Psychologizing School Problems: The Science of Personality Adjustment in Interwar U.S.

by Huimin Wang
University of Wisconsin - Madison

Abstract

This research report is part of my dissertation project, "Creating the Well-Adjusted Citizen: The Human Sciences and Public Schools in the United States, WWI - 1950," which examines the ideas of psychological adjustment and shifting meanings of the "well-adjusted citizen" in the human sciences and in public schools. The goal of the dissertation is to explore the implications of adjustment thinking upon the scrutiny of emotional fitness among its citizenry in the United States. This report focuses specifically on how human scientists and educators approached the interpretation or measurement of personality in the interwar years. I argue that within scientific constructions of personality, there existed two tendencies: one sought to quantify and standardize personality into separable traits or measurable quotient; the other treated personality as a dynamic and holistic process in the context of individuals' interactions with culture. Both tendencies bore epistemological and political implications in the history of psychology and schooling. Ultimately, the ways in which experts and educators conceptualized personality shaped ideas of human differences and functioned to reinforce hierarchical understandings of human nature.

Psychologizing School Problems: The Science of Personality Adjustment in Interwar U.S.

In 1919, the US Public Health Service prepared a circular for state and local health officers, educational administrators, and others interested in promoting mental hygiene. The circular stated: "it is quite generally accepted that the imperfect mental adjustment exhibited by a number of individuals who are incapable of the highest citizenship, though not insane in the proper interpretation of the term, is largely due to the lack of proper mental training during childhood." The circular suggested that teachers should pay attention to the personality development of children and watch for the kinds of "faulty traits of personality which may be corrected in their incipiency."[1]

A new way of thinking about individuals' fit (and misfit) in social and educational institutions gradually spread in the US after World War I. The key to evaluate fitness were various conceptions of psychological "adjustment" and "maladjustment." Marked by the emphasis on the emotional, social, and personality adjustment of children at home, school, and society, this psychological way of thinking intersected with new scientific construction of human nature and mental hygiene, and penetrated various reform efforts in education and welfare. The aim of my larger dissertation project is to examine the emergence and circulation of adjustment thinking in the human sciences and public schools, and the social implications of the scrutiny of emotional fitness among its citizenry in the United States.

The collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center helped me map out the networks of scholars, educators, and philanthropic officers who promoted ideas of emotional, social, and personality adjustment in scientific communities, as well as in education reforms. In particular, using the records of the Commonwealth Fund, the General Education Board, the Social Science Research Council, and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, I was able to capture the emergence and circulation of ideas about psychological adjustment during the interwar years.

This report focuses on interwar discourse of personality adjustment in scientific community and educational reform. Specifically, I ask a series of questions: How did social scientists and educators imagine personality? What methods did they use to interpret or measure personality adjustment? What were the intellectual and social implications of particular approaches? I argue that at least two tendencies were in tension within scientific constructions of personality: one sought to quantify and standardize personality into separable traits or measurable quotient; the other treated personality as a dynamic and holistic process in the context of individuals' interactions with culture. Both tendencies bore epistemological and political implications in the histories of psychology and schooling. Ultimately, the ways in which experts and educators conceptualized personality shaped ideas of human differences and functioned to reinforce hierarchical understandings of human nature.

The Emerging Discourse of Personality Adjustment

During the interwar years, the emerging discourse of personality adjustment intersected with new scientific construction of human nature and mental hygiene in the US. The years after World War I saw various efforts to explore the psychological composition of human beings in relation to environment. More and more scientific experts and educators started to reframe social problems including school failure, juvenile delinquency, industrial employment mismatch, and the management of immigrant population and race relations as problems of emotional, social, and personality maladjustment.

