

The Development of Philanthropic Interest in the Scientific Study of Political Behavior

By Emily Hauptmann

Professor, Political Science Department
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

emily.hauptmann@wmich.edu

© 2011 by Emily Hauptmann

Most political scientists in the U.S. agree that the behavioral revolution of the 1950s and 1960s brought about a sea change in the discipline (Adcock 2007). In the last few decades, however, some have argued that it may not have been so great or sudden a change after all (Drzyek 2006, Farr 1995, and Gunnell 1993). Others, including myself, have tried to pinpoint how political science changed after WW II and when it did so (Adcock 2007 and Hauptmann 2012). Still, whatever one's view of these matters, "behavioralism" (as political scientists came to call the orientation associated with the revolution), remains firmly embedded in the academic study of politics in the U.S. The study of informal institutions and political processes, a loosely positivistic idea of a "value-free" science and the emphasis on the collection and statistical analysis of quantitative data, behavioral commitments all, are part of the deep structure of political science today.

My research at the RAC this spring focused on one principal question: in the years immediately after WW II, how and why did the officers in the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) support behavioralism? Implicit in this question are a few ideas about why the records of foundations and research councils are good sources for understanding the rise of new academic approaches. For one, foundations and councils not only

help launch particular approaches, but they also help establish them in the academy.¹ On this level, I am interested in whether the RF and the SSRC developed and acted on programmatic commitments to behavioralism that proved crucial to its development. Second, foundations and research councils can be important forums for discussing new approaches, even when these discussions do not ultimately lead to major new programs. Studying records of officers' interviews, grant files, accounts of conferences and meetings, etc., can help historians understand how people made sense of a new approach and who supported or opposed it and why.

There are several marked contrasts between the SSRC's support for behavioralism compared to that of the RF. For one, many associated with the SSRC, especially the political scientist Pendleton Herring, who began his long term as its president in 1948, were strongly committed to the scientific study of political behavior very early. They were in the vanguard of what they hoped would be a new approach to the study of politics. By contrast, the RF was a later and relatively less enthusiastic supporter of the behavioral sciences. Unlike the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation, both of which devoted most of their social science budgets to supporting the behavioral sciences, the RF's social science program was more eclectic and included some programs supporting distinctly anti-behavioral approaches to the study of politics.²

Similarly, while the leaders of the SSRC championed behavioralism as a new approach to the study of politics, the RF's first major grants in this area did not highlight its novelty. Instead, in the case of the grant to the University of Alabama's Bureau of Public Administration that supported the writing of Valdimer Orlando Key's *Southern Politics* (1949), RF officers categorized this project as part of their well-established program in public administration, rather than as a new approach to political research. Furthermore, in the case of the RF grant that

supported the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center's study of the 1956 presidential election, several prominent Division of Social Sciences (DSS) officers were still expressing doubts about the merits of what had by the mid-1950s, already become a nationally recognized center of behavioral research.

The differences between the SSRC and the RF's support for behavioralism discussed in this report diverge sharply from another comparison of RF/SSRC commitments I studied during a 2005 visit to the RAC. In that earlier visit, I focused on the records of a different RF initiative in the Social Sciences, the Legal and Political Philosophy Program (LAPP), a program the RF promoted far more actively than did the SSRC. Indeed, though the SSRC eventually agreed to administer an LAPP fellowship program, its leaders were reluctant to take it on, objecting that the LAPP program did not belong in "social science."³ In the case of the LAPP, the SSRC was a largely passive and reluctant junior partner in an RF conceived program.

By contrast, in the area of political behavior, the SSRC self-consciously acted to steer academic political science towards the scientific study of political behavior. The active part the SSRC played in this area is particularly remarkable, since without its own endowment or other independent source of funds, its leaders had to raise money from other sources to begin working on this initiative. Rather than being the somewhat reluctant "pass-through" as in the case of the RF's LAPP program, the SSRC's Committee on Political Behavior (CPB) developed into a strong advocate for the behavioral approach to political science and even helped shape foundation programs in this area.⁴

Though I have chosen to make the differences between the SSRC and the RF's commitment to behavioralism the focus of this report, several other related themes also emerged during my research. Since I cannot discuss these at length here, I shall simply mention them and

allude to them from time to time below. First, behavioralism appeared far less monolithic in the records I studied than I had imagined it would be. Rather than agreeing on fundamentals, self-identified behavioralists had protracted debates about what kinds of data and methods of analysis were best suited to understanding political behavior. I touch on these debates when I discuss the RF's support for different behavioralist projects below.

Second, I also noticed how debates about the substance and merits of behavioralism were enmeshed in bigger questions about what the newly emerging relations between government, private foundations and universities would mean for political scientists. Specific political behavior projects served as a lightning rod for these questions, since these projects were being done in a variety of sites and supported by a variety of funders. Departments of the federal government, state bureaus of public administration, university research institutes and private polling firms all did behavioral research – private foundations, government agencies and private businesses all funded it. For political scientists in the mid-twentieth century, debating the merits of behavioralism meant more than just debating whether the study of politics ought to rely on the statistical analysis of quantitative data. It also meant trying to foresee what political science would become if it continued on a primarily behavioral path in the emerging postwar academic research economy and whether this possible future ought to be welcomed or avoided.

