent who strongly supported his or her daughter’s further education. Exceptions to this profile included Jewish and African American women, women from wealthy and occasionally poor families, and women who lacked parental approval of their educational choices. All of the women in my study were confident of and committed to their own and often other women’s full intellectual development in spite of women’s marginalization in academe. In many cases, the donor-recipient relationship was formed within social net-

works already established. In others, it was formed in networks taking shape as more women pursued graduate degrees and became social science researchers, meeting each other in graduate programs, in social reform organizations, and in higher education institutions as faculty and members of boards of trustees.

SUPPORT FOR WOMEN'S RESEARCH IN THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

An early example of grounded, woman-defined research emerging out of such networks was a study conducted by the Association of Collegiate Alumnae (ACA). This study, completed in 1885, was designed as a direct response to Edward Clarke's *Sex in Education* (1873). Clarke argued on the basis of a few anecdotal examples that intellectual pursuits depleted women's physical health and robbed them of their capacity to reproduce. In response, researchers in the Association surveyed over 1200 women college graduates and found that their responses contradicted Clarke's "evidence."⁶ The study results supported ACA members' determination to provide both graduate and undergraduate opportunities, so that women could do "the hardest kind of intellectual work," add "to the world's stock of knowledge," and join the ranks of teachers and scholars increasingly sought by colleges and universities.⁷ To foster these kinds of opportunities, the Association determined to provide women with fellowships to study in graduate programs in Europe and the United States. The ACA was the first organization to recognize and finance the work of American women scholars; it began doing so as early as 1890 with its annual European Fellowship for overseas graduate work. Over the years, the ACA and then the AAUW became the principal national-level organization to which individuals and groups donated funds to support fellowships and scholarships for women. The contributions of the AAUW to developing social science knowledge cannot be ignored; fellowship funds enabled dozens of women social scientists to pursue graduate study before 1940 and launched them on their academic careers.⁸

Clearly, however, the AAUW's fellowships for graduate students represented a drop in the bucket. Some colleges, including Vassar and Bryn Mawr, provided graduate fellowships for alumnae to study at European institutions. Most graduate institutions also provided in-house fellowships, but women received few of these in the first half of the twentieth century, and before the 1920s money was scarce for both men and women as principal investigators on research projects

of their own. Some funding was available in this period: John D. Rockefeller, Edward S. Harkness, and James B. Duke supported higher education institutions; the General Education Board, the Rosenwald Fund, and the Jeanes Foundation helped finance the construction of public schools in the South; and local and national philanthropies raised funds for relief efforts before and during World War I. But philanthropic foundations did not begin giving generously to social science research until the 1920s. When they did, the money was targeted toward producing scientific data that would support the organization and management of what Guy Alchon calls a “techno-corporatist state.” In other words, funders wanted to promote cooperative management of capitalistic growth by both public and private organizations, with the ultimate goal of reducing class friction, unemployment, and other socioeconomic ills that had emerged by the turn of the century with the expansion of industrial capitalism.⁹

Several philanthropies supplied some funds for survey research, industrial studies, and investigative reports before the 1920s. The most notable, the Russell Sage Foundation, began financing studies in 1907, but research was only one of several funding priorities, and the studies were designed to furnish “disinterested” statistical and other kinds of information for voluntary associations, government offices, and legislators attempting to address large social problems at the municipal and state levels. Academic researchers received some of the Russell Sage funds, but most of the support stayed within the foundation for internally led studies or was administered through local charity organization societies, of the kind conducted by Mary Richmond in Philadelphia and New York, as Sarah Lederman illustrates in this volume.¹⁰

But these institutional grants were exceptions; male and female social scientists in the early 1900s relied largely on individuals or families to support projects. Women carried this pattern forward into the 1920s and 1930s, often using the funds to develop and maintain cooperative and multidisciplinary projects that explored social economic and social welfare problems. Two cases illustrate this form of support: the social economy research program at the University of California, Berkeley, and the Council of Industrial Studies at Smith College. I focus on these two programs because they capture emerging fields within the study of economics and economic history. In addition, they demonstrate how critical noninstitutional grants were in supporting women’s efforts to develop new social science knowledge, particularly in the interwar period. Finally, the Berkeley and Smith programs sug-

gest the kinds of contexts in which women were able to elicit and use such support. The former program emerged in a university that was transforming its identity from a teaching to a research institution; the latter developed in a women's college, where graduate students were scarce and monetary resources for supporting faculty research were almost nonexistent.

