STUDENT SUBCULTURES--AN ANALYSIS OF THEIR ORIGINS AND AFFECTS ON STUDENT ATTITUDE AND VALUE CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Benjamin Joseph Hodgkins

1964

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

STUDENT SUBCULTURES--AN ANALYSIS OF THEIR ORIGINS AND AFFECTS ON STUDENT ATTITUDE AND VALUE CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

presented by

Benjamin Joseph Hodgkins

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Sociology

Major professor

Date 7-29-64

ATTITUDES
SOC

AUG 12 1968

132

10

320

327

JAN 05

ABSTRACT

STUDENT SUBCULTURES--AN ANALYSIS OF THEIR ORIGINS AND AFFECTS ON STUDENT ATTITUDE AND VALUE CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by Benjamin Joseph Hodgkins

Research findings on the impact of higher education upon student attitudes and values have been contradictory. Studies in this area usually assume one over-riding ethos toward which students change. Sufficient evidence exists to suggest that higher education in America is a more complex phenomenon. This complexity, reflected in both the nature of higher education and in the diversity of the student body, has received inadequate attention. The purpose of this study, then, was twofold. First, to develop an adequate theoretical framework which considers this complexity. Second, to utilize it in the study of the influence of higher education upon attitudes and values.

Drawing from previous research on higher education and college students, three primary educational goals were identified, the academic, vocational, and social. It was theorized that these three goals were shared to some extent by all college communities and students. Differences among schools, between schools and students, and among students, were considered differences of emphasis on these three educational goals.

Student subcultures emerged as a result of a strain toward consistency by individual students whose goal orientation differed

from that of the school attended. Following relevant psychological theory, it was anticipated that students would conform, minimize the inconsistency, or look elsewhere for support for their own goal orientation. From these alternatives, using the educational goals as a basis for differentiation, four subcultures were identified. These were, academic conformist, academic intellectual, vocational, and collegiate. The conformist shared the college communities' desire for a "well-rounded" education, the intellectual sought knowledge, the vocational desired job training, and the collegiate sought to develop his personal characteristics. Support for this differential emphasis was gained from the family, peers and faculty. By emphasizing certain aspects of education, other available features were ignored or de-emphasized. The result was a selective influence exerted on student attitudes and values, thereby partially reducing the effect of higher education in different substantive areas on attitudes and values.

Using this theoretical model and related research, it was generally hypothesized that social origins were related to subcultural membership which in turn was related to changes in attitudes and values. Thirteen specific hypotheses were used to test indirectly the validity of these relationships.

The sample used was 977 students at a large, state supported, university. Paper and pencil inventories were administered to all subjects in the spring of their senior year. Data were gained on the subject's subcultural identification, social origins, and attitudes and values. Also, datum on student grade point averages was used.

Controlling by subculture and using the X^2 test, significant differences were found in the proportion of students in the various

subcultures with different social origins, attitudes toward politics, fine arts, and grade point average. Using data on self-reported attitude change and controlling by subculture, significant differences were found in the proportion of students in each subculture reporting changes in their self-concept, attitudes toward religion, authority, the future, and education. Different directional tendencies in attitude change were found among the subcultures also. The general hypotheses, therefore, were accepted.

It was concluded that, for the sample considered, subcultural membership was an important factor in the influence exerted by the university on attitudes and values of students. Within the student body considered, differences in college influence as well as student performance appear to be related to the manner in which a student adjusts to the academic milieu. This adjustment is apparently dependent on both the educational goal orientation of the college and the student's educational goal orientation.

Consideration was given to alternative explanations and the implication of these findings for future research was discussed.

STUDENT SUBCULTURES--AN ANALYSIS OF THEIR ORIGINS AND AFFECTS ON STUDENT ATTITUDE AND VALUE CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

By

Benjamin Joseph Hodgkins

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology

1964

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many individuals who have contributed directly or indirectly to this study. While it is not possible to extend my appreciation to all of them, the following individuals must be singled out.

I am deeply indebted to Dr. David Gottlieb for his encouragement, assistance and suggestions. The role of an academic advisor is never easy. His patience and understanding in this capacity was of major importance for the successful completion of this work.

To the members of my committee I am grateful for the cogent comments and suggestions relative to the development of the thesis. To Dr. William Faunce in particular, who performed additionally as a very successful "pinch-hitter" during Dr. Gottlieb's absence, I am grateful.

For the use of the data and for general assistance and advice, I am very happy to acknowledge the aid of Dr. Irving Lehmann of the Office of Evaluation Services, Michigan State University.

