Mark A. May: Scientific administrator, human engineer

Dennis Bryson
Bilkent University, Turkey

Abstract

Underappreciated by historians of the human sciences, educational psychologist Mark A. May played a key role in managing and formulating the policy of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale University, initially as the institute's executive secretary, then as its director, from 1930 to 1960. Moreover, during the 1920s, the 1930s and after, he participated in a number of conferences, seminars, committees and other projects sponsored by the Social Science Research Council and Rockefeller philanthropic organizations. Focusing on May's efforts during the interwar period, this article will examine how May worked to advance an integrated program in the psychological and social sciences affiliated with the field of personality and culture. For May, a human engineering agenda geared toward the socialization and education of the individual was intimately connected to his vision of interdisciplinary social science.

Keywords

human engineering, Institute of Human Relations, Mark A. May, personality and culture, socialization

Introduction

Educational psychologist Mark A. May (1891–1977) played an important role in promoting and directing collaborative and interdisciplinary efforts in the psychological and social sciences in the United States during a three-decade period, from about the mid-1920s to the mid-1950s. For May, these efforts were closely connected with a

Corresponding author:
Dennis Bryson, Faculty of Humanities and Letters, Department of American Culture and Literature, Bilkent University, Bilkent, Ankara, TR 08600, Turkey.
Email: dennis@bilkent.edu.tr

human engineering agenda aimed at the socialization and education of the personality and 'character' of the individual, and, more generally, especially during the 1930s, at the reconstruction of western culture. His goal was to re-engineer human beings by fostering the formation of cooperative, self-controlled and non-antagonistic personalities, who would be able to deal with the exigencies of modern life in a socially adjusted manner. Ever fearful of social conflict and disintegration, May hoped that the psychological and social sciences would contribute, by means of human engineering, to a cooperative, integrated and pacified community life, in which such phenomena as anxiety, frustration, aggression, competition, strife and war would be attenuated. May's concern with socialization and education as modes of human engineering was amply demonstrated in his efforts as executive secretary and director of the Yale Institute of Human Relations (IHR), an organization that engaged in one of the most important efforts at interdisciplinary research in the human sciences during the interwar years. Eventually, his agenda on the socialization and education of the individual was made subordinate to – while continuing to persist within the framework of – the quest for 'a unified basic science of behavior' at the institute (May, 1971: 151). Significantly, May also came to play a major role in promoting the new unified science of behavior, especially from 1937 on.

My focus in this article will be on May's activities as an administrator and participant in a series of interdisciplinary efforts sponsored by the Rockefeller philanthropic organizations, the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and Yale University during the 1920s, the 1930s and the first year or so of the 1940s. While May was not a profoundly original thinker in the conventional sense, he played an important role, and at times a key role, in various seminars, conferences, committees and research projects – and, most importantly, in the Yale Institute of Human Relations – coming to act during these years as a promoter and 'broker' of knowledge in the human sciences. This role provided him with a strategic position within major networks of Rockefeller executives, officers of the SSRC and members of its committees, university administrators, and researchers in the social and psychological sciences. Because of his strategic position within these networks, May's memoranda and reports, his correspondence with other members of these networks, his minutes and notes of committee meetings, and records of his comments at seminars and conferences provide invaluable insights into developments in the human sciences in North America during the interwar years. These writings shed light on the elaboration of such fields as personality and culture, human relations, and the study of socialization, but also on the emergence of the behavioral sciences in general during this period.

Most significantly, a careful reading of May's reports, memoranda and other writings provides new insights into the Yale Institute of Human Relations and its complex and meandering history during the interwar years.[1] May's varied writings not only highlight the key role that he played as the institute's executive secretary and director, but demonstrate how the institute focused over the years on a set of closely related problems and issues concerned with the socialization and education of the individual, even as it shifted from one research agenda to another. In contrast to his own important account of the history of the IHR published in 1950 (and republished, in a somewhat revised form, in 1971), May's other writings suggest that the institute's history was not simply a triumphalist story in which, after a period of confused and misdirected efforts,

the neo-behaviorist approach of psychologist Clark Hull came to prevail. Rather, these writings suggest a different story, one in which alternative research options, such as 'community studies' and 'human relations', were pursued at the IHR, and, indeed, under other circumstances, might have come to prevail. Moreover, these options were not simply superseded or replaced by Hull's neo-behaviorist approach; instead, themes associated with them, especially those regarding the socialization and education of the individual within social and cultural contexts, persisted in the work of researchers affiliated with the IHR. Concomitantly, a human engineering perspective geared toward socialization and education remained a central concern of IHR researchers over the years. As May's writings make clear, he played a major role in advancing such concerns at the institute.

My study of May will build upon and contribute to the work conducted by scholars on the history of collaborative and cross-disciplinary efforts in the human sciences, as facilitated by the foundations, during the 20th century. As D. Fisher (1993), T. Richardson (along with Fisher, 1999), K. J. Biehn (2008), H. Crowther-Heyck (2006), D. Haraway (1989), J. Meyerowitz (2010) and D. Bryson (2005, 2009) have observed, various foundation-sponsored interdisciplinary efforts in the social and behavioral sciences thrived in the 20th century by initiating and mobilizing networks, teams, committees and communities of researchers and administrators. These networks and groupings attempted to foster lines of communication and association that crossed disciplinary boundaries, uniting social and behavioral scientists working on shared problems and issues as well as on the elaboration of various modes of human engineering. The patterning of the networks that resulted from such foundation-sponsored efforts has been characterized by these scholars in the following manner: as forming a 'discourse coalition' consisting of foundation trustees, officers and researchers (Fisher, 1993: 65–6); as a 'web of criss-crossing personnel on the committee, in universities, and on the staff of the big philanthropies' (Haraway, 1989: 71); as an 'informal, interdisciplinary community' of researchers based, in large part, on committees with 'interlocking membership' (Crowther-Heyck, 2006: 313, 320); and as 'philanthropic and academic circles . . . that resemble kinship networks that socialize members and establish their own cultural perspectives' (Richardson and Fisher, 1999: 3). Members of the 'upper echelons' of these networks, such as Yale president James Rowland Angell, have been described as belonging to the 'foundation-interlocking directorate' (Biehn, 2008: 26). Often informal rather than formal lines of authority were utilized to foster these interdisciplinary networks, and common repertoires of concepts, approaches and language, frequently promoted by 'scientific entrepreneurs and brokers', operated to coordinate the activities of their members (Crowther-Heyck, 2006: 328–30).

More specifically, I hope to contribute, as I have indicated above, to the scholarly work on the Yale Institute of Human Relations. Following in the wake of May's influential history of the IHR, mentioned above, historians of the human sciences, including J. Morawski, J. Capshew, R. Lemov and R. Darnell have examined the history of the institute in some detail.[2] In a pioneering article, Morawski (1986) made a major contribution to the understanding of the institute by examining in an extensive manner the founding and operation of the IHR during the interwar years. Her emphasis on how the institute elaborated an approach to interdisciplinary social science which tended to

suspend the subjectivity of the researchers involved, thus making them into cogs in a well-organized 'psychic machine' dedicated to advancing a unified science of behavior, also represented an important contribution (ibid.: 236). Following in May's footsteps, she presented the history of the IHR as the triumph of Hull's neo-behaviorist approach, although, unlike May, she was highly critical of this approach. While she recognized and commented upon May's role as an administrator in the institute, she unwittingly ended up downplaying this role by overstating Hull's contribution to the management and reorganization of the IHR. Capshew (1999), again emphasizing Hull's role within the IHR, supplemented Morawski's work by elaborating on how a number of prominent 20th-century psychologists were trained at the institute. Capshew barely mentioned May in his study of the IHR. In her book *World as Laboratory*, Lemov (2005) examined in detail the role that figures such as Hull, O. H. Mowrer, J. Dollard and G. P. Murdock played within the institute; in doing so, she considered the role of anthropology as well as that of psychology within the institute. She was concerned, in a highly critical manner, with the human engineering implications of IHR research. As with Capshew, she minimized the role of May within the IHR; claiming that May 'favored a touchy-feely-ish program' for the institute, she depicted him as a misguided and bumbling administrator (Lemov, 2005: 72–3). An exception to the neglect of May's role in the IHR by historians is Regna Darnell's perceptive treatment of this role in her book on Edward Sapir; while the focus in her chapter on the IHR was on Sapir's relationship to this organization, she noted that May, along with Angell, 'determined the policy of the IHR' and that he 'was passionately committed to teamwork and synthesis as the IHR mandate' (Darnell, 1990: 384).

May's background, concerns, and participation in collaborative projects

May's biographical background provides useful insight into his thinking and activities as a human scientist and administrator. He was, in a sense, the product of the 19th-century culture of character (to use historian Warren Susman's phrase). Born in Jonesboro, Tennessee, in August 1891, May grew up on a farm in rural Tennessee. At an early age, he decided to become a minister, and he seems to have pursued this goal as an undergraduate in Maryville College, a Presbyterian college in Tennessee, as well as in the course work that he did later in the Divinity School at the University of Chicago and in the Union Theological Seminary in New York City. While at Chicago, he took a course from the psychologist James Rowland Angell;[3] this course, along with others taken at Chicago, increased May's interest in psychology. Abandoning his aspiration to become a minister, May began graduate work in psychology at Columbia University's Teachers College in 1915, working on his doctorate under the direction of Robert S. Woodworth, Edward Thorndike and James McKeen Cattell. Columbia was then a important center for psychology: Woodworth was a leader in experimental psychology and the study of motivation; Thorndike was an expert on learning theory and the study of animal behavior; and Cattell had been an innovator in mental testing and would in the future make important forays into applied psychology (King, Viney and Woody, 2009: 287–91, 308–11). May finished his PhD, entitled *The Mechanism of Controlled Association*, in 1917. After a

stint in the army working in Robert Yerkes' intelligence testing unit during the First World War (for more on Yerkes' unit, see Kevles, 1968; Carson, 1993) – and, within this unit, evaluating the claims of conscientious objectors – May began his academic career, teaching psychology at Syracuse University from 1919 to 1924 and assuming a professorship in educational psychology at Yale University in 1927. (See W. W. May, 1978, for most of the information on May in this paragraph.)

May became involved in the study and assessment of personality and character during the 1920s. As Susman (1984: 271–85) has argued, the early 20th century was an era in which 19th-century notions of character – which referred to the moral attributes of individuals, such as integrity, civic-mindedness, industriousness, self-control and willingness to sacrifice oneself – were being eclipsed by notions of personality, associated with an individual's attractiveness, magnetism, ability to influence others, self-realization, and the like. May seems to have sensed this shift. While nostalgic for the 19th-century culture of character, which presumably prevailed in the rural Tennessee community in which he grew up, he enthusiastically took up personality as a scientific object. Instructively, he saw both character and personality as taking form within group and community contexts. Thus, character could most effectively be cultivated within small groups such as the classroom, while personality, which May conceived of as the 'social stimulus value' of the individual, involved the 'social effectiveness' of the individual within the community.

In 1924, May was hired as co-director of the Character Education Investigation, a project then being initiated with the aim of studying the moral education of children and youth. May's involvement in this study marked the beginning of his long affiliation with Rockefeller philanthropy; the study was funded by the Rockefeller-sponsored Institute of Social and Religious Research (ISRR) under the auspices of the Columbia Teachers College.[4] Under the supervision of Thorndike, May's old mentor at Columbia, May and Hugh Hartshorne (professor of religious education, the University of Southern California) conducted tests on the moral conduct of children and youth in varied situations. The tests, often geared toward quasi-naturalistic situations within the classroom, athletic venues and other contexts, attempted to measure deceit, including cheating, lying and stealing; service, including cooperative and charitable behavior; and self-control, including inhibition and persistence. Statistical techniques were utilized to analyse the data gathered by the tests. May and his collaborators came to the conclusion that unified and coherent moral traits, such as honesty, helpfulness and self-control, were not demonstrated in the behavior of the children that they studied. Rather, children responded not to abstract principles, but to specific situations. Thus, a child might be scrupulously honest with regard to classroom exams but steal money from other children's lockers, or even be honest on exams in arithmetic but cheat on spelling tests. (For brief useful accounts of the Character Education Inquiry, see W. W. May, 1978; Hartshorne and May, 1927; and May's contributions to the American Psychiatric Association, 1929: 49–52.)