The SSRC: An Active Promoter of Behavioralism

I shall now provide a handful of examples from the SSRC's records housed at RAC to illustrate its activist role in promoting behavioralism. Throughout its life, the SSRC's Committee on Political Behavior was fostered and supported by the political scientist Pendleton Herring. Named chair of the new committee by the outgoing president of the SSRC in 1945,⁵ Herring drafted, in September of that year, a preliminary statement of what this committee might

accomplish. The committee, Herring argued, should focus on a new area of research demonstrably in need of Council support and promising “scientifically sound work.” If it were organized by the Council, Herring continued, a committee on political behavior would be in a good position to do its work “in consultation with colleagues from...psychology, anthropology and sociology.”⁶ The committee, however, did not become active until nearly four years later in 1949, by which time Herring himself was president of the SSRC.⁷

In its early years, many members of this committee believed that political science had not gone nearly as far as sociology, psychology and anthropology towards becoming a behavioral science. Herring took the lead in addressing this perceived deficiency by organizing a conference in the summer of 1949 in Ann Arbor, out of which the first active CPB would emerge. The invited group of twenty political scientists heard from anthropologists, sociologists and a statistician on topics such as “polling methods and related techniques of attitude measurement that are applicable to political analysis” and “a sociological approach to politics,”⁸ though it also devoted some time to discussing the political scientist V.O. Key’s soon to be published *Southern Politics*. A report on the conference that appeared in the SSRC’s publication, *Items*, underscored all that political scientists stood to learn from other social sciences and how valuable interdisciplinary research could be in advancing the study of political behavior (Heard, 1949). Rather than feeling discouraged by the difficulties ahead, many who had attended the conference wrote Herring afterwards to say they had been energized by the meeting and looked forward, as one put it, to carrying on “the ‘missionary’ work” to spread the message of behavioralism among political scientists.⁹

Shortly after the Ann Arbor conference, Herring began his efforts to staff the committee with scholars he believed were doing research that would help flesh out the scientific study of

political behavior. Herring first approached David Truman of Williams College, who agreed to join, but not chair the committee. Herring then approached V.O. Key of Yale University, who served as chair the first four years of the committee's active life, from 1949 through 1953.¹⁰ Though political scientists were the most numerous members of the committee, Herring also recruited other social scientists to join it, including the social psychologist Angus Campbell of the University of Michigan, and the psychologist M. Brewster Smith of Vassar College.¹¹ Herring himself was devoted enough to the committee's work to be consistently active as an *ex officio* member throughout the 1950s.

By early 1950, the committee was up and running and beginning to work on an ambitious agenda to establish behavioralism more firmly within political science. As its records reveal, the committee pursued this goal in several ways. First, to broaden the behavioral approach beyond the field of American politics, the committee incubated and then helped launch the new SSRC committee in comparative politics, whose members applied the behavioral approach to political systems outside the U.S.¹² CPB members often insisted that behavioralism should not be understood as a specific field within political science but as an approach applicable to many areas.¹³ By helping new committees with a behavioral focus get started, the CPB put its conviction that behavioralism was widely applicable to other fields into practice.

Second, the CPB made sure its projects and aims were well-publicized, not only in the SSRC's *Items* but also in professional journals read by political scientists from all fields, like the *American Political Science Review* (APSR).¹⁴ In addition to the pieces about the committee's research activities that appeared in the APSR during the early 1950s, members of the committee also undertook broad surveys of the current state of political research and publicized the training seminars and fellowship opportunities the CPB sponsored widely.¹⁵ By the end of the 1950s

most U.S. political scientists had some sense of what “behavioral science” and “behavioralism” meant, in large part because of the CPB’s self-conscious efforts to publicize them.

Third, some members of the CPB helped secure Carnegie funding for Michigan’s Survey Research Center’s (SRC) study of eligible voters in the 1952 presidential election. Ultimately, Carnegie awarded the grant for this study to the CPB rather than to the University of Michigan. Though it is unclear whether this arrangement was originally suggested by the SRC’s Angus Campbell, the director of the proposed study, or by officials at the Carnegie Corporation, all strongly endorsed it. For his part, Campbell argued in a 1952 letter to Herring, that his proposal might have a better chance of being funded if other prominent members of the CPB discussed it with Carnegie officials in person. Campbell also framed his proposed study as the logical outgrowth of the CPB’s 1949 conference in Ann Arbor as well as “a powerful stimulus to the general field of quantitative research in political behavior.”¹⁶ Apparently, John Gardner of the Carnegie Corporation also felt that the CPB should play a leading role in the project, prompting Herring to inform the Executive Committee of the SSRC that the Corporation preferred to make the grant to the CPB rather than to Michigan, so that CPB members could oversee the planning and execution of the study.¹⁷

Some items in the SSRC records devoted to this grant suggest that Campbell, Herring and Gardner all thought this arrangement would allow Campbell and his team of researchers to conduct their study without the intervention of Michigan’s political science department – and especially its chair, James Pollock. Though Pollock was a nationally recognized political scientist, committed behavioralists on the CPB and at Michigan thought he would obstruct Campbell’s project, or at the very least muddy its waters. It fell mostly to Herring to deal with the increasingly annoyed Pollock, as the latter began to realize that he and his department were

being denied any significant role in Campbell's study. Over the course of several months, Herring consistently refused to grant Pollock any authority over the shape of Campbell's study, though he worked hard to maintain cordial personal relations with him. This particular example illustrates the tensions that were beginning to emerge within political science between self-identified behavioralists and representatives of other approaches who saw behavioralism either as a deviation to be corrected or only a slight variation on older themes.¹⁸