THE UC BERKELEY SOCIAL ECONOMY RESEARCH PROGRAM

The social economy research program at Berkeley was developed largely by one faculty member: Jessica B. Peixotto, the first woman appointed full-time to the University of California faculty. She had received her Ph.D. (the second awarded to a woman at Berkeley) in political economy in 1900 after completing a dissertation entitled "The French Revolution and Modern French Socialism" under Bernard Moses. In 1904 she became the economics department's lecturer in socialism. Promoted to assistant professor in socialism (1907), then associate professor (1912), and eventually professor in social economy (1918), she built a steady record of research and service at the local and national levels. By the late 1910s, Peixotto had established social economy as one of the department's three programs, something of a distinction in a department among the earliest to name itself a Department of Economics. Peixotto used the social economy program to bring more women into this department at Berkeley, one of the few in the country to hire women as instructors and, in time, as tenure-track faculty.¹¹

After completing service during World War I as a member of the Council of Defense Subcommittee on Women and Children, Peixotto began enlarging her earlier research program by conducting a study for the California Civil Service Commission that investigated cost of living issues among clerical, wage-earning, and executive state employees. From this study, Peixotto concluded that annual pricing of family and household budgets could be theoretically interesting if she expanded the criteria typically used to examine the decision-making processes in household spending.

It was this work that captured Clara Hellman Heller's interest and drew her financial support. Heller was a close friend of Peixotto's; both women had come of age in the upper echelons of San Francisco's merchant elite and shared similar progressive political views. Peixotto's father Raphael had moved to the city when Jessica was a child and

raised his large family there as he expanded his business interests. Heller's father, Isaias Hellman, was a banker who migrated north from Los Angeles and developed both business and real estate holdings in the city. Her husband, Emanuel S. Heller, a lawyer with a lucrative practice, was a University of California alumnus and himself a philanthropist. But it was largely Clara Heller's money that supported Peixotto's work. She was a generous benefactor of the university and the Democratic Party as well as such San Francisco institutions as the San Francisco Opera, the Symphony Association, the Museum of Art, and the Children's Hospital.¹²

Heller's ongoing grants for Peixotto's work were targeted to help expand the research capabilities of women in social science at Berkeley. They contributed significantly to the development of consumer economics in a critical period. And her faith in the nature and quality of the research moved her to continue supporting the Heller Committee for Research in Social Economy under the leadership of Emily Huntington, who took over after Peixotto retired in 1935. By 1943, Heller's annual grants totaled \$63,050, and when she died, her son (who was on the university's board of regents) continued to finance the committee until his death in 1961.¹³

Heller expected the committee to conduct "studies of problems in Social Economics with special reference to conditions in the State of California." Peixotto used this broad mandate to become a major influence in developing the theoretical and empirical sophistication of the field of consumer economics. The Heller studies can be divided into three groups: quantity and cost budgets, published annually; income and expenditure studies; and special studies. The first two comprised cost of living studies and bore some relationship to the third, which encompassed investigations into such areas as care for the dependent aged and children, unemployment relief and the unemployed, California's labor market and problems of re-employment, the nutritive value of diets among particular population groups, and standards and methods of relief.¹⁴

The quantity and cost budget studies began with a straightforward premise. In perusing the cost of living research, Peixotto discovered that not enough distinction was made between the ways families in various social and economic groups spent their money in relation to their incomes. Beginning in 1923, the committee conducted price surveys in the San Francisco Bay region to determine the living costs for families of wage earners, clerks, and professionals. By 1929, Peixotto

could claim that the budgets were “used in wage arbitrations, by union and business officials, charity workers, the Labor Bureau, Inc., the State Bureau of Labor Statistics, and other agencies.” In 1932–1933, the committee added a fourth budget, to cover dependent families on relief. A fifth was added in 1939; it investigated single working women’s living costs.¹⁵

One innovation in the committee’s approach was the wide range of items priced—from food to household furnishings to recreation activities—and the incorporation of concerns about other household management costs. This work was modified and revised whenever the committee pursued an income and expenditure study that contributed new insights into the substance and methods of the budget surveys. The result, as Peixotto claimed in 1933, was a rare effort “to measure [the changing standards of living] in quantitative terms,” involving tracking the “increasing proportion of income that is being spent for the so-called ‘miscellaneous’ items—including automobiles, recreation, in fact all expenses other than food, clothing, and shelter.” The index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics did not reflect the typical expenses of salaried professionals—including domestic service and automobile upkeep—and applied the clothing expenditures for wage earners to middle-class earners. Peixotto suggested in 1935 that “the interest in these budgets continues, particularly since no other agency in the country prices a complete set of detailed budgets at regular intervals.” Moreover, the attention to detail regarding how families spent their incomes, as opposed to how economists thought they probably spent it, expanded the categories examined and made the studies more reliable.¹⁶