Ideas of psychological adjustment became popular especially through the work of mental hygienists, who selectively embraced theories of psychoanalysis, dynamic psychiatry, and behaviorism.[2] Starting from the 1920s, in collaboration with National Committee for Mental Hygiene, the Commonwealth Fund's Program for the Prevention of Delinquency and its Mental Hygiene Program funded various

studies on the problems of maladjustment among juvenile delinquents, and sponsored the development of child psychiatry and child guidance clinics. Those programs facilitated the spread of conceptions associated with mental hygiene and psychological adjustment. At the same time, mental hygienists increasingly devoted their attention to childhood maladjustment and promoted the use of schools as a key site to attack the problematic psyche. For instance, Bernard Glueck, the Director of Psychiatric Clinic at Sing Sing Prison in New York, claimed in a 1917 article in the journal *Mental Hygiene,* that the studies on adult criminals "aid considerably in estimating the relative importance of early signs of maladjustment." Building on intricate classification and causation analysis among all prisoners in the state, Glueck and his colleagues developed an "etiology of maladjustment" that charted a number of hereditary and environmental factors of maladjustment in relation to one's life cycle.[3] In the early 1920s, Glueck served as the director of the Department of Mental Hygiene in the New York School for Social Work, which was among the first institutions to received funding from the Commonwealth Fund. In his annual report, Glueck concluded that about two thirds of the men under study at Sing Sing Prison reflected the problem of the recidivist. "This habituation in criminal ways has its determining roots in the childhood of these individuals." Through establishing connections between crime and childhood maladjustment, Glueck recommended to examine "the problems of childhood maladjustment." He considered public schools as the "most practical avenue through which the behavior and personality problems of childhood."[4]

Beyond mental hygienists, scientific experts in different fields also started to embrace a more holistic idea of selfhood – personality. Personality, as a new way of capturing the self, quickly gained intellectual and cultural purchase among the human sciences and public discourse in the first half of the 20th century.[5] Since the 1920s, more and more human scientists became dissatisfied with the concept of intelligence in explaining human differences and school problems. As Bernard Glueck recognized, in understanding the causes of childhood adjustment, the scientific community put "increasing emphasis on the 'conditioning influences' of life-experiences" rather than on "heredity and predetermination… Much more promise for a helpful orientation lies in an endeavor to understand the nature of the child's personality." [6] Personality and its adjustment gave human scientists and educators a new analytical tool to discuss human nature and individual

difference, and to evaluate the psychological and sociological conditions that shaped those differences.

Measuring Personality Types and Quotient

The 1920s and especially the 1930s witnessed the proliferation of tests, inventories, and scales for the measurement of personality adjustment. During this period, the first wave of experimental efforts to categorize personality emerged. Classic tests included the Thematic Apperception Test by Henry Murray and Christiana Morgan and Gordon Allport's Test of Ascendance-Submission. As historians of psychology point out, the research on personality in American psychology saw the growing dominance of psychometric model since the 1920s. Psychometric perspective of traits and large-scale tests started to represent the dominant paradigm for American personality psychology onward.[7] The market for personality testing and adjustment scales, however, expanded significantly beyond experimental work among psychologists. To some extent, commercial use and market demand drove the growth of personality testing. As historian Kurt Danziger points out, the need of social sorting in education and employment deeply shaped investigative practice and research product in American psychology.[8] In the field of education, a full-fledged testing movement coincided with and to some extent swept along the new sensibility in personality development. Possessed with statistical innovations developed and enhanced in intelligence testing, many experts were ready to apply psychometric assessment to the new idea of personality. The American Council of Education, for example, organized a few special committees to work on measurement, educational record, student guidance, and vocational adjustment in the 1920s and 30s.[9] Through overlapping conferences and committee work, various test developers and educational administrators proposed plans to integrate the measurement and evaluation of personality into schooling practices.

During the interwar years, schools were central to the production, consumption, and reconceptualization of knowledge on children's psychological adjustment. Researchers and administrators concerning school problems became pioneering

producers for a battery of tests to evaluate students' personality adjustment. Educators sometimes led the construction of personality tests, at other times cooperated with professional psychologists to develop tests, and also adapted available measures to new tests. The interlocking processes of collecting data, constructing questions and keys, validating tests, creating standard deviation and normal distribution, and promoting and selling tests almost always revolved around the education market. Teachers, guidance counselors, education administrators, and social workers expected personality tests to play an instrumental role in the diagnosis, classification and placement of individuals. In this process, there was a tendency to treat personality as equivalent to limited number of traits independent form each other and then assign values to different traits.