Outside the study of the 1952 election, the CPB and Campbell's team at the SRC worked together in other ways to root the study of political behavior more securely in political science. Campbell announced at a 1953 meeting of the CPB that he intended to organize a workshop the following summer "at which post-doctoral political scientists could develop plans for research based on the cards of the 1952 study, and receive guidance from the staff of the Survey Research Center in planning and conducting such research."¹⁹ The following fall, David Truman, now chair of the CPB, notified his committee that at their next meeting they would discuss their "collective reaction to some of the proposals of the 'students' whom Angus [Campbell] filled with the crusading spirit during the past summer."²⁰ After Campbell and other social scientists at the SRC had trained young political scientists how to design research projects analyzing the SRC's survey data, the CPB designed a fellowship program (funded by a grant from Carnegie), to support the most promising among these projects. These deliberate efforts to encourage behavioral research among political scientists bore fruit, because a number of the first young political scientists to attend the summer seminar and receive CPB grants quickly rose to prominence in the discipline.²¹ Towards the end of the 1950s, the CPB's David Truman noted with pride that Michigan's SRC had become one of the most important sites for advanced

training in political behavior in the country, concluding, “in a sense this Center has become a specialized and important graduate school.”²²

In just the first five years of its life, the SSRC’s CPB took a number of significant steps to promote behavioralism as a new research program in political science. Though dependent on foundation funds for its operation, the programs the CPB pursued were largely designed by its members, not its funders. Many of these programs, as I have shown, sought to spread the word about behavioral research among political scientists and to make work in this area appealing to younger scholars. By the early 1960s, few political scientists had failed to notice that some of their colleagues had indeed been “filled with the crusading spirit” and that their zeal was bringing profound change to the discipline.

The Rockefeller Foundation: A Tentative Supporter of Behavioralism

Compared to the SSRC, the RF was a far less enthusiastic supporter of behavioralism in political science. Unlike the SSRC’s Herring, who developed programs based on his strong commitment to behavioralism from the late 1940s through the 1950s, most of the officers of the RF’s Division of Social Sciences in the 1940s and 1950s had no such commitment. Though neither Joseph Willits, Director of DSS from 1939 to 1954, nor Norman S. Buchanan, Director of DSS from 1955 to 1958, were openly critical of the behavioral sciences, neither one of them made a special point of supporting them. Both Willits and Buchanan were trained in economics, a field possibly even more untouched by the development of the behavioral sciences in the 1940s and 1950s than political science. Kenneth W. Thompson, who became Director of DSS in 1960, after seven years on the DSS staff, was frequently critical of the behavioral sciences, especially of its manifestations in political science. A student of Chicago’s Hans Morgenthau, Thompson

often voiced his mentor's critique of "scientism" in the study of politics and made sure that Morgenthau himself was heard by the leaders of the RF (Guilhot 2011).

The one notable exception to this coolness towards behavioralism among the RF's DSS officers was Leland C. DeVinney. When DeVinney joined the RF's staff in 1948, he was one of a large group of social scientists working under the direction of Samuel Stouffer, to complete the four-volume *Studies in Social Psychology during World War II*, more commonly known by the title of its first two volumes, *The American Soldier* (Princeton, 1949). The book was widely praised for its sophisticated yet practical use of survey methods and attitude measures. Once on the RF staff, DeVinney argued that the RF should support this kind of social science dedicated to developing "better instruments and methods for the observation, description, measurement, and analysis of human behavior."²³ Although DeVinney was a strong advocate for the behavioral sciences in the RF, his principal interests were in sociology and psychology rather than political science.²⁴ While Herring, Truman and others at the SSRC believed the relatively slow development of behavioralism in political science justified concentrated and vigorous action, DeVinney appears to have focused on encouraging RF support for well-established behavioral science programs, staffed principally by sociologists and psychologists.²⁵

The various positions DSS officers took towards the behavioral sciences are vividly illustrated in the grant file devoted to the RF's funding of the social psychologist Angus Campbell's SRC study of the 1956 presidential election.²⁶ (Rather than discuss the RF grant record in this area chronologically, I begin with this mid-1950s grant to Campbell to highlight the contrasts between the RF and SSRC support for the same body of research.) Beginning in the mid-1950s, the RF provided significant support for Campbell's voting behavior studies by providing a 1956 grant of \$110,000 for three years, followed by a \$206,800 grant in 1960 for

four years. Though these were substantial grants, they were hardly early investments in new lines of research. By the mid-1950s Campbell had already completed several studies based on surveys of a random sample of the electorate nationwide, including the one overseen by the CPB, discussed above. He and his team at Michigan's SRC were well-established and well-funded for the time, having already completed projects funded by Carnegie, the Office of Naval Research, the Federal Reserve Board and I.B.M., among others.²⁷ The RF's support for Campbell's research on voting behavior came late and with some reservations.