According to May and his collaborators, group situations had a profound effect on character. As they observed: 'Whatever concrete reality character may have is to be found . . . not in the isolated individual, but in the fact of social interrelation. Character belongs as much to the group as to its members' (Hartshorne, May and Shuttleworth, 1930: 273). Thus, they found that the peer groups of school children exerted great influence on the moral conduct of children; indeed, the 'code of honor' prevailing

among classmates and groups of children seemed to be the primary factor affecting and 'integrating' their conduct. May and his collaborators summarized the implications of this finding for character education in these words:

> It can hardly be expected that most children can be taught to be responsive to social ideals unsupported by group code and morale . . . The normal unit for character education is the group or small community, which provides through cooperative discussion and effort the moral support required for the adventurous discovery and effective use of ideals in the conduct of affairs. (Hartshorne, May and Shuttleworth, 1930: 379)[5]

From his vision of character education as involving the moral training of the individual within group situations, May came to adopt a special perspective – one which he was to retain for many years – on the training and conduct of researchers within collaborative ventures. Basically, he came to believe that the training of researchers and the fostering of collaborative research required something akin to character education; that is, it required the inculcation of a moral code within researchers. Thus, while May was well aware of the corporate precedents for collaborative research endeavors within such organizations as the Bell Telephone Laboratories (May, n.d.a: 7–8), he tended to stress the ethical dimension of such research. Reflecting on these issues some years after the Character Education Investigation had terminated, May (1943–4: 161) noted that both science and society needed to operate on the basis of moral codes. For scientists, this meant that they needed to dedicate themselves to honesty, to the fearless search for truth, to sharing the results of science, to giving due credit to colleagues and predecessors, to forgoing personal attacks against others (and thus to controlling aggression toward others), to upholding freedom of inquiry, and to interiorizing, as their individual super-egos, these aspects of the moral code of science (May, 1943b: 103–6). Moreover, according to May (1943–4: 160–1), scientists needed to cultivate such traits as objectivity, rationality, modesty and humility. Most importantly, researchers involved in collaborative endeavors would need to learn habits of cooperation (May, n.d.a) – habits that, for May, represented a form of moral conduct, as we have seen above.[6]

May increasingly came to concern himself with the concept of personality during the late 1920s and the 1930s. May formulated an approach stressing the 'social stimulus value' of personality – an approach focused on the 'social effectiveness' of the individual with respect to the response of others to that individual.[7] Emphasizing the manner in which the individual's personality was embedded in the social group, May explained that personality as social stimulus value represented the manner in which the individual impressed other people with regard to an array of variables, including the individual's physique, voice and use of language, dress, manners, habits, abilities, and the like (May, 1929: 766). He noted that his approach to personality was 'quite in accord with the common-sense view taken by the man in the street. The adjectives popularly used to describe personality are such as attractive, forceful, strong, magnetic, or their opposites. These adjectives are not descriptive of the individual's social reactions, but rather of him as a social stimulus' (May, 1971[1932]: 83). Fearful that social conflict would disintegrate the community – which May had come to view as similar to, and even continuous with, the biological organism (May, 1929: 769, 778, 783) – May eventually

came to be concerned with the effect that socially disruptive personalities might have on the community. Accordingly, in a call for human engineering that he made some years after his formulation of the social stimulus value of the personality, he expressed concern over the issue of 'how to avoid developing within the personalities of individuals the antagonisms, hostilities, fears, and aggressive habits that are anti-social and that are manifested in criminality, suicide, divorce, revolution, and insanity' (May, 1950: 16).

During the 1930s, May participated in a series of conferences and seminars in which the personality and culture approach was formulated and elaborated. In doing so, May increasingly immersed himself within the networks of social scientists engaged in the elaboration of this approach – and he increasingly came to adopt this outlook as an integral aspect of his own perspective on the psychological and social sciences and human engineering. Indeed, as early as the late 1920s, May had been moving in this direction with his participation in the First Colloquium on Personality Investigation, held at Columbia University in 1928, and in the Second Colloquium, held at Columbia in 1929. At these colloquia, May was exposed to various perspectives on the social and cultural influences on personality – perspectives that anticipated the emerging personality and culture approach. It was at the SSRC's Hanover Conference of 1930, however, that May became especially involved in the study of personality and culture. Indeed, this conference marked his entry into a network of scholars and foundation officers – which would eventually come to include Lawrence K. Frank, Robert S. Lynd, Edward Sapir, Margaret Mead and John Dollard – working in the field of personality and culture and (in their eyes) in the closely related field of human relations.

During the summer of 1930, SSRC secretary Robert S. Lynd invited May to attend the Conference on Personality and Culture – held as part of the Hanover Conference convened by the SSRC late that summer. As Lynd mentioned in a letter to May, he wanted to include May in the conference because of the latter's concern with 'the angle of the child' and more particularly with the 'process of [the child's] growing up into an adult world' (Lynd to May, 1930). The conference included such important figures as anthropologist and linguist Edward Sapir, psychologists Floyd Allport and Gardner Murphy, sociologist Kimball Young, psychiatrist Harry Stack Sullivan and foundation officer Lawrence K. Frank (Social Science Research Council, 1930). A series of presentations was given by Frank, Sullivan and May on the interrelationships of personality and culture and related issues, and several research proposals were examined at the conference. Most importantly, a tentative formulation of the field of personality and culture emerged from the conference.[8] On the final day of the conference, May (1930) presented a paper in which he outlined various methods for investigating personality. After discussing his notion of personality as social stimulus value, May examined the 'cultural approach' to the personality. Significantly, May's treatment of the cultural approach to personality demonstrated his increasing awareness that cultural patterns could be utilized as a means for guiding conduct as well as for influencing the 'inner mechanisms' of the personality. Thus, cultural patterns, such as the 'customs, practices, beliefs, superstitions, ideals, codes of the group, or of society', played a major role in shaping a person's conduct and social effectiveness (ibid.: 11).

May continued to focus on personality and culture – and the closely related field of human relations – as a participant in the Hanover Conference on Human Relations, which had been convened by Lawrence K. Frank in the summer of 1934 in order to assemble educational materials on human relations for secondary school students. (The conference was funded by the General Education Board [GEB] on the instigation of Frank, who was the GEB officer in charge of such fields as personality and culture and child growth and development.) The Hanover Conference seems to have provided May with an opportunity to work more closely with Dollard and thus to assimilate the latter's perspective on the manner in which 'the person is [to be] viewed as an organic center of feeling moving through a culture' in studying the individual's life history (Dollard, 1935: 4). May was also exposed to Frank's agenda for the rebuilding of culture at this conference and at the 1935 follow-up conference (see Frank, 1936, for more on this agenda). In addition to Frank and Dollard, Lynd, Hartshorne (now of the Yale Divinity School), Mead, Earl T. Engle (Department of Anatomy, Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons), and several others were in attendance at the conference. On meeting, the conference participants shifted their focus from the conference's original theme to the field of personality and culture. Eventually, after considerable debate and contention, they formulated a detailed *Outline* for the study of this field. To the latter document, May contributed a section on personality assessment.[9]

In the fall of 1934, a few months before he assumed the directorship of the IHR, May was appointed to chair the Subcommittee on Competitive-Cooperative Habits, the major prong of the SSRC's Research Committee on Personality and Culture (which May also chaired).[10] May was probably offered the position as the result of his extensive SSRC and foundation connections, his role as executive secretary within the IHR, and his prominence within the field of psychology. He worked with psychologists Gordon Allport and Gardner Murphy in organizing and supervising the subcommittee; Dollard, Doob, Mead, psychologist Barbara Burks, and others as well from the various social sciences, worked as its research assistants. May's work with the SSRC subcommittee closely paralleled and complemented his efforts with the IHR. Thus, while working with the SSRC subcommittee to elaborate a personality and culture approach to the phenomena of cooperation and competition, May was simultaneously engaged in formulating and promoting a collaborative program in the field of 'human relations' within the IHR – and, for May, the initiatives of the subcommittee appeared to merge with those of the IHR, with the two sets of initiatives seeming to mutually inspire and amplify each other. Thus, May considered Dollard's important 1935 book *Criteria for the Life History* as well as his own and Doob's report for the subcommittee, *Competition and Cooperation* (1937), to be products of both the subcommittee and the IHR, even though they were officially sponsored either by one or the other. Significantly, the subcommittee represented an experiment in planning research within the social sciences (Young, 1936), again complementing the IHR program.

During the depression years, social scientists and administrators such as Frank and Lynd came to the conclusion that American culture was inconsistent and disorganized and hence in need of reconstruction (Frank, 1936; Lynd, 1939; Bryson, 2009). Along such lines, May and Doob emphasized in their report for the SSRC subcommittee the need for cultural reconstruction. As they put it, 'The greatest of all human experiments,

indeed the chief end of man, is to discover or invent a culture that is most congenial to the nature of the biological constitutions of those who share it' (May and Doob, 1937: 2). More specifically, May and Doob stressed the need to reorient current cultural practices away from competition and toward cooperation – a need that, for many, the depression had made all the more pressing.[11] As May and Doob exclaimed:

> Leaders of thought at the present time nearly all agree that in the Western World competition has produced a rich technological culture which now, because of radically altered conditions, can be enjoyed by men only if they learn to displace the no longer productive competitive practices with new, as yet only partially discovered, cooperative ways of living. (May and Doob, 1937: 2–3)

Instructively, there were parallels between the call for less competitive and more cooperative cultural practices by May and Doob in their SSRC report and the research conducted at the IHR during this period on frustration and aggression; the IHR research efforts suggested the need for less frustrating cultural practices in order to alleviate aggression.

May and the Yale Institute of Human Relations

First as executive secretary (1930–5) and then as director (1935–60), May played a key, if underappreciated, role in managing and reorganizing the Yale Institute of Human Relations, in formulating and facilitating its research agenda, and in providing reports and historical narratives of its activities. As suggested above, May was well connected with the worlds of Rockefeller philanthropy and the Social Science Research Council, as well as with an array of psychologists and social scientists, by means of his participation in a series of conferences, seminars and committees sponsored by the SSRC and the Rockefeller organizations. These activities and connections served him well as the executive secretary and the director of the IHR. Thus, he was able to utilize the ideas and approaches with which he had become familiarized as well as the networks in which he had become immersed in order to advance his aims within the IHR. More specifically, May gained a sense of the importance of new approaches within the related fields of personality and culture, human relations, personality development, socialization and community studies through his involvement in the SSRC and Rockefeller-sponsored projects – and he played an important role in advancing these approaches within the IHR. The new approaches were intimately connected with a human engineering agenda oriented toward the socialization and education of the individual, and May was active in advancing this agenda within the IHR as well. As May (1950: 16) noted in his survey of the work of the IHR: 'One of the great problems of social life is how to engineer the processes of child growth and social learning so that the resulting personalities and characters of adults will be such as to make the social and cultural apparatus work for the good of all its members.'