Frank Freeman, Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of Chicago, and Ethel Kawin, psychologist in the University of Chicago Laboratory School and Director of Guidance at Glencoe Public Schools, co-developed a "Teacher's Rating Scales for Pupil Adjustment." They stated the school had responsibility for the "personality development of its pupils."[10] In order to help schools and teachers make quick judgments on pupils' adjustment or maladjustment, Freeman and Kawin established five general categories regarding the personality development of students: intellectual characteristics, work and study habits, emotional adjustment, social adjustment, and scholastic achievement. Each category consisted of certain desirable traits. For example, the scale for emotional adjustment imagined "an emotionally adjusted child" as someone who "has emotional reactions well controlled," "is usually cheerful and happy," "feels reasonably 'secure'," and "has both extrovert and introvert characteristics in moderate degrees."[11] A socially adjusted child was expected to work well in group settings and have good attitude toward others. Hence, the "Teacher's Rating Scales for Pupil Adjustment," along with a variety of popular personality tests developed during the 1930s, also exemplified how social norms and biases were written into the standards of personality.

Not only did many tests ask questions that assumed the desirability of politeness, sociability, and heterosexual adjustment, the common validating practices of personality tests also reinforced existing social distinctions. For instance, test

developers often paired prison inmates with average high school students and compared their scores, in order to validate personality tests, knowing the reasons for imprisonment ranged from vandalism, homosexual acts, addictions, to felonies involving violence. In the validation process of the "Washburne Social-Adjustment Inventory," John Washburne, a professor at Syracuse University, paired "bright, adolescent, third- or fourth-offense prisoners" with "high school pupils who were selected by their teachers as being neither outstanding well-adjusted nor maladjusted." He then paired high school boys and girls "who were judged exceptionally maladjusted by at least three competent judges" with high school boys and girls who were considered as "exceptionally well-adjusted." By testing about 5,000 persons from those groups, he found that their scores presented "four overlapping, fairly normal curves, arranged in exactly the order one would expect of a true measure of social adjustment." In this way, the test was validated as a useful tool for measuring the personality and habits of all ages above the 8th grade.[12] Therefore, in the process of standardization, personality scales, inventories, and tests were often loaded with cultural expectations and prescribed differences along the lines of age, gender, race, class, and sexuality, which to large extent mirrored the existing social order.

Analyzing the Total Personality in Cultural Context

While the statistical or psychometric approach to personality reinforced social norms and hierarchies in the new formulation of the human psyche, an alternative approach presented both promise and peril. At the same time personality tests became popularized in school, industry, and state agencies, a relatively dynamic view emerged that treated personality as a holistic and an individually- and culturally-specific process. The records and publications from the Committee on the Study of Adolescents under the Progressive Education Association's Commission on Secondary School Curriculum and the American Youth Council's "Negro Youth Study," both sponsored by the General Education Board, epitomized this point of view.

The Progressive Education Association (PEA) established a Commission on Secondary School Curriculum in 1932, with the goal to develop a program for collaborative research for the reorganization of secondary education. The Commission worked closely with the famed PEA Commission on the Relation of School and College, which conducted the Eight-Year Study — an experimental project exploring innovative curriculum without the burden of traditional college admission requirements. [13] Initially, the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum consisted of a few sub-committees concerning different subjects such as science and social studies. They soon realized that in order to conceive the reorganization of secondary school curriculum, an understanding of adolescents' needs and personality was imperative. A Committee on the Study of Adolescents was thus added in 1934, with Caroline Zachry as chairman.[14]

The Committee on the Study of Adolescents (also known as the Zachry Committee) conducted intensive studies on more than two hundred white students from selective progressive schools, most of whom came from middle to upper-middle class background. Those schools were also core participants in the Eight-Year Study on the relation between secondary school and college. Meanwhile, Caroline Zachry started to organize weekly staff seminars exploring theories and techniques. [15] Those case studies and seminars became the intellectual ferment for a dynamic and holistic approach to analyzing adolescent personality.