It is not clear from the material in the file whether it was Campbell who first broached the idea of the RF support for his 1956 study, or whether a RF officer invited him to do so. Some of the earliest items in the file, however, show Campbell making his case for support directly to DeVinney, a fellow social psychologist. This occurred when DeVinney was serving as Acting Director of DSS from mid-1954 to mid-1955.²⁸ Moreover, Campbell's longer 1955 letters to DeVinney reveal that the two men knew one another well, and that Campbell felt sure DeVinney understood and supported the work Campbell proposed to do.²⁹

By contrast, Norman Buchanan initially took a more skeptical view of the proposed project.³⁰ Feeling that Campbell's proposal lacked a compelling justification, Buchanan wrote to DeVinney, "The immediate case for this study seems to be that there is an election in 1956. Are we to expect then, a study in 1960, 1964, *ad infinitum*?" Further, Buchanan wondered whether Campbell and his associates believed another survey would help them "understand the political process" or whether their goal was merely "the refinement of survey techniques."³¹ Despite Buchanan's reservations, the RF funded Campbell's proposal later in 1955. When Buchanan assessed Campbell's work, along with that of the Institute of Social Research (ISR) as a whole some two years later, his concerns had eased somewhat. Buchanan still worried, however, that

the frenetic pace of work at the ISR prevented scholars from thinking about how their work might contribute to social scientific theory. The ISR's staff, Buchanan noted, was "kept panting" because the University of Michigan provided only 10% of their budget – the rest came from grants or contract research.³²

Another DSS staff member, skeptical and sometimes explicitly critical of behavioral science was Kenneth W. Thompson. Few letters or memoranda from Thompson appear in the Campbell grant file until 1957, in that year Thompson solicited assessments of the work Campbell and his team had done thus far, and met with Campbell to discuss some of the more critical of these. Thompson appears to have asked at least eleven political scientists to assess the contributions of Campbell's work to political science and political theory and to address whether they believed this work had predictive power.³³ Only two of the responses included in the file are unqualifiedly positive. The rest of them are either intermittently critical or critical throughout.³⁴ Notes on an interview both Thompson and DeVinney conducted with Campbell begin with a long list of challenges the officers wanted Campbell to address, many of which seem more consistent with Thompson's skepticism about the applicability of behavioral science to the study of politics than with DeVinney's views. The officers note that they asked Campbell to discuss what about his work was specifically interesting to political scientists, given its strong emphasis on "psychological variables." They also challenged Campbell to justify an assumption implicit in his emphasis on cumulative data, namely that there are "underlying stable factors" that can explain political behavior over time, rather than "continually changing interests and motives...in response to continually changing historical events." The officers summarized Campbell's responses to these and other criticisms, remarking that Campbell expressed "surprise[] and disappoint[ment] at the implication that a significant number of political

scientists do not find this work interesting and useful.”³⁵ Nevertheless, as with Buchanan’s reservations, Thompson’s skepticism neither prevented nor abruptly ended RF support for Campbell’s work.

Considered on its own, the RF’s support for Campbell’s studies of the 1956 and 1960 presidential elections seems puzzling. Several key officers went on the internal record at the RF with significant doubts about the project’s merits, and Buchanan did so even before the first grant was made in 1955. How then, can one make sense of RF support for studies in voting behavior?

My sense is that not only did DeVinney’s commitment to the behavioral sciences matter, but so did the RF’s long history of support for the political scientist V.O. Key. Though now considered an important figure in the rise of behavioralism, I believe Key is better understood as a transitional figure in the history of political science. Like many people who received advanced degrees in political science in the early decades of the twentieth century, Key had a strong grounding in public administration and his earliest published work fell squarely in that field as well.³⁶ Furthermore, although Key, like many other behavioralists, emphasized analyzing quantitative data, he argued that political behavior could be most fully understood on the basis of aggregate data, such as voting returns and census data, rather than opinion surveys. Key’s reliance on electoral and demographic data, though not a common approach, was more familiar to many mid-twentieth century political scientists than the construction and analysis of surveys.³⁷ For these reasons, I believe it was possible for the RF to support Key without initially seeing that support as a strong endorsement of behavioralism. To expand on these points, I shall discuss two RF grants to Key: the first supported the research and writing of Key’s 1949 *Southern Politics*,

and the second funded Key's collection and analysis of decades of statistics on state elections outside the South.

The project that became Key's *Southern Politics* began as a proposal from Roscoe Martin, the director of the University of Alabama's Bureau of Public Administration, to the RF's Joseph Willits. When Martin's proposed bureau-sponsored study of the poll tax ran aground, he approached Willits to discuss the possibility of RF funding for a broader study of the electoral process in the South.³⁸ Bureaus of public administration were research organizations charged with doing research in the interest of the public officials and citizens of the state or municipality to which they were attached.³⁹ The RF made the initial grant to the Alabama Bureau in early 1946, DSS officer Roger F. Evans, who specialized in reviewing grants in public administration, was responsible for overseeing its progress. Therefore, at least initially the RF appears to have regarded this as a public administration project, rather than as a self-consciously novel foray into behavioral science.⁴⁰

Once Key agreed to lead the study, he too did not emphasize the novelty of what he wished to do. Moreover, he expressed his intention to write a book addressed to a wide audience rather than just political scientists.⁴¹ Key's *Southern Politics* was well received by both popular and academic reviewers. The popular press praised its "humane" and "dispassionate" analysis of the deep flaws that marred electoral politics in the southern states, while political scientists heralded it as an excellent model for the scientific study of political behavior.⁴² Though it may have inspired many of the early makers of the behavioral revolution, Key's book also fulfilled the hopes of the project's creator, Roscoe Martin, who cared more about changing the politics of the South than improving the research methods of political science.