Another innovation was Peixotto’s challenge to the taboo of violating that “romantic and shadowy domain of home life, ‘hopelessly private,’ ‘sacred,’ ” in which families had been “shut away” making their budgetary decisions. Introducing psychologically and sociologically informed explanations of consumer choice, she presented a case for “the American standard of living” reflected in professionals’ desires and actual decisions, a standard that represented a kind of ideal annual household income for all “standard” families consisting of a husband, a wife, and “two growing children.” She developed what she called the “‘comfort’ standard,” of about “\$7,000, the sum needed to satisfy a set of desires for goods and services, desires that at the present time influence widely and profoundly the way men earn their money and the way they spend it.” Moreover, she brought this “hopelessly private”

life, in which middle-class women played an increasingly dominant role, into public discussion by publishing the research and encouraging its use in the making of public policy. By using as a guiding principle “the unswerving faith of our time in the social value of a rising standard of living; the growing belief especially among wage earners in a universal ‘right’ to a comfort standard,” she succeeded in placing economic decisions at the household level squarely within a widely shared social vision of American middle-class life. No doubt Peixotto’s personal experience, including the eleven years she devoted to domestic and charitable occupations between high school and college to satisfy her father’s paternalistic concerns, helped to shape her understanding of these issues. But so, too, did the changing conditions of social and economic relationships in families and in society; the age of advertising and consumption framed the ways families, and often women, made decisions about household budgets.¹⁷

The Heller Committee program of the late 1920s and early 1930s reflected Peixotto’s success in connecting the committee’s research and distribution activities to other local agencies, including the YWCA, welfare associations, unions, and school boards. Under Huntington, the most significant larger-scale special studies of the middle to late 1930s were an indication of the committee’s effort to place the local findings in a national context, in light of New Deal efforts to respond to unemployment and poverty. By insisting that the committee remain in the economics department, governed by faculty members appointed by the chair, Peixotto and Heller assured that the work would have an impact on the character of the department, as well as on the larger social economic research and policymaking community. As many of the researchers actually associated with Heller Committee work were women Ph.D. students and faculty in economics and home economics, the committee created a safe and respected haven for women social scientists at the University of California in the very years the university was expanding both its research and its teaching commitments in the state. Further, the Heller annual donations were among the university’s earliest sources of outside funding for social science research. When the university agreed to begin financing the committee’s work, Heller’s donations decreased proportionally. When the university’s commitment slackened under the presidency of Robert Gordon Sproul in the 1930s because the research itself was considered less significant than other kinds of social and economic research and theory making, Hel-

ler's donations increased in order to sustain the committee's work, still in demand by such agencies as the Brookings Institution.¹⁸

Why is this case significant in a collection of studies of women and educational philanthropy? First, the University of California was a land-grant institution. Accordingly, until the 1920s most public funding for research went to projects in the sciences and to studies related to agriculture and food production, major contributors to the state's economy. Consumer economics was not a priority of the state, nor was labor economics until the middle to late 1920s. The Heller grant provided seed money, or an opening for the university to help finance the research. Second, the funding and the program transformed the department's activities and faculty representation. The Berkeley Department of Economics was among the very few then extant to appoint not just one woman, but eventually four in positions that led to tenure; three became full professors in economics and the fourth a full professor in the law school. Still other women were appointed to faculty research and assistant positions for varying periods of time. Third, the social economy program was unusual in its full integration into the department's teaching and research. The Heller funding raised the profile of Peixotto and the work of her social economy colleagues and students among members of the university community. And it served the university well in the 1930s. When President Sproul received inquiries regarding the university's response to the Depression, he could point to the work in the department. Heller's support was critical to creating and maintaining these distinctive characteristics in Berkeley's economics department for four decades. Fourth, the grant enabled women to direct research into areas that were avoided or overlooked by male economists. Because this research focused on households and used women as informants about budgetary decision making, they were less likely to be funded by foundations seeking to support the more "objective" and "scientific" domains of male economists' work.¹⁹

THE SMITH COLLEGE COUNCIL OF INDUSTRIAL STUDIES

The Smith College Council of Industrial Studies offers a different example of creatively funded research. Supported largely by a single donor to further the work of women social scientists on the Smith faculty, the Council conducted research that could not have been done

otherwise. In the 1920s and 1930s, Smith College occasionally provided faculty with leaves of absence and small stipends in order to foster faculty development. Although hiring of women faculty expanded in most colleges in the 1920s, funding for “extras” like research was not plentiful. By the 1930s, colleges were hard-pressed even to hire new faculty. Small stipends were available to faculty with strong proposals (they were typically used for travel, books, or research assistance), but completing social science research projects was often difficult and expensive in colleges located in relatively rural areas. Thus, women faculty at Smith’s Northampton, Massachusetts, campus felt the effects of isolation, the struggle for access to libraries, the need for clerical assistance to complete statistical research, and a heavy teaching load. As an economist herself and a member of the faculty, donor Dorothy Wolff Douglas recognized these difficulties.²⁰