May's annual reports, memoranda and other writings on the IHR; his correspondence with IHR researchers, university administrators and foundation and SSRC officers; as well as the minutes and other records written by May for the IHR Executive

Committee provide new insights into the history of the IHR. For one thing, they demonstrate May's active involvement in IHR affairs. Even as the IHR's executive secretary, May played a key role in formulating and coordinating the IHR's research agenda. As the institute's director, May not only continued to play this key role, but he hired a number of researchers to work with the institute and disbursed its liquid research fund. Moreover, he extensively interacted and communicated with researchers by participating in institute seminars and conferences and by providing researchers with encouragement and guidance. Perhaps most importantly, by examining May's reports, memoranda, correspondence and other writings, we get a sense of the complex and meandering path taken by his and others' efforts to formulate a coordinated and unified scientific program at the institute. These efforts involved an early focus on family studies, which was soon abandoned but eventually resulted in an important study of juvenile delinquency by William Healey and Augusta F. Bronner (1937); the initiatives taken by May in 1932 to promote and formulate a research program geared toward community studies, which included an unsuccessful attempt to hire Robert S. Lynd to direct a study of New Haven and of child-rearing practices within this community; the formulation by May and Dollard of an approach stressing the study of human relations (conceived of in terms of the personality and culture perspective), as elaborated in a memorandum written by Dollard in June 1934, an essay written by May in November of that year, and the latter's 1935–6 IHR annual report; and, finally, the triumph of an approach to human behavior based on Hull's neo-behaviorist learning theory – as well as on aspects of Freudian psychology, culture theory and the social structure concept.[12]

May was not part of the group of Yale administrators that had originally planned the IHR and requested funding for it – this group consisted of Yale president James Rowland Angell; Robert Hutchins, the dean of the law school; and Milton Winternitz, the dean of the medical school – but he joined the institute at an early stage.[13] The IHR was established in 1929, with ample Rockefeller support, in order to promote interdisciplinary research on behavior and human relations with a view toward ameliorating pressing social problems and promoting human welfare. The institute was to encourage collaboration among social and biological scientists with the aim of establishing an integrated science of individual and social behavior. The institute was also to enhance the professional education offered in such fields as medicine, law, divinity, education, nursing and social work by providing students in these fields with knowledge of human behavior and social relations (May, 1950: 1–3; Morawski, 1986: 227–8). From its inception, the institute was associated with a human engineering agenda, as Biehn (2008) has demonstrated. The initial Rockefeller grant, made in January 1929, totaled $4.5 million; it covered a new building to house the institute and affiliated units, salaries and research expenditures for psychiatry, funding for the care and maintenance of patients to be utilized for clinical study, and support for research in psychology, child development, social science and primate studies (May, 1950: 43–4). The Rockefeller funding was renewed in 1938 with a grant of $700,000 for a 10-year period (ibid.: 55).

May was appointed executive secretary of the IHR in April 1930, replacing sociologist Donald Slesinger. In his new position, May found himself thrown into the thick of institute affairs, working on formulating a unified and coordinated research program

geared toward community studies for the institute, writing reports and memoranda on IHR affairs, and dealing with hiring and other issues. As the IHR staff member charged with keeping track of research and acting 'as a correlating and integrating influence' on it (Weaver, 1934), May wrote all or nearly all of the IHR reports during this period.[14] From December 1931 on, May worked as executive secretary directly under, and in consultation with, IHR associate directors Edgar S. Furniss, the dean of graduate studies, and Milton Winternitz, the dean of the medical school (Yale Corporation, 1931; Furniss to Lynd, 1932). May also consulted extensively with Yale president Angell, who was formally the institute's director; May informed Angell of IHR proposals and developments by means of memoranda and correspondence, as well as within the meetings of the Executive Committee.

'We regard the Community Studies as our major cooperative enterprise', May informed E. E. Day, the head of the Rockefeller Foundation's Division of the Social Sciences, in the spring of 1932 (May to Day, 1932h). Indeed, during that year, May assumed, as the institute's executive secretary, a key role in formulating and promoting a series of initiatives geared toward community studies – initiatives that would, May hoped, provide the institute with its central, unifying program. The program was to be centered in the Social Science Division of the IHR, but it would involve researchers in other divisions as well. Building on several IHR studies then in progress, May suggested taking the city of New Haven as the venue for his proposed program, which would embrace the study of individuals, families, small groups, institutions and culture patterns within the city, as well as the city and its population as a whole (May, 1932b). May believed such a program would encourage specialists in the biological and social sciences to integrate and unify their efforts by focusing these efforts on 'common research materials', that is, on specific individuals, families and groups within the New Haven community. Thus, social scientists, psychiatrists, psychologists, physiologists and other biological scientists, in coming to focus on the same individuals, families and small groups, would be encouraged to coordinate their efforts in order to formulate a unified program (May, 1935b: 3). A key aspect of May's program – which seems to have been greatly influenced by Edward Sapir and Robert S. Lynd, both promoters of the personality and culture approach – was the focus on the individual within his or her social settings. As May indicated in a report written in the summer of 1932, the 'general problem' of the IHR focus on community studies would be 'the development of the normal personality in its social environment' (May, 1932c: 13). Along these lines, May proposed the appointment of a psychiatrist in order to assist with the community studies program (ibid.: 12).

As a means of advancing the community studies agenda, May became quite involved with the negotiations to hire sociologist Robert S. Lynd, and he acted as the intermediary between the IHR Executive Committee and Lynd. Indeed, it was May who signed the official job offer letter to Lynd (May to Lynd, 1932f). As had been the case with Sapir, Lynd had been involved with the 1930 Hanover personality and culture conference – in fact, Lynd had organized this conference as the SSRC secretary – and May very likely hoped that Lynd's interest in personality and culture would push the institute's research agenda in the direction of this field. More importantly, from the standpoint of May and the IHR Executive Committee as a whole, the attempt

to hire Lynd as 'Research Professor of Sociology' represented an effort to make community studies the integrating focus of IHR efforts in the social sciences. The hope seemed to be that having such a prestigious social scientist – co-author with his wife, Helen Merrill Lynd, of the sociological classic *Middletown* (1929) – placed in charge of the integrative social science project of the institute would finally begin to steer it in the right direction. As Furniss wrote to Lynd: 'It is the intention of all of us . . . that the work of which we are asking you to take charge shall become the major interest of the Social Science Section of the Institute. We expect as the years pass to draw the research program into a coherent whole with its focus upon the program which you may map out' (Furniss to Lynd, 1932). The proposed program would involve, as Lynd understood it, a 'battery of studies . . . dealing with the interaction of the New Haven cultural setting with the maturation of children's personalities' (Lynd to May, 1932a); it would thus constitute a community study of New Haven focusing on personality and culture issues. Lynd was hesitant to accept the job offer, citing the difficulty of meeting the expectation that his research efforts would provide the basis for coordinating the disparate studies then being conducted by the IHR, as well as the problem of his wife having to give up her job should the family relocate to New Haven (ibid.). He requested that for the coming year he be allowed to come to Yale twice a week in order to explore research options as a possible step toward accepting the position the following year (Lynd to May, 1932b), but the IHR Executive Committee declined to agree with this plan (May to Lynd, 1932g). One can only speculate on the course that IHR research might have taken if Lynd had actually accepted the position – but clearly it might have been very different from the one taken.

A few weeks later, again in an effort to advance the community studies approach, May submitted to Angell a proposal entitled 'A Program of Research for the Social Science Division of the Institute of Human Relations'; it proposed, as its name implies, a central research program for the institute based on the social sciences (May, 1932a). As with the effort to hire Lynd, the proposal demonstrated the ongoing influence of the field of personality and culture on May. May's plan drew at least part of its inspiration from a research proposal drawn up by Sapir (1932), now chair of the Anthropology Department at Yale.[15] The latter suggested that two communities in New Haven – one of them an Italian section of the city, the other a middle-class 'Anglo-Saxon' section – be taken as the focus of the study. The cultural backgrounds of both communities were to be studied, with special attention to be given to the new cultural features appearing in the Italian community as older features dropped out. Sapir's plan was to entail the intensive study of the development and adjustment of selected members of the two communities, and it would include the collection of life history materials.

May's (1932a: 1) own plan proposed coordinating research in the social and biological sciences by focusing on 'basic problems of personality and social structure' in the two New Haven communities suggested by Sapir. The human relations and personality growth of selected individuals – drawn from 4 age groups, including infants/pre-school children, school-age children, adolescents, and adults – living in the two communities were to be studied over extended periods of time. May placed emphasis on the interaction and functioning of individuals within institutional contexts, including families, schools, factories and even the city as a whole. He also stressed the importance of

studying the mores and cultural patterns of the groups involved in the study. May (ibid.: 8) felt that the quality of human interaction – which would involve 'the degree of mutuality or cooperation' that characterized such interaction, as well as other qualities such as purposefulness, efficiency, joy or satisfaction, and meaningfulness – could be arranged on a metric scale ranging from the pathological to the healthy and successful. He hoped that the study would contribute to the understanding and control of human interaction and personality growth. May (ibid.: 3) advanced a social-therapeutic 'hypothesis' with respect to the relationship of personality and social structure. According to May (ibid.), healthy and successful human relations would lead to 'both growth of persons and [the] development of cohesive and creative social structures'. Thus, the personality growth of a single individual within the network of institutions that, for May, constituted social structure would contribute to the personality growth of all.

In the fall of 1932, the Executive Committee decided that the institute's 'program should follow the general lines laid out' in May's proposal of that spring, and May was instructed to prepare statements detailing what had been thus far accomplished along the lines indicated in his proposal as well as how a program based on this proposal could be further elaborated (May, 1932e). A 'Community Studies Group' consisting of Sapir, sociologist Maurice Davie, and faculty members representing the fields of public health, law, history and religion was put to work on the program, utilizing New Haven as an urban laboratory (May, 1934b: 17–18). Reviewing the community studies program in 1935, May claimed that a 'good beginning' was made in launching the program, but he believed that it had not achieved success. According to May, the psychologists, psychiatrists and clinicians, who focused on individuals, had not been able to coordinate their research projects with the social scientists, who focused on the social and cultural backgrounds of individuals. The two sets of specialists did not attempt to study the same individuals and families, and they could not get beyond their preoccupation with their respective disciplinary issues (May, 1935a: 24; 1935b: 3–4).

In spite of May's belief that the emphasis on community studies had failed, it is important to recognize that IHR researchers continued to work in this field over the years. Thus, one of the major achievements of the institute during the 1930s was John Dollard's *Caste and Class in a Southern Town* (1988[1937]), which constituted a community study of Indianola, Mississippi. Based in part on the life history materials of the African American residents of this community, Dollard's study focused on the social structure and the emotional patterns associated with race relations in Indianola. Irvin Child's study of Italian youth in New Haven, again based in part on life history materials, also represented a community study; it was eventually published as *Italian or American?* (1970[1943]). Studies conducted by Hortense Powdermaker and Kovoor T. Behanan – focusing on African Americans in the South and in New Haven respectively – were also oriented toward the community studies approach (e.g. May, 1939b: 29–33). Finally, W. Lloyd Warner conducted his important studies on 'Yankee City' (Newburyport, MA) with the encouragement and support of May and the IHR (Warner and Lunt, 1941: xi–xii). Instructively, although not formally affiliated with the institute, the Yankee City series was published by Yale University Press.[16]

May had proposed centralizing power in the hands of a director in his spring 1932 plan for the IHR – and, as this suggestion indicates, May had, by 1932, become well

aware of the problems facing the institute as its executive secretary. During the summer of that year, in the report on the institute that he did for President Angell, May complained that 'approximately 80% of the funds of the institute are devoted to projects which are only loosely or remotely related'; indeed, many of the projects 'do not even fit into a larger pattern' (May, 1932c: 1). Along such lines, May admitted that the IHR had not yet become 'a true institute', and he suggested that there was a need 'to continue our efforts to make an institute out of . . . diverse activities' (ibid.: 13).[17] The most important problem that needed to be addressed concerned the need 'to liquidate more funds for cooperative research' (ibid.). Moreover, it was unclear precisely who, if anyone, was on the staff of the institute, as the IHR had 'remained ambiguous and non-committal in respect to its staff' (ibid.: 14). In dealing with these problems, May suggested, apparently speaking for the Executive Committee, 'that the Institute should center its major emphasis on types of research which could not be or would not be undertaken without an institute' (ibid.: 1).

By late 1932, May was exhausted by the strenuous administrative demands thrust upon him as the IHR executive secretary, and he contemplated leaving Yale and taking the position of dean of education at Stanford University. In a letter to psychologist Lewis Terman – who had encouraged May to come to Stanford – May complained of the 'rather difficult – if not to say impossible – situation' that he was encountering at Yale (May to Terman, 1932j). However, by then, May had already decided to decline the Stanford position. As May suggested to Terman, there were several reasons for his decision to stay at Yale, including a clarification of his duties and responsibilities and the lessening of his administrative burdens; an increased emphasis in the future on 'personality studies' within the institute; and May's involvement in a research project in the Yale Department of Education. Moreover, according to May, Angell was convinced that May should stay on at the IHR, as 'for the past three years [May had been] engaged in drawing the forces of the Institute into a single coherent program' and therefore was 'more or less obliged to see the matter thru [*sic*] to a greater degree of maturity than it has now reached' (ibid.). What May did not mention to Terman was that, in response to the Stanford offer, Angell had promised May the directorship of the institute (Angell to May, 1932). Angell and May agreed that for administrative and budgetary reasons the latter would wait for two years or so before actually assuming the position (May to Angell, 1932i).