Several years later in 1951, Key approached the RF with a project of his own design to collect and analyze state election statistics. By this time, the Committee on Political Behavior had already been formed, with Key serving as its head. If Key had not seemed to be an advocate for behavioralism to the RF officials in the late 1940s, his association with this new approach was impossible to miss now. How then, did the social science officers at the RF understand and argue for the merits of the research Key was now proposing?

In the 1951 grant action, the RF highlighted how Key's new project continued the work he had done in *Southern Politics*, which in many ways it did.⁴³ In the new project, Key proposed to collect and analyze fifty years of electoral data for nineteen states outside the South, using approaches similar to those in his 1949 book. Such a systematic collection of electoral data over time, Key believed, offered the best basis for answers to a range of questions about political parties, voter participation and political machines. Notably, Key contrasted the merits of the data he proposed to collect with the shortcomings of nation-wide surveys of voters during a presidential election year. He expressed his "grave doubts" about the merits of conclusions based solely on such surveys, arguing that "an analysis of many contrasting situations from state politics gives a much better base for understanding than does the usual reliance solely on presidential data."⁴⁴ Key's ideas about the best data for the study of political behavior differed considerably from Campbell's, and were probably also more familiar to political scientists and public administrators in the early 1950s than were Campbell's.

Nevertheless, several DSS officers found the weight Key placed on collecting and analyzing electoral data unsettling enough to ask Key to justify it. In the early months of 1951, after Key had already submitted several drafts of the project, but before the grant was made, Key noted that DSS Director Willits had told him that several members of his staff were "a little

worried by my emphasis on quantification.” Key sought to assuage these concerns by pointing out that a good part of the analysis in *Southern Politics* had relied on in-depth interviews with public figures, and also by noting that he “regard[ed] statistical methods in political research more as a means of description and of thinking, than as a means of precise measurement.”⁴⁵ Apparently, the way Key addressed these concerns was successful enough that over the next few years, several members of the DSS staff who had been especially critical of the trend towards “scientism” in political science not only praised Key’s open-mindedness on this point, but also sought his recommendations and advice.⁴⁶

Evaluating the RF’s grants in the area of voting behavior is challenging for a number of reasons. For one, DSS officers did not obviously make them as part of a specific program, in contrast to the LAPP grants for political theory I studied in 2005. Though the grant files in the area of voting behavior do not fit neatly into a programmatic frame, I found them historically valuable because they preserve a record of early debates about what behavioralism would become, and how it might have changed political science. Also, it is hard to make a strong case for seeing these grants as a particular officer’s effort to encourage the growth of behavioralism within political science. The officer who seems most likely to have conceived such a project was Leland DeVinney, since his diaries especially reveal that he focused much less on encouraging behavioral research in political science than in sociology and psychology. Nevertheless, the grants I have discussed along with many others in the area of voting behavior, were probably part of the RF’s significant commitment of thirty-five percent of DSS funds to develop “a science of social behavior.”⁴⁷ Despite their doubts about the merits of behavioral science, DSS Directors Buchanan and Thompson, appeared to have followed Willits’ lead in pursuing a “catholic” program in the social sciences.⁴⁸

Editor's Note: This research report is presented here with the author's permission but should not be cited or quoted without the author's consent.

Rockefeller Archive Center Research Reports Online is a periodic publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center. Edited by Erwin Levold, Research Reports Online is intended to foster the network of scholarship in the history of philanthropy and to highlight the diverse range of materials and subjects covered in the collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center. The reports are drawn from essays submitted by researchers who have visited the Archive Center, many of whom have received grants from the Archive Center to support their research.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and are not intended to represent the Rockefeller Archive Center.

Works Cited:

Adcock, Robert. "Interpreting behavioralism." In *Modern Political Science: Anglo-American Exchanges Since 1880*, edited by Robert Adcock, Mark Bevir and Shannon C. Stimson, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2007, pp. 180-208.

Converse, Jean. *Survey Research in the United States: Roots and Emergence, 1890-1960*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Dryzek, John. "Revolutions without Enemies: Key Transformations in Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 100: 4 (2006), pp. 487-492.

Eldersveld, Samuel. "Research in political behavior." *American Political Science Review* 46: 4 (1952), pp. 1003-1045.

Farr, James. "Remembering the Revolution: Behavioralism in American Political Science." In *Political Science in History: Research Programs and Political Traditions*, edited by James Farr, John S. Dryzek and Stephen T. Leonard, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp. 198-224.

Frantilla, Anne. "Social Science in the Public Interest: A Fiftieth-year History of the Institute for Social Research." *Bentley Historical Library Bulletin*, No. 45. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1998.

Garceau, Oliver. "Research in the Political Process." *American Political Science Review* 45: 1 (1951), pp. 69-85.