Douglas was appointed instructor in the economics department at Smith in 1924, just before she finished her Ph.D. at Columbia in French economic history and theory. She had been married to economist Paul H. Douglas, who relinquished his position at the University of Chicago to teach at Amherst in order to keep his household and family intact and encourage his wife’s academic career. By 1930, when Smith promoted her to assistant professor, Douglas was divorced, caring for four children, and sharing her house in Northampton with her domestic partner Katherine D. Lumpkin. She had inherited a good deal of family money and contributed generously to social and political causes, particularly those supporting organized labor. By the 1930s she was exploring female and child labor and labor legislation. One result was *Child Workers in America* (1937), co-authored with Lumpkin. Her politics and her own research shaped her belief that contemporary policy discussions, particularly regarding labor issues, had to be informed by economic history. Her contributions to establish the Council of Industrial Studies at Smith arose out of these concerns and commitments.²¹

On condition that it remain independent of the economics department and include an interdisciplinary advisory board of faculty from Smith’s economics and history departments, Douglas provided a grant of \$3,500 to Smith College to establish and develop the Council in 1932. She believed the focus should be on the Connecticut River Valley region and suggested that the college contribute up to \$1,500 beginning in the second two years, after which her support would end and the college could decide whether to continue the Council’s work.

William A. Neilson, Smith's president, appointed Katherine D. Lumpkin to serve as the Council's first director (1932–1939) on a half-time basis. Lumpkin had done some master's-level work in sociology at Columbia, participated in a YWCA effort toward interracial student organization in her native South, finished a Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin in 1929, and taught at Mount Holyoke for one year. This was followed by a research fellowship from the Social Science Research Council to study families in New York seeking public assistance, and then by involvement in a project with the Bryn Mawr Department of Social Economy and Social Research.²²

The work of the Council represented a concerted effort to make this a coordinated enterprise—to utilize the expertise of faculty at a number of colleges in the region, to offer research support to graduate students from other institutions working on their dissertations, and to envision the projects as a series of related studies that would yield a coherent body of work about the valley. The grant was designed to accomplish two additional goals. One was to capture the region's historical and economic transformations over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The other was to collect and preserve whatever documentary evidence existed in the various industrial and social agencies in the valley. Both of these, Douglas hoped, would also result in some collaboration with businesses, agencies, and individuals in the region, helping to popularize the idea of research within local communities.²³

Two directors, first Lumpkin and then Constance McLaughlin Green, headed the Council's program from 1939 to 1948. The chair throughout the 1930s and 1940s was Esther Lowenthal, professor of economics at Smith. Douglas, Lumpkin, and Lowenthal originally hoped that the committee's research would explore why industries that had long been located in the valley were abandoning "valuable property" to undertake "new investment" outside of western Massachusetts. But because some industrial leaders would not open their papers and decision-making processes to Smith's researchers, the Council settled on exploring the impact "of plant abandonment" on families, institutions, government, and other economic activity when a major industry pulled up stakes and left town. By the early 1950s, the Council had produced studies exploring the development and decline of transportation systems, trade practices going back to the colonial period, agricultural practices in the nineteenth century, women workers in local war industries, and the rise and decline of a number of industries in

the Holyoke and Springfield areas. The studies were all carefully coordinated to increase understanding of the region's transformation historically and as it was actually taking place by the middle of the twentieth century. The second Douglas donation of \$3,500 was depleted by 1936, and the Smith College board of trustees agreed to support the Council's work on a year-by-year basis, with a reduced budget, until Green resigned after her husband's sudden death in 1948. By then, the Council had produced a significant body of research and uncovered and helped to preserve a large collection of primary materials that otherwise would have been lost to subsequent researchers.²⁴

The Smith case presents an important form of creative financing by and for women. For Lumpkin and the Smith faculty, the Council offered resources for pursuing work in economic history and labor economics during the Depression, when private and public funding for social science research was harder to obtain than it had been in the 1920s. This was particularly the case for women doctoral students at the dissertation stage. By 1938, five of approximately seven projects conducted by the fellows were being used for dissertation studies. Smith College faculty were able to work with doctoral-level students, a rarity at the women's colleges, where most women academic social science scholars were employed. In addition, the studies produced invaluable archival materials: diaries, collections of correspondence, oral histories, industrial publications going back to the colonial period, and a variety of business papers and town records. These materials were catalogued and preserved by the Council's researchers. Finally, the studies were coordinated in an unusually rigorous way for social science research. The Council's projects offered the opportunity to examine the impact of the immediate economic situation on the valley; by focusing on the region, Douglas, Lowenthal, and Lumpkin ensured that as each project was defined it fit within the larger scope of the grant, contributed to the other studies, and extended and enriched the body of work the Council produced. And in the process of creating this work, both the knowledge and the networks of the women increased. The fellows often overlapped in their stay at Smith and were able to share work with each other, while benefiting from faculty oversight. The scholarship produced was impressive; many of the studies were published in *Smith College Studies in History*.²⁵ Thus, as in the Social Economy program at Berkeley, targeted, private funding had a measurable impact on social science research by women at Smith.