May finally became the director of the institute in April 1935, during the administrative reshuffle following Winternitz's relinquishing of his position as co-director of the IHR. As the institute's director, May played a key role in the reorganization of the IHR and in steering it toward a coherent and unified program. Thus, on assuming the position as director, he moved to free up funds for a liquid research fund that he could utilize to support research oriented toward a unified IHR program. He was responsible for bringing several younger men into the institute – including Dollard, Miller, Mowrer, Ford and others – and it was this group of younger researchers who, along with Hull (and several others such as G. P. Murdock), came to play a major role in elaborating the integrated research program (May to Hull, 1950). May engaged in an ongoing dialogue with IHR researchers, reading and commenting upon their work, encouraging and offering them guidance, and participating in IHR seminars and conferences. While May generally did

not impose his agenda in a rigidly top-down fashion, he was well aware of the need to exert some degree of 'control' over the activities of the researchers affiliated with the institute. More particularly, he understood that within 'the director–staff plan' – a scheme that worked well in university settings – the director would exert major influence. As May (n.d.a: 1) explained with regard to this kind of set-up: 'The director controls the budget and the selection, promotion, demotion, or dismissal of staff members. He can reward cooperation and punish competition.' Or as May (quoted in W. W. May, 1978: 658) more emphatically put it in an interview conducted after his retirement:

> I was a damn tyrant! I had $100,000 a year from 1935 until the mid-fifties to do with as I damn well pleased! If Neal [Miller] or any of my boys came in, I just gave them whatever money they needed and no questions asked. But if you came in with a project that didn't square with our overall plan, then I would withhold the funds until you got tired of asking.

With May at the helm of the institute, a series of major steps was taken to facilitate its reorganization. Beginning in the spring of 1935, May convened a series of meetings with senior faculty in order 'to discuss plans for making good the promises to the [Rockefeller] Foundation concerning the achievements of a coordinated program' – but May discovered that the members of this group were unwilling to reach agreement on such a program (May, 1971: 157). Subsequently, following the advice of one of the senior members of the institute – very likely Robert Yerkes (Morawski, 1986: 231) – May came to focus on involving younger researchers in the IHR rather than on relying on senior scholars. He wanted the younger researchers to acquire training in more than one field, or at least to familiarize themselves with more than one field (see, for example, W. W. May, 1978: 659). Along such lines, several important seminars, which came to play a major role in integrating the IHR research program, were either set in motion or given new direction. For example, in the fall of 1935, Hull's Wednesday Evening Seminar – which came to include Dollard, Miller, Earl Zinn, and others – started to work on the formulation of a unified research program based on the synthesis of learning theory and psychoanalysis (May, 1971: 162). The meetings of the institute's Monday Night Group, initiated by younger members of the IHR staff, brought together researchers from different fields in order to come to understand 'more about the aims, methods, and concepts of each other's work' (May, 1939b: 6).[18]

In his history of the institute, May depicted his role as the institute's director as that of 'an expediter and coordinator' (May, 1971: 151), but, as suggested above, he was quite capable of exercising his power in a heavy-handed manner when he felt it necessary to do so in order to further the IHR program. Generally, he seems to have exercised a relatively laid-back style of the 'pastoral modality of power' (Foucault, 2003: 182) over his 'boys', providing them with encouragement and acting as a kind of 'father figure' to them. Moreover, he tended to delegate power to subordinates, especially to Hull – who initiated the important Wednesday Evening Seminar and was described by May as the 'planning and supervising architect' of the rote learning project, another important IHR initiative (May, 1940b: ix). Nevertheless, May could use his control of IHR funding to cajole and threaten researchers – and even to deny support to those he did not consider loyal to the institute's vision. Most notoriously,

May eventually cut off IHR funding to linguistic anthropologist Edward Sapir and his students.[19]

As director, May wrote all of the annual reports of the institute, as well as what, in effect, became the official history of the institute, which was initially published in 1950 (and republished, in a somewhat revised form, in 1971). In a sense, he came to control the narrative of the institute's history and activities. More particularly, the annual reports accomplished several things. First, as researchers seem to have been required to submit reports to May on their research activities and publications, the reports enabled May to monitor these activities in order to keep them on track with regard to the institute's program. Second, the reports helped researchers to understand each other's projects, thereby facilitating communication within the IHR. Third, the reports were widely distributed to foundation officers, university administrators and others, as well as to IHR researchers, thus giving them a sense of the institute's goals and achievements. Finally, May was given the opportunity in the reports to formulate and elaborate upon the institute's agenda and explain and correlate specific projects. Thus, the 1935–6 annual report (May, 1936b) operated as a manifesto for the 'science of human relations' – the field that had been jointly elaborated by Dollard and May – and the report proclaimed that the future of IHR research appeared to lie in this field. To communicate this message, May wanted the report widely distributed to IHR researchers.[20] The next year's report, for the 1936–7 year, offered a detailed treatment of the frustration–aggression hypothesis – the hypothesis, attributed to Freud by IHR researchers, that aggression was caused by the frustration of human desires and needs (May, 1937b: 16 ff.). Hull was impressed with the latter report, especially with May's treatment of the frustration–aggression hypothesis. As Hull noted to May, 'Until I read your report I had not realized the extent to which the frustration–aggression hypothesis was integrating the work [of the IHR]' (Hull to May, 1937). Significantly, though May's 1950 history presented the IHR's evolution as a linear narrative in which a 'unified science of behavior' based on Hull's neo-behaviorist learning theory ultimately triumphed, May's annual reports suggest a rather different story. They indicate that a more complex and meandering path was taken by May and his colleagues as they attempted to develop a coherent and integrated program for the institute; they also suggest that other options – such as 'community studies' and, somewhat later, 'human relations' – were being considered as the focuses for IHR efforts.

May remained interested in such related fields as personality and culture, human relations, personality development, and socialization as director of the IHR. He thus continued to be concerned with the socialization and education of children, adolescents and adults, and to believe that the altering of the cultural patterns of socialization and education could be utilized as a form of human engineering. His participation in the 1934 Seminar on Human Relations and the Subcommittee on Competitive-Cooperative Habits had reinforced such concerns. While May did not rigidly impose his personality and culture agenda on researchers – and, in any case, in Dollard, he had a key ally in furthering this agenda – themes from personality and culture and related fields persisted in the efforts of IHR researchers. Most notably, as we will see below, the book *Frustration and Aggression*, perhaps the key achievement of IHR researchers during the 1930s, elaborated a personality and culture perspective within the

framework of Hull's learning theory. Along such lines, May suggested in 1939 that IHR studies were, at that time, 'related mainly to the processes of learning and especially in those forms of behavior that are required by society of growing individuals. The central problem of the Institute at the moment, [*sic*] is the process of socialization of the human organism in its culture' (May, 1939a: 6).

As director of the institute, May recognized the importance of the socialization and training of IHR researchers (e.g. May, 1936b, 1939b). As May succinctly put it at a 1939 conference, 'The problem of the integration of the social sciences, as I see it, is primarily one of adult education' (May, 1940c: 132). For May, the 'adult education' of researchers involved the 'engineering' of the educational situation through the provision of resources such as books and teachers and by means of 'arranging a system of suitable rewards for learning or punishments for not learning' (ibid.). Most importantly, as he explained in various pronouncements (e.g. May, n.d.a; n.d.b; 1943b; 1943–4), it entailed the fostering of an ethical code emphasizing such conduct as cooperation, honesty, mutual understanding, and the sharing of ideas and approaches among researchers. Equating the formation of knowing subjects with that of ethical subjects, May wanted to develop an ethical subjectivity among researchers in order to guide them toward collaborative effort aimed at the construction of a coordinated and unified human science.[21] Along these lines, May came to believe that older men such as Sapir – with well-established reputations and research agendas – could not be motivated to engage themselves in a cooperative and constructive manner in the IHR research program. Hence May encouraged a group of younger researchers to join the IHR effort to create a unified research program. Such younger men could be trained to cooperate with each other.

On assuming the directorship of the IHR, May found himself under considerable pressure by Rockefeller officers to steer the institute in the direction of an integrated and coordinated program. In a series of meetings involving May, Rockefeller officers and Yale administrators, Rockefeller administrators such as Alan Gregg, head of the foundation's Division of the Medical Sciences, and Edmund E. Day, the director of the Division of the Social Sciences, expressed their displeasure over the fact that the institute had seemingly made little progress toward the goal of developing a unified and coordinated program. They also expressed doubts regarding the renewal of Rockefeller funding of the institute, which was set to expire in 1939. Day, for example, seems to have told May that the institute should not accept Rockefeller grants if it could not come up with a unified and coherent program; indeed, according to one account, he even suggested that the IHR return Rockefeller funds if it could not do this. May was considerably dismayed by such comments, claiming that he would not have accepted the IHR directorship if he had known it might entail 'cracking down' on the researchers affiliated with the institute. He even threatened to resign his position as IHR director and take a job with the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors Association (the so-called Hayes office) in California. (For a record of these exchanges between May and the Rockefeller Foundation officers, see especially Gregg, 1935a, 1935b.) In spite of the criticisms of the IHR by the Rockefeller officers, however, these officers soon came to see May and the performance of the IHR in a more positive light. Thus, as early as the spring of 1935, Day was writing to May: 'You do not need to be told that I am greatly pleased at the turn recently taken in the affairs of the Institute. My only regret is that such a move was not made three

or four years ago' (Day to May, 1935b). Moreover, somewhat over a year later, Day informed Rockefeller trustee Raymond Fosdick that the former's expectations for the institute had increased since May had been made director. As Day (1936) put it, 'Since that time [i.e. since May had become the IHR director] the program of the Institute has finally begun to assume the form originally contemplated'.

For the first two years or so as director of the IHR, May worked on formulating and promoting as the institute's research focus what he referred to as the 'science of human relations'. May was much influenced by Dollard in his formulation of the human relations approach, and the two worked closely together on the elaboration of this field. The human relations approach centered on the human individual, taking the individual as the 'prime unit' anchoring scientific knowledge (as 'individual behavior' was to become the prime unit of the human sciences a couple of years or so later [Morawski, 1986: 241]). This approach was, as Alexis de Tocqueville, the 19th-century French observer of the United States, might well have appreciated, an expression of the individualistic orientation of American culture. To be sure, the human relations approach situated the individual within the social and cultural field; it was thus concerned with the manner in which 'acculturated' individual organisms engaged in relations with one another. It was also very much concerned with the temporal dimension of individual lives – with their life histories and with the developmental phases that individuals with biological needs and cravings went through as they confronted the cultural patterns of their groups.