Guilhot, Nicolas, editor. *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

Gunnell, John G. *The Descent of Political Theory: The Genealogy of an American Vocation*. Illinois: Chicago University Press, 1993.

Hauptmann, Emily. "From Opposition to Accommodation: How Rockefeller Foundation Grants Redefined Relations between Political Theory and Social Science in the 1950s." *American Political Science Review* 100: 4 (2006), pp. 643-649.

Hauptmann, Emily. "The Ford Foundation and the Rise of Behavioralism in Political Science." (forthcoming) *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 2012.

Heard, Alexander. "Research on Political Behavior: Report on a Conference." *Items* 3: 4 (1949), pp. 41-44.

Lucker, Andrew M. *V.O. Key, Jr.: The Quintessential Political Scientist*. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.

ENDNOTES:

¹ In a forthcoming article (Hauptmann 2012), I argue that the Ford Foundation's Behavioral Science Program worked as a catalyst for the development and institutionalization of behavioralism in political science.

² Joseph H. Willits, Director of Division of Social Sciences (DSS) at the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) (1939-1954), explicitly endorsed what he called his division's "catholic" approach to supporting work in the social sciences, arguing that "humanists" and "social students" could learn from, rather than merely clash with one another. See Joseph H. Willits, "Social Science and Social Studies," pp. 2-3, 4, 22, and 52, Folder 19, Box 3, Series 910, RG 3, RF, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC). See also the discussions of the RF's support for anti-behavioral work in Hauptmann (2006) on Legal and Political Philosophy Program (LAPP) and in Guilhot (2011) on International Relations Theory.

³ See the section, "Infiltrating the SSRC," in Hauptmann (2006), pp. 645-646.

⁴ Herring served on the staff of the Carnegie Corporation from 1946 to 1948. When he became president of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) in 1948, he was able to secure Carnegie funding for a number of Committee on Political Behavior (CPB) activities, the 1949 conference in Ann Arbor and Michigan's Survey Research Center's study of the 1952 presidential election among them (both are discussed below). See "Committee on Political Behavior, 1949-1964, Committee on Governmental and Legal Processes, 1964-1972: A Report on the Activities of the Committees," SSRC, August 1973, p. 105, in Folder 1119, Box 189, Subseries 19, Series 1, Acc. 1, SSRC, RAC.

⁵ Robert T. Crane, SSRC, to V.O. Key, 8.2.45, Folder 5832, Box 470, Subseries 76, Series 1, Acc. 2, SSRC, RAC. In this letter, Crane, the outgoing president of the SSRC, asks Key to join the newly formed Committee on Political Behavior and informs him that he has appointed Herring as the new committee's chair.

⁶ Herring, "Proposal for the Establishment of an Exploratory Committee on Research in Political Behavior," September 1945, pp. 2, 4, Folder 5832, Box 470, Subseries 76, Series 1, Acc. 2, SSRC, RAC.

⁷ In the intervening years, Glen Heathers, who was working as SSRC Executive Director Donald Young's assistant, organized at least one workshop on political behavior at the University of Pittsburgh. An outline of topics discussed there, dated 1/6/47, 1/7/47 and 1/8/47, appears in Folder 5831, Box 470, Subseries 76, Series 1, Acc. 2, SSRC, RAC. For Carnegie Corporation records of Heathers's discussions with Carnegie's Charles Dollard, John Gardner, and Pendleton Herring (during his brief tenure as a member of Carnegie's staff), see Folder 14, Box 327, series III A.8, Carnegie Corporation, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University.

⁸ Pendleton Herring provides an overview of the planned program in "Proposed Seminar on Political Behavior," 4/4/49, Pendleton Herring, p. 1, in Folder 5831, Box 470, Subseries 76, Series 1, Acc. 2, SSRC. For the final program of the conference, see Alexander Heard (1949).

⁹ Avery Leiserson to Pendleton Herring, 9/6/49, Folder 5831, Box 470, Subseries 76, Series 1, Acc. 2, SSRC, RAC.

¹⁰ SSRC *Annual Reports*, 1950-1954.

¹¹ In Folder 5833, Box 470, Subseries 76, Series 1, Acc. 2, SSRC, RAC, see David Truman to Pendleton Herring, 9/29/49; Pendleton Herring to Valdimer Orlando Key, 10/25/49; Pendleton Herring to Angus Campbell, 12/20/49; M. Brewster Smith to Pendleton Herring, 1/3/50.

¹² Towards the end of 1951, Pendleton Herring drafted a memo, "A Tentative Approach to the Study of Comparative Politics," in which he urged the CPB to think about how scholars of comparative politics might change their approach to increase the number of cases they studied and to broaden the scope of their generalizations beyond European political systems. Pendleton Herring, 12/3/51, in Folder 1120, Box 189, Subseries 19, Series 1, Acc. 1, SSRC, RAC. By the end of 1953, the CPB helped organized a conference for comparativists. In early 1954, the SSRC authorized the creation of a new Comparative Politics Committee, its membership drawn largely from participants in the 1953 conference. See Minutes of the CPB, 11/7/53 and 11/8/53, p. 2 and Minutes of the CPB, 1/23/54, p. 1. Both are located in Folder 1120, Box 189, Subseries 19, Series 1, Acc. 1, SSRC, RAC; SSRC *Annual Report*, 1953-1954.