FOUNDATION SUPPORT: THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA CASE

Beginning in the 1920s the third type of funding—foundation grants—became available when women academic social scientists were able to access funds already allotted to male colleagues. The University of Chicago's Local Community Research Committee, Harvard's Bureau of International Research, and the University of Pennsylvania's Department of Industrial Research are examples of programs that received such funding. (An exception was a \$7,000 grant Emily Huntington secured from the Rockefeller Foundation to augment Heller funds for a study of unemployment and re-employment in California in 1937; she remained the principal investigator and controlled the grant.) The situation at Penn nicely illustrates how women scholars made use of foundation money.

Penn's Department of Industrial Research was initially financed by the Carnegie Corporation, the Philadelphia Association for the Discussion of Employment Problems, and the university under the direction of Joseph Willits in 1921, who co-founded the department with Anne Bezanson and appointed her as his assistant director. In 1928–1929, after the Carnegie Corporation ended its support, the department received a five-year grant from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM), effectively tripling the budget for that period. The grant was given on condition that the university increase its support over the same period.²⁶

Bezanson, who did not initially have a faculty appointment at Penn despite her Ph.D. in economics from Harvard (1929), became co-director in 1934, after Willits left to act as dean of the Wharton School. In 1939, when Willits left for the Rockefeller Foundation, Bezanson became director. The department was established to offer courses in industrial relations and to pursue “co-operative industrial research in the Philadelphia community.” As funding increased in the late 1920s, its purposes expanded to include building social science research within the community. Another emergent goal, that of conducting “fundamental studies of the economic and human problems and phenomena of industry,” gave the faculty and research associates considerable latitude in designing projects. This latitude was always tempered by the idea that the research itself would be conducted in a coordinated fashion rather than by lone scholars in isolation.²⁷

The Rockefeller support for Penn's Department of Industrial Research continued into the middle 1940s, although at a reduced level.

As a result of this financing, approximately one-third of its total budget over two decades, the department created an enormous body of research. This encompassed work in personnel and labor relations; the hosiery, upholstery, textile, and bituminous coal industries; and community labor studies that included examinations of labor market trends, personnel relations, wages, and transportation. Under Bezanon and Willits, the department hired several women to conduct research, including Eleanor Lansing Dulles, who contributed a number of studies, and Gladys Palmer, who directed the research after Bezanon's retirement. These appointments occurred at a time when the University of Pennsylvania hired no women to its social science faculty.²⁸

In the early twentieth century, women scholars in the social sciences turned to a number of sources in their quest for research funding. Individual and family donor support for research was highly valued in certain kinds of institutions into the 1920s, including colleges and universities in the early stages of redefining themselves as research institutions in the social as well as other sciences. This was largely because few other external sources of funding existed for these research interests. Such support continued to be important into the 1930s and 1940s for maintaining research programs that otherwise would not have received any outside funding. However, in the 1920s philanthropic foundation support had surpassed this earlier kind of funding both in quantity and in its ability to accord status to the receiving institutions. The experience of the Industrial Research Department at the University of Pennsylvania illustrates what large allocations of research funds made possible for scholars in institutions fortunate enough to benefit from them. For women social science scholars who did not have access to these funds, the best means of gaining financing and controlling their own projects was by securing the first and second kinds of support: fellowships for investigator-initiated projects, and grants from private individuals to support programs and research projects in the institutions in which women academics worked—typically four-year colleges, often women's. By the 1930s, both of these kinds of financing offered women far less prestige and recognition in the social sciences than foundation support granted to a named principal investigator, but both were critical to keeping women in the academic social sciences and funding their work.

When women were the beneficiaries of foundation support in programs such as Penn's, they were not usually able to translate that support into career advancement strategies at the pace and rate of men. They rarely were granted principal investigator status or appointed to the research universities most prominent in social science research. Emily Huntington at Berkeley, Anne Bezanson at Penn, and a few others were exceptions. Given this lack of professional visibility and recognition, the extent to which women were able to carry on their research programs is truly remarkable. The support these scholars received was largely due to their sharing research and reform goals with wealthy donors, carefully cultivating these donors and aligning with them in commitment to women as researchers and the kinds of knowledge needed for municipal and state social reform, and determinedly pursuing continued and new funding.