The shift to an emphasis on the study of human relations from the earlier stress on community studies did not mark, in May's mind, an abrupt break with regard to the IHR's program for the integration of the human sciences. A focus on studying the socialization of the individual within social and cultural contexts characterized both research agendas. The major difference between the two was simply that community studies stressed the study of individuals, their interaction with one another, and the processes of their personality formation within the context of specific communities – and thus the importance of gathering social and cultural data on these communities – while human relations did not. The close relationship between the two agendas is suggested by the fact that Dollard, who, as noted above, played a key role in advancing the study of human relations at the institute, was working on an important community study, *Class and Caste in a Southern Town*, at around the same time that he was attempting to further human relations. Indeed, he made ample use in his study of a southern community of the life history approach – an approach endorsed by May as an important method for studying human relations in his formulations of this field. One major reason for May's adoption of the new focus on human relations was simply the fact that he had, by the mid-1930s, come to the conclusion that the community studies agenda was not feasible, as the various specialists that he wanted to involve in such studies could not be induced to cooperate.[22] (Along such lines, in 1935, the Advisory Committee on Personality and Culture, an important SSRC committee concerned with a field closely related to that of human relations, came to the conclusion that it would not be practical to pursue the study of personality and culture by focusing on specific communities [Bryson, 2009].[23])

As elaborated by May and especially by Dollard, the human relations approach was profoundly influenced by psychoanalysis. Indeed, May credited Dollard for bringing

Freud's psychoanalysis to the IHR (May, 1971: 161) as well as for inspiring the concern with human relations within the institute (see below). After earning his PhD at Chicago by writing a dissertation on the American family and its changing functions under the supervision of sociologist William F. Ogburn, Dollard received an SSRC fellowship which he used to study psychoanalysis at the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute during the 1931–2 year. There he underwent a training analysis with Hans Sachs. On returning to the United States, Dollard assisted Sapir at Yale with the Seminar on the Impact of Culture on Personality. While back in the USA, Dollard continued his psychoanalytic training, conducting several 'control analyses' under the supervision of Abram Kardiner, Karen Horney and Eric Fromm (Dollard, n.d.: 1). May offered Dollard a position at the institute at the conclusion of Sapir's seminar, and the two came to work closely together, both within the IHR and within the context of SSRC and Rockefeller-sponsored seminars and projects, as we have seen. While Dollard provided May with ideas and perspectives regarding such fields as psychoanalysis, human relations and the study of the life history, May, in return, provided Dollard with personal and institutional backing. Along such lines, Dollard expressed gratitude to May for the latter's support for the *Criteria* book; as Dollard wrote to May, 'your encouragement has certainly been a considerable factor in my putting the thing forward' (Dollard to May, 1935).[24]

Under the influence of Dollard and others, May took up the field of human relations in 1934, coming to see this field as the key to focusing and integrating IHR efforts. Indeed, at various times during the years 1935 and 1936, he even lobbied for the establishment at Yale of a Department of Human Relations, complete with endowed chairs, and he proposed that a Clinic of Human Relations be created and come to play a central role within the institute (see, for example, May to Angell, 1936d; May, 1935c).[25] In formulating his human relations agenda, May was undoubtedly influenced by Frank's 1934 Seminar on Human Relations, as well as by a memorandum written by Dollard (1934) suggesting that human relations become the research focus of the IHR. Instructively, both May and Dollard made a concerted effort to interest Day in the field of human relations. For example, both men presented Day with documents supporting human relations in February 1935, and together the two held a 'pow-wow' with Day, apparently to discuss the human relations agenda, in the spring of that year (see, for example, Day to May, 1935a; May to Day, 1935).

Months before, even as May was preparing to assume the directorship of the IHR, he was contemplating making human relations the central focus of institute efforts. In a memorandum written in the fall of 1934, May (1934c) recommended that he be authorized to explore how the field of human relations could be delimited, planned and organized, as well as how a focus on this field would fit in with other IHR research projects and what budgetary, personnel and administrative changes would need to be implemented in order to proceed with it. He credited Dollard for being largely responsible for coming up with the idea of centering IHR research on human relations. May's contribution to the elaboration of the field took the form of an essay 'Is There a Science of Human Relations?', which he seems to have originally written in November 1934 (see May, 1934a). The essay was read by Day, who complimented May on it, informing him that it was 'distinctly more interesting' than the 5-year report on the IHR that May had recently presented to him and expressing his hope that

May's IHR report for the next year would 'pack some of the same wallop' (Day to May, 1935a). The essay was eventually published, in a somewhat revised form, in the summer of 1936. As it provided a concise but detailed overview of the field of human relations as May (under the influence of Dollard) envisioned it, this essay is worth examining here.

May argued in the published version of the essay, which appeared in the July 1936 issue of *The Family*, that 'a new science that will have as its object of study the relations that individuals bear to each other in a cultural setting' was needed (May, 1936a: 141). The new science would take into account 'the sacred precincts of human personality' and the related problem of 'motivation' along with the cultural patterns and institutional contexts that confronted the individual. As May noted, it would focus on how the basic life processes of the living human organism were molded by culture and institutions. As he put it, 'In order to keep alive and well he [the individual] must perform the basic biological functions of eating, excreting, sleeping, exercising, and protecting himself from disease and danger according to a set of rules known to the anthropologists as culture patterns' (ibid.: 142). Most importantly with regard to May's human engineering agenda, the development of individuals could be engineered by intervening in the process of transmission of culture patterns. As May put it, 'the growth process and hence the ultimate development of any organism can be changed, within limits set by hereditary determiners, by controlling the aspects of the cultures that are transmitted to it and the manner of transmission' (ibid.: 143).

Along such lines, May emphasized the importance of education, which involved the transmission of culture from one generation to the next, for dealing with human relations and the problems that could arise within these relations. In the educational process, the child acquired aspects of culture from cultural surrogates such as parents and teachers within institutional contexts such as families, schools and churches. Alluding to the process of learning – which so came to preoccupy Hull and the younger psychologists affiliated with the institute – May proclaimed:

> The basic problem of learning is to find out how the patterns of culture get into the organism and determine its reactions and behavior. In learning, the organism selects, rejects, modifies, and interprets the culture patterns that are presented to it, and in so doing achieves a personality of its own. (May, 1936a: 144)

May (1936b) elaborated on the human relations agenda in his 1935–6 annual report, which appeared in the fall of 1936. An official IHR document, this report served as a manifesto for the 'science of human relations'. As May informed Angell, in requesting that the report be published in advance of the volume containing the annual reports of the deans and directors of other university faculties and facilities, he was 'anxious' that his colleagues 'be fully informed concerning the future research program of the Institute as I now see it' (May to Angell, 1936e). While it covered much of the same ground as May's essay, the report did put more emphasis, in comparison with the essay, on certain aspects of the human relations agenda. For one thing, it was somewhat more explicit on the human engineering implications of the proposed science. As May (1936b: 1) put it, '[t]he need for developing a science of human relations that is basic

to the great practical problems of human engineering' was especially pressing at that time. May also alluded to the importance of cultural reconstruction: 'The human engineering task of building a "scientific culture" in which each individual member will find adequate satisfaction, cannot proceed very far until a realistic and sound science of human relations has been developed' (ibid.: 6). Perhaps even more than the essay, the report focused on the individual, on the need to study 'human individuals in their entirety and from the standpoint of their actions and interactions with other individuals' (ibid.: 2). It also made explicit reference to the socialization process and juxtaposed the socialization of the individual to the influence that the individual could have on culture. Thus, according to May, the 'current social and biological sciences' were not adequate for 'the study of the individual from the standpoint of the process of his socialization or from the standpoint of the influence that he exercises on the culture in which he lives' (ibid.: 4). Most importantly, in surveying the existing IHR projects and in elaborating a plan for new projects, May placed emphasis on a developmental perspective. Thus, in order to deal with human relations problems, researchers should focus on 'definite periods in the life spans of normal individuals' – which would include infancy, the pre-school years, the beginning of school, puberty, leaving the home, marriage, old age and so on (ibid.: 6–7). Researchers should also deal with life crises faced by adults, such as unemployment, disease and mental breakdowns. Along such lines, May called for developmental studies of the same individuals over the years and 'the systematic recording of life histories' (ibid.: 14).

Ultimately, it was not May and Dollard's human relations approach but Hull's neo-behaviorist system that provided the intellectual framework for an integrated and coordinated approach to the psychological and social sciences at the institute. Beginning in the fall of 1935, Hull's Wednesday Evening Seminar was opened to the general participation of interested IHR researchers; increasingly, the seminar, which focused on exploring psychoanalytic concepts within the framework of neo-behaviorist learning theory, came to be seen as a key 'integrating device' within the IHR (May, 1971: 162–3; Morawski, 1986: 234–5). In part as the result of the seminar, Hull's neo-behaviorist system came to be perceived within the IHR as the route to the achievement of a comprehensive and unified science of behavior. In spite of (or perhaps because of) Hull's single-minded pursuit of a rigidly positivistic vision of the behavioral sciences – the laws of which could be expressed as mathematical equations – he seemed to exude a kind of scientific charisma. Hull attracted and trained a number of devoted followers at the IHR, including Miller, Hovland, Sears, Mowrer and eventually Dollard, and May came to fully endorse Hull's intellectual leadership.[26] Nevertheless, May and IHR researchers continued to be concerned with the 'general problem of the socialization of the individual' (May to Murray, 1939) as well as with the closely related fields of human relations, personality and culture, personality development, and community studies. This set of research issues and approaches was translated into the jargon and conceptual apparatus of Hullian learning theory by institute researchers, but it remained a major focus for a number of these researchers over the years – for some, long after they had left the IHR.[27]

According to Morawski (1986: 234), Hull became interested in the IHR in 1935; he ruminated extensively on the institute and elaborated schemes for its management and

for its research agenda. While Morawski's suggestion that Hull's plans and actions can be considered as the basis for the institute's reorganization seems overstated, it is clear that Hull was able to exert considerable influence on institute researchers and eventually to assume the role as its intellectual leader.[28] Under the circumstances, this should not be surprising. Hull had become the foremost behaviorist psychologist by the mid-1930s (Lemov, 2005: 79), and he seemed to offer IHR researchers an approach to the comprehensive science of behavior at precisely the moment in which it was needed. For, as May liked to remind IHR researchers, the end of the initial phase of Rockefeller funding was in sight, and unless steps were taken toward formulating a coherent and coordinated research agenda, the funding would not be likely to be renewed (W. W. May, 1978: 661). Moreover, an emphasis on behavior seemed consonant with recent formulations of the overall agenda of the Rockefeller Foundation. As Max Mason, the foundation's president, indicated in late 1934 with regard to the aim of the foundation's new coordinated program: 'The salients of concentration . . . are directed to the general problem of human behavior, with the aim of control through understanding' (quoted in Bryson, 2005: 63). Finally, as Morawski has suggested, Hull's program offered benefits without seeming to threaten the interests of others involved in institute research efforts. More particularly, Hull's agenda stressed '[t]he orderly structure and simple rhetoric of scientific processes' – which researchers found 'familiar and alluring' – while not challenging the specific projects of researchers (Morawski, 1986: 237).

Starting with the 1936–7 IHR report (May, 1937b), Hull figured prominently in May's reports on the institute and its activities. Although May and many of the IHR researchers continued to be concerned with problems and issues pertinent to human relations – as May's reports amply demonstrated – a shift toward an emphasis on a rigidly positivist science of behavior was reflected in the reports. It seems likely that May did not see any major contradiction between the science of human relations and the science of behavior; certainly, one does not detect any sense that he was bothered by tensions between the two approaches in his writings. In any case, the shift was gradual and never altogether completed; for May and for a number of the IHR researchers, the two approaches were not seen as mutually exclusive but as converging in important ways. Indeed, May continued to use such phrases as the 'problems of human relations', 'the science of human interaction', 'the science of human behavior and interaction' and even 'the science of human relations' in his IHR reports – even as he came to place increasing emphasis upon the 'comprehensive theory of social behavior' and 'the discovery and formulation of certain key principles of human behavior' as the goals of the institute during the late 1930s.