¹³ Portions of a memo entitled "Plans for a Program of Committee Activity: Papers and Small Conferences on 'Some New Directions in the Study of Political Behavior'", make this case explicitly. Its authors argue that political behavior is not a "sub-field...but an approach that is relevant to most if not all of the range of problems within the conventional scope of the discipline." Further, they urge that its advocates not present political behavior "as a 'movement' or fad in opposition to approaches in the institutional, legal, and normative traditions," p. 1, 3/1/53, Folder 1120, Box 189, Subseries 19, Series 1, Acc. 1, SSRC, RAC. (Though no authors' names appear on this

memo, other material in this folder suggests it was drafted by David Truman, Pendleton Herring and M. Brewster Smith.)

¹⁴ See Garceau (1951) and Eldersveld et al. (1952).

¹⁵ Garceau's *APSR* article was based on an extensive survey of current research and teaching on political behavior for which Garceau visited numerous colleges and universities and received syllabi and research materials from many more. Although publicizing the work of the committee was probably not the primary aim of Garceau's survey, it no doubt had such an effect.

¹⁶ Campbell to Herring, 1/25/52, Folder 5858, Box 473, Subseries 76, Series 1, Acc. 2, SSRC, RAC.

¹⁷ As Herring put it in a memo dated 3/12/52, to the Executive Committee of the SSRC, "John Gardner prefers to see the project financed by a grant to the Council, rather than to the University of Michigan, because the Carnegie Corporation officers feel that the former arrangement emphasizes the interdisciplinary character of the undertaking, and insures that the committee's interest in political behavior would receive primary attention." Folder 1428, Box 129, Subseries 16, Series 1, Acc. 2, SSRC, RAC.

¹⁸ For some examples of the conflict between members of the CPB and Pollock, see James Pollock to A. Campbell, 4/30/52, and P. Herring to J. Pollock, 5/2/52, 6/26/52, all in folder 5858, Box 473, Subseries 76, Series 1, Acc. 2, SSRC, RAC.

¹⁹ Minutes of the CPB, 11/7/53, 11/8/53, p. 2, Folder 1120, Box 189, Subseries 19, Series 1, Acc. 1, SSRC, RAC. The 1952 study, to which Campbell refers, was the SRC's Carnegie funded survey of a random sample of eligible voters in the 1952 presidential election. I discuss the CPB's role in this study in more detail below.

²⁰ David Truman to the CPB, 1954 (no day or month is given, but was sent in advance of the October meeting), Folder 1121, Box 189, Subseries 19, Series 1, Acc. 1, SSRC, RAC.

²¹ For the decision on an early set of CPB fellowships, see Minutes of the CPB, 11/18/55, 11/19/55, p. 2, Folder 1121, Box 189, Subseries 19, Series 1, Acc. 1, SSRC, RAC. Among the first group of recipients was Heinz Eulau, President of the American Political Science Association, 1971-1972, and John Wahlke, President of the American Political Science Association, 1977-1978.

²² David Truman to Kenneth W. Thompson, RF, 9/9/57, p. 1, in Folder 4993, Box 583, Series 200S, R.G 1.2, RFA, RAC. The University of Michigan is now home to the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research's summer quantitative methods seminars for graduate students in political science. It is now considered almost indispensable for any prospective Ph.D. in political science, whose research will rely on advanced statistical analysis.

²³ LCD, "Opportunities in the Social Sciences," p. 3, 1948 (no day, no month), Folder 18, Box 3, Series 910, RG 3, RFA, RAC. In the same folder, also see LCD, "Guideposts to RF's Research Program in the Social Sciences," 6/4/48, for similar arguments.

²⁴ According to his RF officer biography, DeVinney received his Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Chicago in 1941. He worked under the Harvard sociologist Samuel Stouffer in the Research Branch of the War Department from 1943-1946 and then served as Associate Director of the Stouffer-led Laboratory of Social Relations at Harvard, 1946-1948.

²⁵ DeVinney's diaries from 1951 through 1953 (RG 12.2, RFA, RAC), indicate that he had far less contact with political scientists than with sociologists, psychologists and anthropologists. I do not know whether this was his choice or whether these disciplines were simply his assigned "beat." Either way, since he had little contact with political scientists, DeVinney did not specifically argue for support for behavioral political science often.

²⁶ All documents cited in this paragraph may be found in Folder 4993, Box 583, Series 200S, RG 1.2, RFA, RAC, unless otherwise noted.

²⁷ See the discussion of the SRC's funding in the early postwar period, see Frantilla (1998), p. 21.

²⁸ L. C. DeVinney's interview notes, 6/2/55, indicate that Campbell dropped off a research proposal with him and asked for comments. A month later, Campbell sent DeVinney a revised copy of the proposal, with a letter noting that he tried to address some of DeVinney's comments. A. Campbell to L.C. DeVinney, 7/1/55. Attached to the letter is a 14 page proposal, dated 6/29/55. These exchanges occurred during the end of DeVinney's term as acting director of DSS, a post he held from July of 1954 (after Willits' retirement) through the end of June of 1955.