Reports and publications from the Committee on the Study of Adolescents emphasized the uniqueness of personality in the context of individual growth experience as well as personal interactions with social and cultural forces. As the Committee staff frequently stated, the individual "responds in every situation as a whole personality."[16] This whole personality was not regarded as reducible to distinct or unitary traits. Instead, "the individual must be conceived as a functionally interrelated whole, a complex organism which has passed through a developmental history and responds at any given moment to an array of inner and outer forces." [17] This approach emerged in a closely connected intellectual community, where interdisciplinary conversation among human scientists and educators embraced the overarching theme of "personality and culture" — the

notion that personality and culture were mutually-constituent and should be examined in relation to each other.

Over the course of the adolescent study (1934-1939), the Committee recruited educators, psychologists, psychiatrists, physicians, anthropologists, sociologists, and psychiatric social workers, who were or later became the leading voices in mid-20th century human sciences.[18] Notably, a cohort of European immigrant researchers with direct experience with Freudian or Jungian psychoanalysis and other psychiatric innovations engaged in the study, including Peter Blos, Erik Erikson, Bruno Klopfer, and Fritz Redl. At the same time, cultural anthropologists and sociologists, who were later labeled as the "culture and personality" school such as Margaret Mead, played a significant role in the Zachry Committee. Other key figures in the field of child sciences and human development in mid-20th century, like Benjamin Spock, were frequent guest speakers in the seminars of adolescent study.

To the Committee members, the best way to analyze the total personality rested in holistic case-history investigation into the individual. Peter Blos' monograph, *The Adolescent Personality*, published under the auspices of the Committee on the Study of Adolescents, provided a thorough treatment of the case history approach. Before immigrating to the U.S. in 1934 to escape the rise of Nazism, Peter Blos lived in Vienna and worked closely with the Vienna psychoanalytic circle. From 1927 to 1932, Blos recruited his childhood friend Erik Erikson to work with Anna Freud in creating the Hitting School, based on psychoanalytical principles.[19] In his book featuring case history method, Peter Blos illustrated the dynamic or "organismic" approach to personality. His case histories utilized an array of interconnected materials that provided contextual references for individual behaviors, including interviews, creative writings, physical examinations, teachers' reports, socio-cultural descriptions of schools, family, and community, as well as personality tests. But to Blos, different case materials should not be treated in isolated fashion. Rather, the goal was to "relate them in their dynamic interaction."[20]

The Zachry Committee conceptual framework was in direct opposition to the statistical approach of personality study. As Wilma Lloyd, a researcher for the Committee commented:

> The statistical approach has disintegrated the personality, abstracted certain aspects of it, devised tests which were supposed to test these aspects, given these tests to great numbers, treated the results according to the normal curve of distribution, and applied the conclusions to the testing of an individual. This was based on a purely atomistic, mechanistic theory.[21]

For Wilma Lloyd, one major pitfall of personality testing was the irrelevance and even the distrust of teachers' judgment. What was worse, it created a negative emotional response in teachers: the "timidity of teachers is having far more serious effects since testing has turned its attention to personality."[22] Lloyd and others did acknowledge that some testing techniques — notably the Rorschach Test and the Thematic Apperception Test, if administrated and interpreted by trained personnel in a school that had the time and equipment, could potentially contribute valuable supplementary insights into adolescent personality. However, they did not believe various supplementary information should take the place of "the person-to-person responsiveness of the trained educator in the presence of the student."[23] In other words, teachers should assume a central and intimate role in understanding and fulfilling the needs of the adolescent personality.