May treated the frustration–aggression hypothesis as a key integrating theme in IHR research efforts in the 1936–7 report – and, as we have seen, Hull, himself, on reading the report, credited May with convincingly demonstrating that the frustration–aggression hypothesis played such a major integrating role. The hypothesis was elaborated as part of an overall project to explore Freudian principles within the framework of Hull's theory of adaptive behavior, and it came to inform one of the most significant of the institute's publications, *Frustration and Aggression* (1939), co-authored by Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer and Sears.[29] Significantly, contrary to the bland concept of socialization that came to prevail in US social science during the post-Second World

War era – which tended to depict socialization as the relatively smooth process of the individual's internalization of social norms, a process that was supposed to result in the individual's conformity with regard to these norms (Wrong, 1961; Morawski and St. Martin, 2011) – socialization, as it came to be formulated by IHR researchers, involved frustration and consequent aggression. According to May, the frustration aggression hypothesis assumed

> ...that the process of socialization of any individual in any culture is essentially frustrating to the individual and to the culture for the reason that socialization always requires certain modifications in basic biologic human urges such as hunger, thirst, and sex. The organism reacts to frustration by various forms of aggression. (May, 1937b: 16)

May believed that the validity of the frustration–aggression hypothesis had yet be established, but it had the potential to 'lead to the discovery of basic laws of social behavior' (ibid.). He cited Dollard's community study *Class and Caste in a Southern Town* (1937) as a major demonstration of the frustration–aggression hypothesis.[30]

By about 1940, the fundamental features of the institute's coordinated agenda for the psychological and social sciences were in place. Based on Hull's neo-behaviorist learning theory – as supplemented by a psychoanalytic approach to personality development and behavioral dynamics, anthropology and culture theory, and the approach to social structure elaborated by W. G. Sumner, A. Keller, W. L. Warner and others – the institute's 'unified basic science of behavior' embraced the study of learning and behavior among animals and humans, and, most significantly, the study of an array of modes of social behavior produced by means of learning.[31] Among the kinds of social behavior studied at the IHR were those associated with speech, social interaction, rational thought, imitation, socialization and personality development, conflict and aggression, cooperation and competition, the incest taboo, various cultural practices studied by anthropologists, political practices, and social structural phenomena such as class and racial caste.[32] Utilizing what May referred to as the 'inductive-deductive method' (the 'hypothetical-deductive method', as Hull put it), the institute attempted to integrate the 'behavioral sciences' by elaborating a set of concepts – postulates, theorems and corollaries – that were to be tested by observation and experimentation. If empirically validated, this set of concepts would provide the shared theoretical underpinnings for IHR research endeavors. In a presentation that he gave at the 1940 conference of the American Sociological Association, May explained the institute's effort to coordinate the sciences of behavior in the following passage:

> In the behavioral sciences the common problem is to understand, control, and predict human behavior at all levels and in all complexities ... A science of human behavior must ... proceed first, from the standpoint of individual psychology and second, from the standpoint of the social environment. It must rest on a set of concepts which serve as a common denominator that makes possible the addition of unlike fractions. (May, 1940a: 11–12)

As we have seen, May helped to foster an ambience within the institute favorable to the study of personality and culture, and, during the 1930s and later, research in

personality and culture was pursued in various projects and by a number of researchers connected with the institute. Thus, the collaborative effort that resulted in the book *Frustration and Aggression* (Dollard *et al.*, 1939) – an effort aimed at the synthesis of learning theory and psychoanalytic hypotheses – was influenced by and contributed to the personality and culture approach in important ways. More particularly, the chapters 'Socialization in America' and 'Adolescence' (the 4th and 5th chapters respectively) clearly demonstrated an affiliation with the field of personality and culture, and indeed represented a significant contribution to the field. Using in these two chapters psychoanalytic, ethnographic, child developmental and other materials, Dollard and his colleagues examined how children and adolescents faced, at different phases of development, various culturally imposed frustrations – including those related to feeding and weaning, efforts to explore and dominate objects in the environment, toilet training, decreasing dependence on parents, masturbation and the sexual inclination of children toward parents of the opposite sex, sex typing, age grading, adolescent instigation to intensified sexual activity, and control of aggression. These frustrations provoked aggressive responses in children and adolescents – responses that were often suppressed or displaced as the result of adult threats to punish aggressive behavior (see ibid.: 58–71, 76–84). The two chapters displayed an affinity to what historian J. Meyerowitz (2010) has dubbed the 'biopolitics of child rearing'; thus, they clearly suggested, if they did not exactly explicitly state, that the formulation and dissemination of new cultural norms of child training would reduce children's frustration and thereby ultimately contribute to controlling aggression within modern society.

Under May's direction, the IHR proceeded with its integrated and collaborative research efforts within the framework of Hullian neo-behaviorist learning theory during the 1940s and early 1950s. Historians have examined how the group of psychologists trained in neo-behaviorist learning theory at the institute during its heyday in the 1930s and 1940s came to exert a major influence within psychology during the middle years of the 20th century and later (Morawski, 1986; Capshew, 1999). The institute also became a model of collaborative research in the behavioral sciences, and social scientists and administrators concerned with initiating collaborative research projects within such endeavors as the Harvard Department of Social Relations and the Ford Foundation's program in the behavioral sciences studied it as an important precedent (Pooley, 2013: 13). Most importantly with regard to May's particular concerns in human engineering, the institute fostered research in personality and culture as well as in such related fields as the study of the socialization process and that of the life history of the individual. It sponsored research oriented to these fields by such researchers as John W. M. Whiting, Irvin Child, Erik Homburger Erikson, Geoffrey Gorer, Allan Holmberg, Allison Davis and John Dollard. Important contributions to personality and culture and the study of socialization included Whiting and Child's *Child Training and Personality* (1953), which displayed the direct influence of the institute, and Erikson's *Childhood and Society* (1950), which was based in part on research conducted while he was at the IHR.[33] Davis and Dollard's *Children of Bondage* (1940), Child's monograph *Italian or American?* (1970[1943]), Leo Simmons's *Sun Chief: The Autobiography of a Hopi Indian* (1942) and Clellan Ford's *Smoke from Their Fires: The Life of a Kwakiutl Chief* (1968[1941]) represented important contributions to the study of the

life history.[34] Such research, especially as focused on issues pertinent to culture and personality and to socialization, had important implications for the practices and 'biopolitics' of child rearing; its influence was reflected in such phenomena as the mass consumption of literature on child rearing during the postwar era (Grant, 1998). Concomitantly, work on personality and culture and on socialization came to exert a major intellectual influence, as Meyerowitz (2010), Morawski and St. Martin (2011), Bryson (2009) and others have suggested, on the North American educated public and social sciences during the mid-20th century.

Pursuing his career in the 1940s and 1950s, May worked on applied projects and wrote on topics related to human engineering while continuing to direct the IHR. During the Second World War, he advised the military on psychological warfare, and after the war he worked on the effects of propaganda for the United States Information Agency. Continuing his work on character education, he worked on instructional films as chair of Teaching Films Custodians from 1946 to 1958 (W. W. May, 1978: 662). May took on the role of public intellectual by giving a series of lectures at Harvard entitled *Education in a World of Fear* (1941a) and writing a book published by the institute, *A Social Psychology of War and Peace* (1943a). In both the lectures and the book, he utilized IHR research, including Hullian learning theory, Mowrer's work on anxiety, and the work conducted on the frustration–aggression hypothesis, to argue that anxiety and behaviors pertinent to war and peace were not instinctual but the result of learning. The human engineering implications of these works were clear. Educators could help teach Americans to manage and realistically assess their anxieties, assisting Americans neither to exaggerate nor deny these anxieties. Moreover, just as people learned to hate and fight, they could learn to live in peace. May suggested that research on how socialization entailed frustration, which in turn led to aggression, might be especially pertinent to dealing with issues of war and peace. Finally, as director of the institute, May attempted to restart the behavioral science program in the early 1950s, and he was able to obtain a grant from the Ford Foundation to fund the research of several younger behavioral scientists (Morawski, 1986: 240).

Conclusion

As I have attempted to demonstrate in this article, May played an important role in promoting interdisciplinary research in the human sciences in the United States during the interwar years and for a number of years thereafter. Immersing himself within networks of researchers in psychology and the social sciences and of foundation and university administrators, May was able to pursue and promote such fields as personality and culture, human relations, the socialization of the individual, and community studies. In doing so, he maintained a keen interest in the human engineering implications of these fields. Most importantly, as the executive secretary and director of the Yale IHR, May was able to mobilize and utilize the networks in which he had become immersed in order to further his concerns. As a result, May's career and formulations provide us with a good case study of the manner in which a scientific administrator was adeptly able to operate within foundation and SSRC-sponsored conferences and projects, as well as within the Yale IHR, in order to advance modes of knowledge

in the psychological and social sciences closely coupled with the fostering and management of human beings. They also provide us, as we have seen above, with new insights into the history of the Yale institute.

Indeed, it was within the Yale institute that May made his most significant effort to integrate and unify the social and behavioral sciences by fostering a collaborative community of researchers – dedicated not only to rigorous scientific standards, but to ethical norms of cooperation, honesty, mutual sharing and understanding, and self-restraint. However, while the importance of the achievements of May and the IHR is undeniable, they came at a high cost, as the comments of two major critical thinkers in 20th-century social science suggest. As political scientist Harold Laski (1930: 150–77) has noted, cooperative research can be aptly utilized as a means to an end, but as an end in itself, it can stifle independent thinking and reflection on basic principles, as well as subordinate research to the whims of powerful foundation executives. Moreover, as sociologist C. Wright Mills (1959: 100–18) has indicated, research institutions run by 'intellectual administrators and research promoters' can entail a 'bureaucratic ethos' geared toward the technocratic manipulation of people in the guise of human engineering. While May liked to see himself as an 'expediter and coordinator' of research, his efforts at the IHR ultimately played a major role in confining IHR research initiatives within the straitjacket of Hullian neo-behaviorism. Those who could not or would not fit themselves into this straitjacket – such as the humanistically oriented scholar Edward Sapir – discovered that they had no place in May's community of researchers at the IHR. While it is clear that May had been put under great pressure by foundation officers to steer IHR research efforts in the direction of an integrated and unified science of behavior, it is also clear that May himself bears much of the responsibility for the results, both positive and negative, of these efforts.

Notes

1. Although beyond the scope of this article, a comprehensive reassessment of the efforts of the researchers of the Yale Institute of Human Relations would be useful. It would be instructive to examine whether or not, and to what degree, a systematic agenda within the field of 'human relations' informed the diverse efforts of IHR researchers, especially within projects conducted or initiated during the institute's first 5 years or so. Such a reassessment might challenge the tendency of recent historians to minimize the long-term significance of the institute (see, for example, Isaac, 2012: 160).

2. Both Biehn and Haraway, in the works cited above, also deal with the IHR, though their focus is on the role of comparative psychologist Robert Yerkes and his primate laboratory within the

institute. Both make useful comments on Yerkes' approach to the field that he dubbed 'psychobiology' and the human engineering orientation of this approach.

3. Angell became president of Yale University in 1921 and continued in this position until his retirement in 1937. In this capacity, he backed the IHR and its efforts at interdisciplinary research. See, for example, Morawski (1986: 219, 225–6, 230).

4. The Institute of Social and Religious Research (ISRR) also funded the research project conducted by Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd in Muncie, Indiana, in the 1920s, which resulted in their classic community study *Middletown* (Smith, 1994: 131–40). Moreover, the ISRR sponsored a project on the education of Protestant ministers directed by May in the late 1920s and early 1930s.

5. Three large volumes, authored by May, Hartshorne and two others, appeared as part of the series *Studies in the Nature of Character* – vol. I: *Studies in Deceit* (1928), vol. II: *Studies in Service and Self-Control* (1929) and vol. III: *Studies in the Organization of Character* (1930). May also worked on character education and movies during the 1920s and later, but I do not have the space in this article to cover this aspect of May's career.

6. May took a somewhat different angle on the relevance of ethics to science in an exchange of letters with Clark Hull that took place during the early 1940s; May claimed that science could provide a basis for an ethical system, a claim that Hull denied (May to Hull, 1943).

7. In elaborating his notion of personality as 'social stimulus value', May found himself engaged in a decade-long controversy with psychologist Gordon W. Allport. As early as 1929, Allport criticized May's social stimulus value approach to personality, asserting that such an approach was superficial as it reduced personality to the outward appearance of the individual in the eyes of others (Allport, in American Psychiatric Association and the Social Science Research Council [APA/SSRC], 1930: 147). May, for his part, criticized the concept of personality trait championed by Allport (May, in ibid.: 79). In spite of their disagreements, May and Allport remained on good terms, collaborating on such projects as the SSRC's Subcommittee on Competitive-Cooperative Habits. For Allport's notion of personality trait and his rejection of character as a scientific object, see Nicholson (2003).

8. See Bryson (2002: 167–71) for more on the 1930 Conference on Personality and Culture and its discussions and proceedings.

9. See Frank (1934) for a report on the 1934 Hanover Conference; see General Education Board (1935) for a report on the follow-up conference held at Holderness, New Hampshire. Also, see Bryson (2002: 172–6) for a summary of the proceedings of the Hanover Conference of 1934 and of its 1935 follow-up conference in Holderness, New Hampshire.

10. See R. Crane's Foreword in May and Doob (1937) and May (1937a) for accounts of the subcommittee.

11. See Brick (2006: 86–120) for a treatment of the critique of competitive individualism elaborated during the 1930s by social scientists associated with culture and personality, including Sapir, Mead and Ruth Benedict.