This resourcefulness and persistence were set against a variety of difficult limitations throughout the first half of the twentieth century, including institutional discrimination—which relegated most women academic Ph.D.s in social sciences to teaching colleges—as well as a system of philanthropic financing that favored male rather than female leadership in social science research. The constraints women researchers faced make all the more clear how important creative financing was for women social scientists in the 1920s and 1930s, the decades when increasing numbers of women were completing Ph.D.s and entering academe. Situated in the women's colleges, these scholars not only lacked access to foundation support for research in the 1920s, but were also not as well protected as their male research university colleagues from the budgetary reductions higher education institutions suffered in the 1930s.²⁹

The women I have discussed here brought to their work a commitment to understanding the impact of economic change on social organizations and relations at the state and community levels, combining the most recent methodologies (in statistical and ethnographic research) with the questions they identified as critical. Peixotto's work in social economics at Berkeley yielded new theoretical perspectives, while Lumpkin and the Council of Industrial Studies at Smith—and, to some extent, Bezanson and the Penn Industrial Relations Department—enlarged understanding of the regional effects of historical economic changes. In examining what Bezanson accomplished with large-scale funding from the LSRM, one cannot help but wonder what kind

of impact Peixotto's and Lumpkin's research might have had on the social science disciplines and public policy had they had access to similar support.

Much of the work of these research enterprises was in high demand by federal and local agencies, and the demand increased throughout the Depression. As Nancy Folbre suggests, women economists (and social economists, particularly) braved the masculine world of academic economics—the basic premises of which were designed to protect patriarchal interests in economic theory and research—in order to promote research questions that granted women an active place in the productive economy. Folbre focuses on Edith Abbott's and Sophonisba Breckinridge's struggles to frame the discipline and influence public policy, but her conclusions also apply to the cases of Peixotto and Lumpkin. Peixotto's efforts to explore how household earnings and consumption functioned in relation to each other, and Lumpkin's efforts to understand local regional economic transformation, were unlike most kinds of research financed by large funding organizations in that period. Nevertheless, these studies produced important findings for policy makers and others seeking to offer municipal, state, or philanthropic intervention in an unstable economic period. Their studies continue to be important to anthropologists seeking to understand the sociohistorical transformations that shaped the physical and cultural contexts of the populations they investigate. Further, the value of those studies today is inestimable for economists who, rather than relying primarily on rational choice models to explain economic activity, are seeking to understand how the discipline developed and to place economic activity in broader and more complex social contexts.³⁰

NOTES

My thanks to Peter Best, Peter D. Hall, Andrea Walton, and the contributors to this volume for their critical readings of different versions of this chapter, and to the Spencer Foundation for its generous support of the larger project of which this is a part.

1. Margaret Rossiter argues that “creative” philanthropy was also “coercive,” used to pressure institutions to accept women graduate students and appoint women faculty (*Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940* [Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982], 39). For information about Parsons, see Louis A. Hieb, “Elsie Clews Parsons in the Southwest,” in *Hidden Scholars: Women Anthropol-*

ogists and the Native American Southwest, ed. Nancy J. Parezo (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1993), 63–75; Desley Deacon, *Elsie Clews Parsons: Inventing Modern Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), chapter 10; and Andrea Walton, “Rethinking Boundaries: The History of Women, Philanthropy, and Higher Education,” *History of Higher Education Annual* 20 (2000): 29–57. Kamala Visweswaran analyzes the financing women anthropologists obtained in “‘Wild West’ Anthropology and the Disciplining of Gender,” in *Gender and American Social Science: The Formative Years*, ed. Helene Silverberg (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998), 86–123.

2. Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *The Power and Passion of M. Carey Thomas* (New York: Knopf, 1994), chapter 12; and David C. Hammack, “A Center of Intelligence for the Charity Organization Movement: The Foundation’s Early Years,” in *Social Science in the Making: Essays on the Russell Sage Foundation, 1907–1972*, ed. David C. Hammack and Stanton Wheeler (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1994), 1–33.

3. Susan Levine, *Degrees of Equality: The American Association of University Women and the Challenge of Twentieth-Century Feminism* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995), 8–9. On the dominant lines of research in social sciences before 1920, see Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

4. Thanks to Andrea Walton for helping me to clarify this point. On funding for women in the sciences, 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; Lawrence K. Frank, “The Status of Social Science in the United States,” 1923, file 679, box 63, series III, Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, N.Y. (hereafter cited as LSRMA); and Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies*, 39, 46–50, 205–206.

5. Rosalind Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1982); Ellen Fitzpatrick, *Endless Crusade: Women Social Scientists and Progressive Reform* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); and Robyn Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform, 1890–1935* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991). On the importance of female networks in securing support, see Lynn D. Gordon, *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1990).

6. See Edward H. Clarke, *Sex in Education; or, A Fair Chance for the Girls* (Boston: James R. Osgood, 1873); and Sue Zschoche, “Dr. Clarke Revisited: Science, True Womanhood, and Female Collegiate Education,” *History of Education Quarterly* 29 (winter 1989): 545–69.

7. Christine Ladd Franklin, quoted in Ruth W. Tryon, *Investment in Creative Scholarship: A History of the Fellowship Program of the American Association of University Women, 1890–1956* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women, 1957), 5.