Although the consequences are not as tangible, the general milieu of Quonset 81 and the fellow graduate students who have inhabited it most certainly deserve acknowledgment for the good fellowship, moral support and plain "good discussion" given the author.

Finally, to my wife and two children, Kathleen and Benjamin, who have given more than anyone, I am most thankful.

****

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Research dealing with the impact of higher education upon college students has long puzzled social scientists and educators. Quite apart from the substantive knowledge learned in the course content, the question of higher education's ability to influence the student's values, attitudes and beliefs, an ability held by many to be more important than the imparting of substantive knowledge, has been undetermined to date. With the growing complexities of a modern industralized society, calling for an increasing proportion of the societies' young to embark upon a college career, the need to better understand these influences has become more pressing.

Writing in 1956, Jacob, in an extensive review of research done on the problem to that time, concluded that college experience had done little to form or alter student values.[1] Goldsen, however, in a study of students at several universities and colleges reports,

> . . . the findings of the present research call attention to what is almost a sociological truism and yet is often overlooked: that if young people are exposed for four years to institutional norms and values in the very milieux in which they are explicit and authoritative, they will become socialized to the predominant values of that milieu and will come to acknowledge their legitimacy.[2]

---

[1]Philip E. Jacob, Changing Values in College: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of College Teaching (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 4.

[2]Rose K. Goldsen, Morris Rosenberg, Robin M. Williams, Jr., and Edward A. Suchman, What College Students Think (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1960), p. 198.

Lazarsfeld, in a review of Jacob's conclusions, could neither accept nor refute them.[3] Conversely, no one has challenged Goldsen et al's., conclusion. It is apparent, then, that the answer to the problem of higher education's influence upon student attitudes and values has not yet been resolved, in spite of the large number of studies reported in this area.[4] This dissertation is addressed to that problem area. Formally, the specific problem may be stated as follows: what influence does higher education have upon student attitudes and values? The very scope of the problem precludes a total examination of all relevant variables. Still, it is possible to delineate several variables which appear to be significant in determining the extent of higher education's influence upon students. Before setting them forth, however, we shall consider for a moment possible causes for the inconsistencies of early studies.

While several reasons may be responsible for the conflicting conclusions of previous studies in this area, three seem apparent to the author: the failure of previous research to consider the nature of the academic situation to which college students are exposed; its failure to consider the diverse nature of the student body; and its lack of an adequate theoretical framework within which such diversity could be handled.

Most studies on attitude and value change in higher education pre-suppose the existence of one over-riding ethos for all colleges and universities, toward which the student must evidence change if college is to be considered a "success." While there is historical

---

[3]Paul L. Lazarsfeld, "Introduction," in A. H. Barton, College Education: A Methodological Examination of Values in College (New Haven, Conn.: The Hazen Foundation, 1959).

[4]In two sources alone, over four-hundred studies in this area were reported.

evidence to suggest that such may have been the case as recently as one hundred years ago, it certainly is not the case today. Just as the needs of an industrialized society have made more complex the political and economic systems, so has it influenced the educational system. This, we would contend, has not been adequately considered in terms of the type of academic milieu to which many students are exposed. As shall be pointed out, most studies dealing with attitude and value change have tended to deal with a particular type of college or university. These studies, in a sense, have set a pace and direction for other studies in this area that are frequently inappropriate, we believe.

While more attention has been given to differences within and between student bodies in recent years, little consideration in actual research has been given to how such differences influence attitude and value change. Again, most studies dealing with such change have been carried out either on a highly homogeneous group of students, or they have tended to emphasize those aspects of findings which refer only to a small segment of a total student body. Thus, in discussing the positive effect of the college environment in changing student attitudes and values, Goldsen remarks,

> I have not mentioned the vast subgroups of the college population who are untouched by the . . . trends I have chosen to talk about. These subgroups form what we call 'insulated subsystems' which slow up or inhibit the kinds of changes I have been discussing.[5]

Such "insulated subsystems," we would argue, include the large bulk of college students today.

---

[5]Rose K. Goldsen, "Recent Research On the American College Student: 2," Orientation to College Learning--A Reappraisal, Nicholas C. Brown, Editor (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1961), p. 27.

The two preceding points only emphasize, however, a more basic shortcoming in this area. That is, the failure to develop an adequate theoretical framework within which such diversity can be handled. Nevitt Sanford, in summarizing a thorough review of the studies conducted in this area through 1960, concludes that,

> It has been the lack of . . . theory and, more particularly the lack of research inspired by such theory, that accounts for the largest barren area in the field we have sought to map. This is the area having to do with the determination of development change in college.[6]

Agreeing with Sanford's conclusion, we would maintain further, that in order to effectively develop such a framework it is necessary to take into account both the complexity of higher education and the diverse nature of the student body. For, we would argue, it is only in so far as these factors are considered that an adequate understanding of the impact of higher education upon student attitudes and values will be gained.