12. For May's account of the various research focuses of the IHR during its first 5 years, see May (1935b: 2–4).

13. Indeed, as of October 1929, May was already a member of the IHR's Research Program Committee, along with Donald Slesinger, then the institute's executive secretary, Clark Hull, and several others; this committee seems to have been set up to assist in selecting proposed

projects, to maintain contact with organizations such as the Social Science Research Council and the university research institutes, and generally to help with the coordination of the institute's research program (Slesinger, 1929a; 1929b). A few months later, in January 1930, May was appointed to chair a committee dealing with statistical issues and equipment, with the aim of setting up a statistical laboratory; Hull and D. S. Thomas were also appointed to serve on this committee (Slesinger, 1930).

14. Although several of these reports did not indicate their authors, textual evidence, including the use of specific wording and ideas, strongly indicates May's authorship.

15. Sapir's (1932) proposal was attached as an appendix to May's proposed program.

16. Warner and his associates were invited to present the results of their research on 'Yankee City' at a conference sponsored by the institute in May 1939. Proclaiming his interest in the 'foundations of personality and culture', Warner presented a detailed summary of his approach and findings at the conference. Thus, he provided a detailed outline of the class structure of Yankee City, and he suggested that this structure would have a large impact on the 'social personality' of individuals within this community. The project of Allison Davis and John Dollard on the life histories of African American youth in southern urban communities was also discussed at the conference; their project resulted in their important study *Children of Bondage* (1940). See Institute of Human Relations (1939a).

17. In the October 1932 version of this report, several corrections were indicated, including the substitution of the word 'diverse' for the word 'division' (as used in the original report). I have used the corrected October version of the report in quoting this section of the report. See May (1932d: 14).

18. In his combined report for the 1937–8 and 1938–9 years, May (1939b: 4–6) described the two seminars as constituting the major integrating and coordinating efforts of the institute.

19. See Darnell's discussion of May's decision to cut off funding from Sapir and his group in 1937 and his denial of the IHR imprimatur for Hortense Powdermaker's study of African Americans in Indianola, Mississippi (Darnell, 1990: 357–8, 389). Although May had wanted to involve Sapir in the institute when the latter arrived at Yale to chair the Anthropology Department in 1931, May came to regret his initial support for Sapir. Thus, May complained to Gregg that Sapir used his IHR funding for ethnographic studies that seemed unconnected with the IHR research agenda (Gregg, 1937).

20. As indicated on the cover of May's IHR report for the 1935–6 year, 500 copies were to be printed.

21. I am indebted here to the work of Eric Hounshell (2013).

22. I deal with May's disappointment with community studies above, in the section on May's agenda for this field.

23. The SSRC's Advisory Committee on Personality and Culture was dismantled and succeeded by the Research Committee on Personality and Culture, which May came to chair in 1935, as I have noted above.

24. For a useful treatment of the relationship of Dollard and May at the IHR, see Darnell (1990: 394–7). According to Darnell (following a personal communication from Leonard Doob), Dollard even came to consider himself as 'the mastermind behind May and the integrated program of the IHR' (ibid.: 394). For more on Dollard, see Miller (1982) and Weidman (1999).

25. May's proposal to establish a Clinic of Human Relations within the IHR is especially worth examining. He hoped that such a clinic would play a central role in the IHR program by

making available to researchers a colony of 'normal person' who would reside as 'guests' within the institute building. The guests of the clinic would provide researchers with the opportunity to conduct 'intensive studies of normal persons' over extended periods, enabling the researchers to study 'such factors as [the] health, emotional life, habits, ideas, and social relations' of the guests. May attempted to recruit Henry Murray of the Harvard Psychological Clinic to direct the clinic, but the latter declined. Ultimately, May's proposal for a Clinic of Human Relations does not seem to have come to fruition. See May (1935b: 8–10) and Murray to May (1935).

26. For a critique of Hull and his 'mechanic-biological' perspective, see J. A. Mills (1998).

27. Instructively, Hull's preferred method in studying behavior, the experiment conducted in laboratory settings, could not generally be applied to the study of personality and culture, socialization, the life history approach, and the like. Thus, socialization might be studied by means of a clinically oriented psychoanalytic approach, ethnographic methods, a comparative approach to ethnographic data, and a 'correlational' method, which tested hypotheses by means of statistical inference – but children going through the process of socialization were difficult to utilize as experimental subjects. For methods used in the study of socialization, see Child (1954: 655–6, 658–9) and Whiting (1968: 545–51).

28. My own sense of Hull's organizational role in the institute is that while he was quite capable of organizing and managing seminars (such as the Wednesday Evening Seminar) and small-scale projects (such as the rote learning project) in which he could preside as the intellectual leader, he was neither interested in nor capable of administrating a large-scale, complex organization such as the IHR had become. This is supported by Alan Gregg's terse description of his interview with Hull held in the fall of 1937: 'H. not verifiedly [*sic*] interested in the set up of the Institute, but enthusiastic and categorical in his defence of his theorems of learning, which he finds so rigorous and mathematically logical' (Gregg, 1937). Lemov's (2005: 73–86) treatment of Hull, in which she depicts him as an eccentric (albeit a prophetic one) obsessed with 'thinking machines', also seems to back up my sense of Hull's role in the IHR.

29. In addition to his support for the work of Dollard, who seems to have initially formulated the frustration–aggression hypothesis (Dollard, 1988[1937]: 267), May played an important role in motivating Neal Miller to work on this hypothesis. In the mid-1930s, May assigned Miller the project of testing Freud's theories by means of experimental psychology – and this project seems to have inspired Miller to work on the frustration–aggression hypothesis. More specifically, May (1934d) recommended Miller for an SSRC fellowship in order to send the latter to Europe to study psychoanalysis, and the two corresponded while Miller undertook a training analysis with Heinz Hartmann at the Vienna Psychoanalytic Institute. In one letter, May rather imperiously wrote Miller: 'I am expecting that your research activities will fit in with our general program. One of the important lines of development is that of devising experimental procedures for checking on certain psychoanalytic concepts' (May to Miller, 1936c). By June 1937, Miller was reporting to May on his extensive work on frustration and aggression in collaboration with Dollard and others (Miller, 1937).

30. Significantly, *Caste and Class* was *not* informed by the Hullian theory of adaptive behavior but was based in large part on Freud's psychoanalysis. In its utilization of life histories in order to study racial tensions in the South, the book elaborated the approach initially formulated in Dollard's *Criteria*. A major achievement for the institute, *Class and Caste* was eventually elevated to the status of a social science classic.

31. May (1971: 159–66) discussed the relationship of Hull's learning theory to psychoanalytic theory, culture, social structure and anthropology in his history of the IHR. For the importance of the study of 'social learning' and 'social behavior' for IHR research efforts, see May (1941b). See Morawski (1986: 235) for Hull's formulation of his 'general theory of social behavior'.
32. A number of these aspects of social behavior were dealt with in the sessions of the Monday Night Group during the 1938–9 year (Institute of Human Relations, 1939b). Issues concerning social class and racial caste were explored in the 'Research Conference on Social Classes' held at the institute in May 1939 (Institute of Human Relations, 1939a).
33. Over the years, researchers who had been affiliated with the IHR produced a body of important work on socialization. See, for example, Child (1954); Whiting (1968). An important book to emerge from the elaboration of the learning-theory approach to socialization was R. R. Sears, E. E. Maccoby and H. Levin's (1957), which examined child rearing practices in the United States. For an overview of the evolution of the concept of socialization during the 20th century, see Morawski and J. St. Martin (2011).
34. The Simmons and Ford books were actually autobiographical documents narrated by Native Americans.

References

Archival abbreviations

GEB: General Education Board Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.
IHR: Institute of Human Relations, Yale University, Records (RU 483), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, CT.
JRA: James Rowland Angell, President of Yale University, Records (RU 24), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, CT.
LKF: Lawrence K. Frank Papers, Ms C 280b, History of Medicine Division, National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, MD.
MAM: Mark A. May Papers, Ms 1447, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, CT.
RF: Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

Published works and archival materials

American Psychiatric Association (APA) (1929) *Proceedings: First Colloquium on Personality Investigation*. Baltimore, MD: Lord Baltimore Press.
American Psychiatric Association and the Social Science Research Council (APA/SSRC) (1930) *Proceedings: Second Colloquium on Personality Investigation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Angell to May (1932) 1 December 1932, box 112, folder 1140, JRA.
Biehn, K. J. (2008) 'Psychobiology, Sex Research and Chimpanzees: Philanthropic Support for the Behavioral Sciences at Yale University, 1923–41', *History of the Human Sciences* 21(2): 21–43.
Brick, H. (2006) *Transcending Capitalism: Visions of a New Society in Modern American Thought*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Bryson, D. (2002) *Socializing the Young: The Role of Foundations, 1923–1941*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Bryson, D. (2005) 'Toward a New Science of Man', *Intellectual News* 15(1): 61–8.

Bryson, D. (2009) 'Personality and Culture, the Social Science Research Council, and Liberal Social Engineering: The Advisory Committee on Personality and Culture, 1930–1934', *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 45(4): 355–86.

Capshew, J. J. (1999) 'The Yale Connection in American Psychology: Philanthropy, War and the Emergence of an American Elite', in T. Richardson and D. Fisher (eds) *The Development of the Social Sciences in the United States and Canada*. Stamford, CT: Ablex Publishing, pp. 143–54.

Carson, J. (1993) 'Army Alpha, Army Brass, and the Search for Army Intelligence', *Isis* 84(2): 278–309.

Child, I. L. (1954) 'Socialization', in G. Lindzey (ed.) *Handbook of Social Psychology*, vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing, pp. 655–92.

Child, I. L. (1970[1943]) *Italian or American?* New York: Russell & Russell.

Crowther-Heyck, H. (2006) 'Herbert Simon and the GSIA: Building an Interdisciplinary Community', *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 42(4): 311–34.

Darnell, R. (1990) *Edward Sapir: Linguist, Anthropologist, Humanist*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Davis, A. and Dollard, J. (1940) *Children of Bondage*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Day, E. E. to May (1935a) 26 February 1935, series I, box 3, folder 22, MAM.

Day, E. E. to May (1935b) 23 April 1935, series I, box 3, folder 22, MAM.

Day, E. E. (1936) 'Memorandum to Mr. Fosdick – Subject: Yale Institute of Human Relations', 28 July 1936, record group 1.1, series 200, box 67, folder 809, RF.

Dollard, J. (1934) 'Some Comments on the Organization of an Institute of Human Relations', 1 June 1934, record group 1.1, series 200, box 67, folder 808, RF.

Dollard, J. (1935) *Criteria for the Life History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dollard, J. to May (1935) 12 August 1935, series 1, box 3, folder 24, MAM.

Dollard, J. (1988[1937]) *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Dollard, J. (n.d.) 'Professional record of John Dollard', Dollard's c.v., series 1, box 3, folder 25, MAM.

Dollard, J. *et al*. (1939) *Frustration and Aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Erikson, E. H. (1985[1950]) *Childhood and Society*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Fisher, D. (1993) *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ford, C. S. (1968[1941]) *Smoke from Their Fires: The Life of a Kwakiutl Chief*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Foucault, M. (2003) 'Omnes et Singulatim: Toward a Critique of Political Reason', in P. Rabinow and N. Rose (eds) *The Essential Foucault*. New York: The New Press, pp. 180–201.

Frank, L. K. (1934) 'Report on Study of Human Relations', box 12, LKF.

Frank, L. K. (1936) 'Society as the Patient', *American Journal of Sociology* 42(3): 335–44.

Furniss to Lynd (1932) 15 March 1932, series 1, box 4, folder 44, MAM.

General Education Board (GEB) (1935) 'Holderness, New Hampshire Conference [transcript]', box 8, LKF.

Grant, J. (1998) *Raising Baby by the Book: The Education of American Mothers*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gregg, A. (1935a) 'Impressions from visit to the Institute of Human Relations, Yale University, New Haven, October 7–12, 1935', record group 1.1, series 200, box 67, folder 808, RF.