8. Marion Talbot and Lois Kimball Mathews Rosenberry, *The History of the American Association of University Women, 1881–1931* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931); Levine, *Degrees of Equality*; and Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940*, 39–40. For the period after 1940, see Linda Eisenmann’s chapter on continuing education for women, this volume; and Margaret W. Rossiter,

Women Scientists in America: Before Affirmative Action, 1940–1972 (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995).

9. Guy Alchon, *The Invisible Hand of Planning: Capitalism, Social Science, and the State in the 1920s* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985), 5. On fellowship allotment, see Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940*, chapter 10; and Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres*. See also Robert H. Bremner, *American Philanthropy*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), chapters 7 and 8; and Theresa Richardson and Donald Fisher, "Introduction: The Social Sciences and Their Philanthropic Mentors," in *The Development of the Social Sciences in the United States and Canada: The Role of Philanthropy*, ed. Theresa Richardson and Donald Fisher (Stamford, Conn.: Ablex, 1999), 3–21.

10. John M. Glenn, Lilian Brandt, and F. Emerson Andrews, *Russell Sage Foundation, 1907–1946*, vol. 2 (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1947), 678. Leah Feder, a doctoral student in social economy at Bryn Mawr College, received funds for her thesis research and writing ("Unemployment Relief in Periods of Depression"): see student files, School of Social Work and Social Research Papers, Bryn Mawr College Archives, Canaday Library, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. (hereafter cited as BMCA); and Mary Ann Dzuback, "Women and Social Research at Bryn Mawr College, 1915–1940," *History of Education Quarterly* 33 (winter 1993): 579–608. On the goals of the Russell Sage Foundation, see Hammack, "Center of Intelligence"; Guy Alchon, "The 'Self-Appraising Sincerity' of Overreaching Theory, Biography as Ethical Practice, and the Case of Mary van Kleeck," in *Gender and American Social Science*, ed. Silverberg, 293–325; and Sarah Henry Lederman, this volume. On Sage, see Ruth Crocker, "Margaret Olivia Slocum, 'Mrs. Russell Sage': Private Grievs and Public Duties," in *Ordinary Women, Extraordinary Lives: Women in American History*, ed. Kriste Lindenmeyer (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 2000), 147–59; and Crocker's chapter about Sage's involvement in philanthropy for higher education, this volume.

11. Most economics study was conducted in economics and sociology departments or political economy departments that included political science programs; see Mary E. Cookingham, "Social Economists and Reform: Berkeley, 1906–1961," *History of Political Economy* 19 (1987): 47–65. The other two programs in the Berkeley department were in business economics and labor economics. On Peixotto: Jessica B. Peixotto Papers, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley (hereafter cited as BL); Henry Rand Hatfield, "Jessica Blanche Peixotto," in *Essays in Social Economics in Honor of Jessica Blanche Peixotto* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1935), 5–14; Clarke A. Chambers, "Peixotto, Jessica Blanche," in *Notable American Women, 1607–1950*, vol. 3, ed. Edward T. James, Janet Wilson James, and Paul S. Boyer (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971), 42–43; "Jessica Blanche Peixotto," *In Memoriam* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941), 24–25; Mary Ann Dzuback, "Peixotto, Jessica Blanche," in *American National Biography*, ed. John Garraty (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); and Clark Kerr, interview with author, 14 May 1996, Berkeley, Calif.

12. William R. Roberts, archivist at the University of California, Berkeley, was most helpful in searching for more information on the Hellers. See "Rites Today for Clara H. Heller," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 18 August 1959, 41; and "Heller Millions to 3 Grandchildren," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 25 August 1959, 36.

13. For the reports of the committee, see Heller Committee, University of California Presidents' Papers (CU-5 series 2) for Campbell and Sproul, University Archives, BL. (University of California Presidents' Papers are hereafter cited as PP, with the then president's name and the year of the item in question.) For the committee under Emily Huntington, see her "The Heller Committee for Research in Social Economy," 20 January 1943, PP (Sproul), 1943: 471. Heller's annual support varied over three decades, beginning at \$4,000 per year throughout the 1920s, decreasing to \$2,400 per year in the 1930s, when the university began allocating research funds to the committee, and increasing to \$3,600 in 1935 and to \$4,800 in 1940.

14. Jessica B. Peixotto, "Annual Report on the Heller Fund for Research in Social Economics" (hereafter cited as HC Annual Report), 1, PP (Campbell), 1924: 1388.

15. Peixotto, HC Annual Report (1929–30), 4, PP (Sproul), 1930: 248. See also Huntington, "Heller Committee," 471. Some of this work was completed in cooperation with the university's Department of Home Economics; see Maresi Nerad, *The Academic Kitchen: A Social History of Gender Stratification at the University of California, Berkeley* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999).

16. Peixotto to Julius Wangenheim, 7 June 1933, PP (Sproul), 1933: 471; and Peixotto, HC Annual Report (1935), 3, PP (Sproul), 1936: 471.