Wilma Lloyd also meditated on the notion of objectivity in personality studies. She deemed the subjective as inevitable: "one could not exclude the observer from the observed," she stated. The best way to reconcile this problem was not standardization, but to include the act of observing and the role of the observer in scientific procedures. In the Bronxville School study, Wilma Lloyd's take on "objectivity" ultimately led her and another researcher to receive Rorschach tests and included their own personality analysis in their study records.[24]

Among researchers in the Zachry Committee, projective tests like the Rorschach were seen as the most promising technique. As Bruno Klopfer commented, the Rorschach "lies on middle ground between objective tests (intelligence quotients,

achievement scores, personality inventories, and the like) on the one hand, and free observation (for example, teachers' descriptions) on the other." [25] Still, Rorschach constituted one of the many methods researchers utilized in the Zachry. No one assumed one set of tests alone would reveal the whole picture of adolescent personality.

Whereas the dynamic view of personality in context seemed to be an antidote to the quantification and mechanization of personality, it also worked to essentialize culture and psychologize social struggles. This contradiction became evident in another interwar project to study the effect of racial segregation on the personality adjustment of African American youth. From 1937 to 1940, the American Youth Council (AYC) under the American Council on Education launched a "Negro Youth Study" project to investigate "what, if any, are the effects of their minority racial status upon the personality development of Negro Youth." [26] The project constituted four regional studies in the United States. [27] Through the use of case history interviews with individuals and families, psychological tests, and sociological sketch of African American communities, those four studies attempted to provide the profiles of African American personality in the context of their racial status and social struggles.

The case studies in the AYC project also adopted an overarching "personality and culture" framework. For example, sociologist Charles S. Johnson opened his study by stating: "The framework within which we have studies the problem of personality development of southern rural Negro youth is that of the relation of personality to culture." [28] While different studies contained different authors' distinct methodological and theoretical stances, [29] the whole project provided justification for a particular view of the black psyche. As the studies on African American youth came to finish, sociologist Robert L. Sutherland, director of the AYC subcommittee to study African American youth, submitted a proposal to the General Education Board. He recommended "a demonstration project in the personality adjustment of Negro youth." Sutherland started the proposal by summarizing the AYC studies of black youth:

> The four areas research studies … presented conclusive
> evidence that large percentages of Negro youth by virtue of their

combined handicap of racial barriers and low social position subtly reflect in their own personality traits minor or major distortions or deficiencies which compound their problem of personality adjustment in American society.[30]

Consequently, Sutherland's takeaway from the case studies appeared to be that African American youth internalized their struggles in segregated society and resulted in maladjusted personality. Sutherland thus proposed to create guidance clinics that would help develop "socially acceptable, emotionally stable, and vocationally efficient individuals free of personality distortions and motivated by socially superior standards." In this case, analyzing personality in the context of culture was easily translated into a way of psychologizing social problems as individual personality maladjustment. By essentializing black culture and psychologizing blacks' responses in segregated society, the dynamic approach of personality analysis was implicated in the construction of a hierarchical understanding of the human psyche.

Sutherland's conclusion demonstrated the power of "the damaged black psyche" image in U.S. social sciences and social policies. As historian Daryl Michael Scott argues, the construction of the black psyche as damaged by racial discrimination helped appeal to public support for desegregation, but also imposed negative ramifications on African Americans' pursuit for equal citizenship rights.[31] The tendency to psychologize structural inequalities had lasting influence in mid-20th century U.S. racial politics and education trajectories, as an increasingly individualistic and therapeutic approach to interpreting and adjusting racial discrimination overshadowed systematic intervention into racialized social structures.[32]