Gregg, A. (1935b) 'Notes on Interviews, October 7–11 AG with Personnel at Institute of Human Behavior [*sic*], Yale University, New Haven', record group 1.1, series 200, box 67, folder 808, RF.

Gregg, A. (1937) Diary entries on interviews with IHR staff, 18–20 October 1937, record group 1.1, series 200, box 67, folder 810, RF.

Haraway, D. (1989) *Primate Visions*. New York: Routledge.

Hartshorne, H. and May, M. A. (1927) 'The Character Education Inquiry, Teachers College, Columbia University', *Religious Education* 22: 958–61.

Hartshorne, H. and May, M. A. (1928) *Studies in the Nature of Character*, vol. I, *Studies in Deceit*. New York: Macmillan.

Hartshorne, H., May, M. A. and Maller, J. B. (1929) *Studies in the Nature of Character*, vol. II, *Studies in Service and Self-Control*. New York: Macmillan.

Hartshorne, H., May, M. A. and Shuttleworth, F. K. (1930) *Studies in the Nature of Character*, vol. III, *Studies in the Organization of Character*. New York: Macmillan.

Healey, W. and Bronner, A. F. (1937) *New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hounshell, E. (2013) 'Training a Vast Army of Social Researchers: Pedagogy at the Columbia Bureau of Applied Research', paper presented at the annual European Society for the History of the Human Sciences conference, 30 July 2013, Wurzburg, Germany.

Hull to May (1937) 12 October 1937, series 1, box 4, folder 40, MAM.

Isaac, J. (2012) *Working Knowledge: Making the Human Sciences from Parsons to Kuhn*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Institute of Human Relations (IHR) (1939a) 'Synopsis of Research Conference on Social Classes', IHR, 20–21 May 1939, transcribed by O. H. Mowrer, series III, box 10, folder 37, MAM.

Institute of Human Relations (IHR) (1939b) 'Abstract of S-R Sessions of Monday Night Group[,] 1938–1939', IHR, series II, box 7, folder 30, MAM.

Kevles, D. J. (1968) 'Testing the Army's Intelligence: Psychologists and the Military in World War I', *Journal of American History* 55(3): 565–81.

King, D. B., Viney, W. and Woody, W. D. (2009) *A History of Psychology*, 4th edn. Boston, MA: Pearson International.

Laski, H. J. (1930) *The Dangers of Obedience and Other Essays*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Lemov, R. (2005) *World as Laboratory*. New York: Hill & Wang.

Lynd, R. S. to May (1930) 10 August 1930, series I, box 4, folder 44, MAM.

Lynd, R. S. to May (1932a) 11 March 1932, series I, box 4, folder 44, MAM.

Lynd, R. S. to May (1932b) 15 March 1932, series I, box 4, folder 44, MAM.

Lynd, R. S. (1939) *Knowledge for What?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lynd, R. S. and Lynd, H. M. (1929) *Middletown*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

May, M. A. (1929) 'The Adult in the Community', in C. Murchison (ed.) *The Foundations of Experimental Psychology*. Worcester, MA: Clark University Press, pp. 738–85.

May, M. A. (1930) 'Research Methods in Personality and Culture', box 9, folder 29, MAM.

May, M. A. (1932a) 'A Program of Research for the Social Science Division of the Institute of Human Relations', box 112, folder 1140, JRA.

May, M. A. (1932b) 'Part III [:] A Program of Research for the Institute of Human Relations', series I, box 109, folder 1109, JRA.

May, M. A. (1932c) 'Report to the President [,] Institute of Human Relations', box 1, folder 2, IHR.

May, M. A. (1932d) 'To the President of the University', series I, box 109, folder 1109, JRA.

May, M. A. (1932e) Minutes of IHR directors, 7 November 1932, series I, box 109, folder 1109, JRA.

May, M. A. to Lynd (1932f) 5 March 1932, series I, box 4, folder 44, MAM.

May, M. A. to Lynd (1932g) 18 March 1932, series I, box 4, folder 44, MAM.

May, M. A. to Day (1932h) 4 June 1932, series I, box 3, folder 22, MAM.

May, M. A. to Angell (1932i) 28 November 1932, box 112, folder 1140, JRA.

May, M. A. to Terman (1932j) 12 December 1932, series I, box 5, folder 55, MAM.

May, M. A. (1934a) 'Is There a Science of Human Relations?', box 13, folder 63, MAM.

May, M. A. (1934b) 'Report of the Institute of Human Relations', box 1, folder 4, IHR.

May, M. A. (1934c) 'Memorandum Concerning IHR', handwritten manuscript, series I, box 1, folder 5, IHR.

May, M. A. (1934d) Recommendation of N. Miller for SSRC fellowship, series I, box 4, folder 46, MAM.

May, M. A. (1935a) 'Report of the Director of the Institute of Human Relations', series I, box 1, folder 5, IHR.

May, M. A. (1935b) 'Memorandum Concerning the Institute of Human Relations', box 1, folder 4, IHR.

May, M. A. (1935c) 'Memorandum for Consideration of Dr. Kahn and for Subsequent Discussion by Dr. Kahn with the Committee of the Institute', series I, box 109, folder 1111, RJA.

May, M. A. to Day (1935) 17 May 1935, series I, box 3, folder 22, MAM.

May, M. A. (1936a) 'Is There a Science of Human Relations?', *The Family* 17: 139–44.

May, M. A. (1936b) 'Report of the Director of the Institute of Human Relations for the Academic Year 1935–1936', series I, box 1, folder 6, IHR.

May, M. A. to Miller (1936c) 10 June 1936, series I, box 46, folder 46, MAM.

May, M. A. to Angell (1936d) 1 September 1936, series I, box 109, folder 1111, JRA.

May, M. A. to Angell (1936e) 8 October 1936, series I, box 109, folder 1111, JRA.

May, M. A. (1937a) 'A Research Note on Co-Operative and Competitive Behavior', *American Journal of Sociology* 42(6): 887–91.

May, M. A. (1937b) 'Institute of Human Relations[,] Report of Mark A. May, Director', series I, box 1, folder 7, IHR.

May, M. A. (1939a) 'The Institute of Human Relations', series II, box 7, folder 34, MAM.

May, M. A. (1939b) 'Report of the Director of the Institute of Human Relations for the Academic Years 1937–38 and 1938–39', series I, box 1, folder 8, IHR.

May, M. A. to Murray (1939) 20 March 1939, series 1, box 4, folder 50, MAM.

May, M. A. (1940a) 'Coordination of the Sciences of Behavior', box 11, folder 18, MAM.

May, M. A. (1940b) 'Foreword', in C. Hull, *et al.*, *Mathematico-Deductive Theory of Rote Learning: A Study of Scientific Methodology*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

May, M. A. (1940c) May's contribution to 'Eleven Twenty-Six' conference, held at the University of Chicago in 1939, in L. Wirth (ed.) *Eleven Twenty-Six: A Decade of Social Science*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 130–4.

May, M. A. (1941a) *Education in a World of Fear*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

May, M. A. (1941b) 'Report of the Director of the Institute of Human Relations for the Academic Year 1940–41', series I, box 1, folder 10, IHR.

May, M. A. (1943a) *A Social Psychology of War and Peace*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

May, M. A. (1943b) 'The Unwritten Code of Science', *The Humanist* 3(3): 103–6.

May, M. A. to Hull (1943) 29 September 1943, series I, box 4, folder 41, MAM.

May, M. A. (1943–4) 'Science and Morality', *The Humanist* 3(4): 157–61.

May, M. A. (1950) *Toward a Science of Human Behavior: A Survey of the Work of the Institute of Human Relations Through Two Decades, 1929–1949*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

May, M. A. to Hull (1950) 25 December 1950, series I, box 4, folder 41, MAM.

May, M. A. (1971) 'A Retrospective View of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale', *Behavior Science Notes* 6(3): 141–72.

May, M. A. (1971[1932]) 'The Foundations of Personality', in P. S. Achilles (ed.) *Psychology at Work*. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, pp. 81–101.

May, M. A. (n. d.a) 'Cooperative Research', box 11, folder 16, MAM.

May, M. A. (n. d.b) 'Some Limitations of the Social Sciences', box 14, folder 110, MAM.

May, M. A. and Doob, L. (1937) *Competition and Cooperation*. New York: Social Science Research Council.

May, W. W. (1978) 'A Psychologist of Many Hats: A Tribute to Mark Arthur May', *American Psychologist* 33(7): 653–63.

Meyerowitz, J. (2010) '"How Common Culture Shapes the Separate Lives": Sexuality, Race, and Mid-Twentieth-Century Social Constructionist Thought', *Journal of American History* 96(4): 1057–84.

Miller, N. E. (1937) 'Research for 1936–37', series I, box 4, folder 46, MAM.

Miller, N. E. (1982) 'Obituary: John Dollard (1900–1980)', *American Psychologist* 37(5): 587–8.

Mills, C. W. (1959) *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mills, J. A. (1998) *Control: A History of Behavioral Psychology*. New York: New York University Press.

Morawski, J. G. (1986) 'Organizing Knowledge and Behavior at Yale's Institute of Human Relations', *Isis* 77(287): 219–42.

Morawski, J. G. and St. Martin, J. (2011) 'The Evolving Vocabulary of the Social Sciences: The Case of "Socialization"', *History of Psychology* 4(1): 1–25.

Murray to May (1935) 29 May 1935, series I, box 4, folder 50, MAM.

Nicholson, I. A. M. (2003) *Inventing Personality: Gordon Allport and the Science of Selfhood*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Pooley, J. (2013) 'A "Not Particularly Felicitous" Phrase: A History of the "Behavioral Sciences" Label', accessed November 2013, @: http://jeffpooley.com/pubs/pooley-behavioral-sciences.pdf

Richardson, T. and Fisher, D. (1999) 'Introduction: The Social Sciences and Their Philanthropic Mentors', in T. Richardson and D. Fisher (eds) *The Development of the Social Sciences in the United States and Canada*. Stamford, CT: Ablex Publishing, pp. 3–21.

Sapir, E. (1932) 'Suggestions for the Cultural and Personality Study of Two Selected New Haven Communities', box 112, folder 1140, JRA.

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E. and Levin, H. (1957) *Patterns of Child Rearing*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Simmons, L. W. (1942) *Sun Chief: The Autobiography of a Hopi Indian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Slesinger, D. (1929a) Agenda and reports of IHR Executive Committee, 29 October 1929, series I, box 109, folder 1110, JRA.

Slesinger, D. (1929b) Minutes of IHR Executive Committee meeting and organization plan, 25 November 1929, series I, box 109, folder 1110, JRA.

Slesinger, D. (1930) Agenda and minutes of IHR Executive Committee, 13 January 1930, series I, box 109, folder 1110, JRA.

Smith, M. C. (1994) *Social Science in the Crucible*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Social Science Research Council (SSRC) (1930) 'Discussion: Conference on Personality and Culture, Social Science Research Council, Hanover, August 1930', box 14, LKF.

Susman, W. I. (1984) *Culture as History*. New York: Pantheon.

Warner, W. L. and Lunt, P. S. (1941) *The Social Life of a Modern Community*, vol. 1. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Weaver, W. (1934) Report on Institute of Human Relations, 23–24 January 1934, record group 1.1, series 200, box 67, folder 807, RF.

Weidman, N. (1999) 'Dollard, John', in J. A. Garraty and M. C. Carnes (eds) *American National Biography*, vol. 6. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 708–10.

Whiting, J. W. M. (1968) 'Socialization: Anthropological Aspects', in D. L. Sills (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 14. New York: Macmillan and the Free Press, pp. 545–51.

Whiting, J. W. M. and Child, I. L. (1953) *Child Training and Personality: A Cross-Cultural Study*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wrong, D. H. (1961) 'The Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology', *American Sociological Review* 26(2): 183–93.

Yale Corporation (1931) Minutes, 12 December 1931, series 1, box 109, folder 1109, JRA.

Young, D. (1936) 'A Note on Procedure in the Planning of Research', *American Journal of Sociology* 42(1): 95–9.

Author biography

Dennis Bryson is assistant professor in the Department of American Culture and Literature at Bilkent University in Ankara, Turkey. He holds a PhD from the University of California at Irvine and an MA from the New School for Social Research in New York City.