17. Jessica B. Peixotto, *Getting and Spending at the Professional Standard of Living: A Study of the Costs of Living an Academic Life* (New York: Macmillan, 1927), vii, viii.

18. Emily H. Huntington, *Unemployment Relief and the Unemployed, 1929–1934* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939), 1, 3.

19. A. O. Leuschner to Dean C. B. Lipman, 29 October 1930, PP (Sproul), Economics/Heller Committee: 1930: 248. On Peixotto's contributions to economics, see Joseph Dorfman, *The Economic Mind in American Civilization*, vol. 5 (New York: Viking, 1959), 570–78; and Elizabeth Hoyt, *The Consumption of Wealth* (New York: Macmillan, 1928). See also Nancy Folbre, "The 'Sphere of Women' in Early Twentieth-Century Economics," in *Gender and American Social Science*, ed. Silverberg, 35–60.

20. Social Science Research Council, "Summary of the Conference on Research in the Social Sciences in Colleges," 12 and 13 December 1931, 8–10, Marion Edwards Park Office Files, 1922–1942, box 28, BMCA.

21. On Douglas, see Faculty Biographical Files, Dorothy Douglas, Smith College Archives, Northampton, Mass. (hereafter cited as FBF). On Douglas and Lumpkin, see Daniel Horowitz, *Betty Friedan and the Making of the Feminine Mystique: The American Left, the Cold War, and Modern Feminism* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998), chapter 3.

22. "Suggested plan," n.d. (circa 1932), box 38, Office of the President, William A. Neilson Papers, Council on Industrial Studies Files, box 38, SCA (hereafter cited as WAN). On Lumpkin, see FBF, Katherine Du Pre Lumpkin; Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, "'To Widen the Reach of Our Love': Autobiography, History, and Desire," *Feminist Studies* 26 (spring 2000): 230–47; idem, "Open Secrets: Memory, Imagination, and the Refashioning of Southern Identity," *American Quarterly* 50 (March 1998), 109–24; and Katharine Du Pre Lumpkin, *The Making of a Southerner* (New York: Knopf, 1946).

23. Katherine D. Lumpkin, "Report of the Director of Research of the Council

of Industrial Studies," *Bulletin of Smith College, President's Report Issue*, 1933, 49–57, SCA.

24. Esther Lowenthal, "Foreword," in Katharine Du Pre Lumpkin, *Shutdowns in the Connecticut Valley: A Study of Worker Displacement in the Small Industrial Community*, *Smith College Studies in History*, vol. 19, April–July 1934, 141, SCA. See also correspondence on Council of Industrial Studies, boxes 398 and 38, WAN.

25. Katherine D. Lumpkin, "Brief Resume of the Work of the Council of Industrial Studies, 1932–1938," box 398, WAN; and idem, "Report(s) of the Director of Research of the Council of Industrial Studies," in *Bulletin of Smith College, President's Report Issue*, 1933–1938, SCA. See also vols. 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 33, 37, *Smith College Studies in History*.

26. The Carnegie Corporation shifted support from research institutes to popular education in the middle to late 1920s (Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, *The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy* [Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1989]). On the LSRM grant: Josiah H. Penniman to Beardsley Ruml, 13 June 1927, and other materials in file 792, box 75, series III, LSRMA. The university's obligation increased from \$10,000 (1928–29) to \$40,000 (1931–32); the LSRM's decreased from \$50,000 (1927–28) to \$10,000 (1931–32).

27. *University of Pennsylvania: The Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, Announcement, 1922–1923* (Philadelphia: University Press of Pennsylvania, 1921), 66; and *Announcement, 1934–1935*, 26, University Archives, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. According to Steven A. Sass, LSRM funding increased the budget to over \$110,000 (*The Pragmatic Imagination: A History of the Wharton School, 1881–1981* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982], 208).

28. The Rockefeller Foundation appropriated \$50,000 over two years in 1932 and \$75,000 over five years in 1935 ("Minutes," 9 May 1932 and 17 April 1935, box 5, file 78); in 1939, the Foundation gave \$11,000 for two specific projects (Norma S. Thompson to Alfred H. Williams, 25 October 1939, box 8, file 112); and in 1940, \$105,000 for three years ("Minutes," 17 May 1940, box 5, file 78); all in Rockefeller Foundation Archives, record group 1.1, series 241, Rockefeller Archive Center.

29. See, for example, Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (1962; reprint, with an introduction and bibliography by John R. Thelin, Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990), 465–69; and Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies*, chapters 6 and 7.

30. Folbre, "Sphere of Women," 54; Alan Swedlund, University of Massachusetts, conversation with author, August 1993; and David Hogan, formerly of the University of Pennsylvania, conversation with author, July 1993. See also, for example, Marianne A. Ferber and Julie A. Nelson, eds., *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993); and Helene Silverberg, "Introduction," in *Gender and American Social Science*, ed. Silverberg, 3–32.