In fact, there were direct links between the AYC studies and post-WWII social scientific exploration into the black psyche. Kenneth B. Clark, one of the key psychologists cited in the landmark decision *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), served as a research staff for at least six months in one of the AYC studies conducted by E. Franklin Frazier.[33] Meanwhile, the four area studies established a variety of techniques to analyze black personality. For example, in the study led by Charles S. Johnson, researchers used a "color ratings test," which asked

children to choose the color (amongst black, dark-brown, brown, light-brown, yellow, white) that fit specific descriptions, such as "principal of your school," "the poorest person you know," "the person your mother works for," "the smartest girl you know," "the man you look up to most," etc.[34] This type of test anticipated the coloring test and the doll experiment Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie Clark used in their study of self-esteem among African American children during the 1940s, which ultimately became a part of the evidence for the psychological harm of segregation on African American Children in the *Brown* decision. Therefore, interwar social-psychological investigations into personality left direct intellectual legacies to post-World War II human sciences and social policies.

Conclusion

Personality became a particularly attractive phrase for educators in the 1920s and 30s because it offered innovative ways to think about human differences. The concept of personality seemed to be promising in terms of challenging rigid distinctions between the normal and the abnormal at a time when many experts embraced biologically-determined conceptions of intelligence. In other words, personality could be a promising alternative to a singular, static, and hierarchical understanding of human nature defined by the idea of intelligence.

However, as this report has shown, during the interwar years, competing visions of personality and divergent approaches to interpret/measure personality coexisted. On the one hand, the new knowledge on personality development provided innovative ways to think about individual differences in broader terms. Scientists and educators, who adopted the idea of "personality and culture," assumed the changeability of individuals in relation to dynamic social process, as well as multiple factors that contributed to problematic behaviors. On the other hand, the theories and techniques of personality adjustment contributed to reifying socially acceptable norms and to defining who belonged to healthy and productive personalities. Psychologized understanding of the relationship between the individual and culture further naturalized important social struggles embedded in inequality as internal personality conflicts.

Ultimately, because of the ways personality was conceptualized, this new articulation of the human psyche and behavior did not fulfill the promise to challenge conceptions of difference and hierarchy but instead helped reinforce those ideas. To some extent, personality testing supplemented what intelligence testing did in the normalization of hierarchical knowledge about human nature. The sciences of personality adjustment also completed the role sciences of the human psyche and behavior played in the inclusion, differentiation, and exclusion of children in public schools.

Notes

[1] "Mental Hygiene Leaflet for Teachers," *Public Health Reports*, vol. 34 (April 25, 1919), 833-834.
[2] Sol Cohen, "The Mental Hygiene Movement, the Development of Personality and the School: The Medicalization of American Education," *History of Education Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (1983), 123-49.
[3] Bernard Glueck, "Types of Delinquent Careers," *Mental Hygiene* vol.1 (1917), 171-195.

4 Bernard Glueck, "Annual Report of the Bureau of Children's Guidance," Dec. 1922: 2-3. Commonwealth Fund Records, Program for the Prevention of Delinquency, SG1, Series 29, Box 1, Folder 1. Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

5 Warren I. Susman, "'Personality' and the Making of Twentieth Century Culture," in Warren I. Susman, *Culture as History: The Transformation of American Society in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984), 271-285.

6 Bernard Glueck, "Annual Report of the Bureau of Children's Guidance," Dec. 1922: 9-11. Commonwealth Fund Records, Program for the Prevention of Delinquency, SG1, Series 29, Box 1, Folder 1. Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

7 Giovanni Pietro Lombardo and Renato Foschi, "The Concept of Personality in 19th-century French and 20-century American Psychology," *History of Psychology* 6, no. 2 (2003), 123-142.

8 Kurt Danziger, *Constructing the Subject: Historical Origins of Psychological Research* (Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), chapter 7.

9 See, for example, American Council of Education Committee on Measurement and Guidance, 1936-40, Box 197, Folder 1963, General Education Board Records, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

10 Frank N. Freeman and Ethel Kawin, *Teacher's Rating Scales for Pupil Adjustment* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), 2, Test Collection, The University of Chicago Library, IL.

11 Ibid, 9.

12 John N. Washburne, *Manual for Washburne Social-Adjustment Inventory* (Yonkers-on-Hudson, NY: World Book Company, 1940), 11-12, Test Collection, The University of Chicago Library, IL.