²⁹ In that letter, Campbell addresses DeVinney as "Lee." The letter offers a detailed account of how successful Campbell believes he and his SRC team have been in fulfilling the CPB's objective that their work "stimulates the interest and if possible the involvement of political scientists" (1). Campbell closes by thanking DeVinney for having "seen fit to take our proposal to the higher councils of the Foundation." (3)

³⁰ In an earlier report to DSS, Buchanan had argued that the RF should not make funding voter and consumer behavior studies a high priority, given that this work was already well-funded by other sources. See NSB to JHW,

7/7/49, p. 4, Folder 18, Box 3, Series 910, RG 3, RFA, RAC. Compare this point to NSB's later concern that the quality of Michigan's ISR's work was compromised by how heavily its staff depended on research contracts.

³¹Norman S. Buchanan to L.C. DeVinney, inter-office correspondence, 8/3/55. In the proposal referred to above, Campbell argues explicitly that collecting cumulative data on voting behavior in successive elections is essential to explaining trends and changes in political behavior. Buchanan apparently did not find these arguments compelling.

³²The SRC was only one of several centers that made up Michigan's Institute for Social Research. Buchanan's full comment: "[The people at ISR] have an expensive plant and personnel to keep going on further survey research studies so that they are kept panting to find new things to do to pay the bills. In general...they get about 10% of their income from the University of Michigan and, for the remainder, about one-third each from Government work, private firms, and from foundations." N.S. Buchanan, interview notes on visit to Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 7/1/57 and 7/2/57.

³³See James M. Burns to K. W. Thompson, 9/3/57, for the best paraphrase of the questions posed in Thompson's letter.

³⁴Eleven letters to Thompson on this topic can be found in Folder 4993.

³⁵L. C. DeVinney and K. W. Thompson, interview with Angus Campbell, 9/3/57. All quotations from p. 1 of document.

³⁶Key's first published work, *The Administration of Federal Grants to States* (1937), was published by Chicago's Public Administration Service.

³⁷For a discussion of Key's graduate training in working with quantitative data at Chicago and his early published work in the area of public administration, see Lucker (2001). See also Converse (1987) for an account of the development of public opinion surveys.

³⁸See R. C. Martin to J.H. Willits, undated note attached to R.C. Martin to Virginius Dabney, 12/15/44, Folder 4797, Box 560, Series 200S, RG 1.2, RFA, RAC. All subsequent references are to folders in Box 560, unless otherwise noted.

³⁹See, for instance, the annual reports of the Alabama Bureau of Public Administration (1945-1946 and 1947-1948); both are included in Folder 4798. Most of the projects mentioned in them are specifically about Alabama and some appear to have been requested by Alabamans.

⁴⁰J.H. Willits to R. C. Martin, 7/6/49, Folder 4799.

⁴¹After refusing several times, Key finally agreed to direct the project sometime in the summer of 1946. See R.C. Martin to J.H. Willits, 9/10/46, Folder 4798. "Our objective has been to come out ultimately with a report that would constitute something of a contribution to the literature of political science as well as a study of interest to a fairly large body of citizenry." V.O. Key to R.C. Martin, "One Year of the Electoral Process Survey," p. 1, 9/20/47, Folder 4798.

⁴²See "Comments on *Southern Politics*," attached to York Willbern, Acting Director of Alabama's Bureau of Public Administration, to Roger F. Evans, 12/21/49, Folder 4799.

⁴³RF Grant action 51082, 5/31/51, Folder 4431, Box 519, Series 200S, RG 1.2, RFA, RAC. All subsequent references are to material in this folder unless otherwise noted.

⁴⁴See V.O. Key, "A Project for the Collection of State Election Statistics," pp. 5-7, n.d. (attached to J.H. Willits' interview notes, 2/20/51), and V.O. Key, "Report on Project, 'Studies in State Election Statistics,'" 8/20/52, p. 3, both in Folder 4431. In the latter report, Key also expressed his "grave doubts about many of the conclusions widely propagated as a result of some of the opinion survey analyses. Some tedious, but fairly simple studies of the larger range of data available in the returns, ought to contribute a better understanding of the ways in which the voter acts and, perhaps, in the long run, contribute to the more rational conduct of public affairs" (p. 3).

⁴⁵V.O. Key to E.S. Mason, Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Public Administration, 4/18/51, Folder 4431. Key also submitted a "Supplementary Statement on Plan for Collection of State Election Statistics," 4/18/51, to the RF to address his concerns about the overemphasis on quantification in his earlier project proposal.

⁴⁶Both Herbert A. Deane, a consultant to the RF for the LAPP program, and K. W. Thompson, express their respect for Key and praise him for not signing on to a narrow scientism. For example, Deane comments approvingly that Key thinks there's "plenty of room [in political science] for the 'poets' as well as the 'scientists.'" HAD, interview notes with VOK, p.1, 3/26/53, Folder 4431. Also, in a 12/31/53 letter to Key, Thompson praises an essay of Key's and asks to meet with him "with or without obligato from the Committee on Political Behavior." Shortly thereafter, Key joined the RF's advisory committee for LAPP.

⁴⁷JHW, "A Program in the Social Sciences," Excerpt from Trustees' Confidential Report, 6/1/50, p. 25, Folder 18, box 3, series 910, RG 3, RFA, RAC.

⁴⁸See note #2.