13 See Craig Kridel, Robert V. Bullough Jr., and John I. Goodlad, *Stories of the Eight-Year Study: Reexamining Secondary Education in America* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2007).

14 Caroline Zachry graduated from Teacher College, Columbia University and was then the director of Mental Hygiene Department at Montclair State Teacher College, New Jersey. Through the Committee on the Study of Adolescents, she became a leading expert in the field of education during the late 1930s, and then founded the Zachry Institute of Human Development in the 1940s.

15 "Dr. Zachry's Seminar on the Study of Adolescents," 1936-37, Box 280, Folder 2925, General Education Board Records, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

16 Caroline B. Zachry and Margaret Lighty. *Emotion and Conduct in Adolescence: For the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum* (New York: D. Appleton, 1940), 4.

17 Peter Blos, *The Adolescent Personality: A Study of Individual Behavior of the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum* (New York: D. Appleton, 1941), 11.

18 Robert J. Havighurst, "Appraisal: Progressive Education Association – Commission on Secondary School Curriculum," 1940, Box 279, Folder 2914, General Education Board Records, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY. The General Education Board appropriated $360,000 in total for the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum from 1934 to 1940, aside from two other grants-in-aid.

19 Lawrence J. Friedman, *Identity's Architect: A Biography of Erik H. Erikson* (New York: Scribner, 1999), Chapter 2.

20 Peter Blos, *The Adolescent Personality*, 12.

21 Wilma Lloyd, "Outline for Cornell Research," 1, Box 281, Folder 2927, General Education Board Records, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

22 Excerpt from Wilma Lloyd's unpublished book, in Caroline B. Zachry and Margaret Lighty. *Emotion and Conduct in Adolescence*, 18.

23 Caroline B. Zachry and Margaret Lighty. *Emotion and Conduct in Adolescence*, 23.

24 Wilma Lloyd, "Outline for Bronxville Research," 1-3, Box 281, Folder 2927, General Education Board Records, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

25 Bruno Klopfer, "The Rorschach Test," Box 281, Folder 2927, General Education Board Records, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

26 Robert L. Sutherland, "Report on the Negro Youth Study," 1, Box 558, Folder 5965, General Education Board Records, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

[27] The four studies were: *Children of Bondage: The Personality Development of Negro Youth in the Urban South*, by Allison Davis and John Dollard, *Negro Youth at the Crossways: Their Personality Development in the Middle States*, by E. Franklin Frazier, *Growing Up in the Black Belt: Negro Youth in the Rural South*, by Charles S. Johnson, *Color and Human Nature: Negro Personality Development in a Northern City*, by W. Lloyd Warner, Buford H. Junker, and Walter A. Adams.

[28] Charles S. Johnson, *Growing Up in the Black Belt: Negro Youth in the Rural Youth* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1941), xvii.

[29] See Alice O'Connor, *Poverty Knowledge: Social Science, Social Policy and the Poor in 20th-Century U.S. History* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2001), Chapter 3.

[30] Robert L. Sutherland, "A Recommendation for a Demonstration Project in the Personality Adjustment of Negro Youth," 1, Box 558, Folder 5965, General Education Board Records, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

[31] Daryl Michael Scott, *Contempt and Pity: Social Policy and the Image of the Damaged Black Psyche, 1880-1996* (Chapel Hill: University of North Caroline Press, 1997).

[32] See, for example, Leah Gordon, *From Power to Prejudice: The Rise of Racial Individualism in Midcentury America* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2015); Mical Raz, *What's Wrong with the Poor? Psychiatry, Race, and the War on Poverty* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

[33] Robert L. Sutherland, "Report on the Negro Youth Study," 1, Box 558, Folder 5965, General Education Board Records, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

[34] "Color Rating Test," in Charles S. Johnson, *Growing Up in the Black Belt*, Appendix, 344-346.