The purpose of this dissertation, then, is twofold: to study the influence of higher education upon student attitudes and values; and to construct an explanatory model, taking into account the previously mentioned factors, which will allow us to study such influence. The first purpose pre-supposes the second, which necessitates that a considerable proportion of this dissertation be directed to the development and validation of the model itself. As a preliminary attempt in this area, the results will, it is believed, constitute a base-line against which future studies may be evaluated.

Within the broader context of sociological theory the extent of academic influence may be properly described as a function of the socialization process, i.e., the extent to which individuals internalize

---

[6]Nevitt Sanford, "Epilogue," The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning, Nevitt Sanford, Editor (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), p. 1083.

attitudes, values, etc. Viewed from this perspective, it would seem that much literature is available from which a theoretical model can be derived to meet the purposes at hand. Traditionally, however, most studies in the area of socialization have been concerned with early childhood,[7] emphasizing child-rearing practices,[8] parental values,[9] and family structure.[10] Thus, while certain insights may be gained from these studies, in a general sense, their direct applicability to the problem at hand is limited. More recently, increasing attention has been given to the fact that socialization does not end with puberty, but continues throughout the life cycle of the individual. This phenomena of "adult socialization" has been studied in the setting of higher education, but primarily in terms of specific groups, such as potential physicians and lawyers. Because of this, it has tended to be restricted to a relatively homogeneous population. The findings reported, accordingly, have limited value when considered in the more

---

[7]Irving L. Child, "Socialization," in Gardner Lindzey, ed., Handbook of Social Psychology (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954), p. 655.

[8]Allison Davis and Robert J. Havighurst, "Social Class and Color Differences in Child Rearing," American Sociological Review, 11 (1946), pp. 698-710; John W. M. Whiting, Becoming A Kwoma (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953); John W. M. Whiting and Irving L. Child, Child Training and Personality (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954); Robert R. Sears, Eleanor E. Maccoby and Harry Levin, Patterns of Child Rearing (Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Co., 1957); D. R. Miller and G. E. Swanson, The Changing American Parent (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959).

[9]David F. Aberle and Kasper D. Naegele, "Middle-Class Fathers' Occupational Role and Attitudes Towards Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 22 (1952), 366-78; Melvin F. Kohn, "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, 64(1959), 337-51.

[10]Talcott Parsons, and Robert F. Bales, Family, Socialization and Interaction Process (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955).

general context of a socially heterogeneous student body. Still, they represent much of what has been done of relevance in adult socialization and will be considered in the subsequent chapters.

Merton has defined socialization as,

> . . . the processes by which people selectively acquired the values and attitudes, the interests, skills, and knowledge--in short, the culture-current in the groups of which they are, or seek to become, a member.[11]

Viewed within this context, socialization as an on-going process is not simply the gross acquisition of group characteristics by the individual, but a selective internalization of those elements available within the group, which in some manner fulfills the individual's subjectively perceived needs. Socialization, accordingly, cannot be viewed as a similar process for all people who are members or seek to become members of a group or organization. Rather, one must consider the antecedent experiences which determine what mode of selection will be utilized and what elements exist within a given situation from which such a selection may be made. A theory is needed which considers the interaction of such factors in a specified social milieu. The potential for this type of theory, we believe, is inherent in the idea of student subcultures.

Sufficient evidence exists that in any academic environment different types of students may be found. These types, while similar in many respects, are significantly different in others to suggest that such differences may well be instrumental in affecting the students perception of, and thus response to, the academic environment. While several theories of student subcultures or student types have

---

[11]Robert K. Merton, George Reader, and Patricia L. Kendall, (Editors) The Student-Physician (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 287.

been advanced,[12] that suggested by Clark and Trow[13] seems most appropriate for our objective of developing an explanatory model. To the writer's knowledge, this classifactory schema has not been empirically tested.[14] It has the advantage, however, of reflecting in modified form, much of the writer's own views on the subject, as well as being amenable to sociological analysis.

If, as previous research suggests, students from different social origins view higher education differently, then their membership in student subcultures may well exert a strong pressure which modifies or enhances higher education's influence upon their attitudes and values. This observation is consistent, moreover, with the idea of selectivity in socialization. Such selectivity, while undoubtedly attributable to many factors, including differences in social origin, seems certain to require some manner of group support for the individual to effectively resist the demands of the academic community for change. Such support, we would suggest, is found within the student subculture. As a general hypothesis then, we would state:

---

[12]B. M. Wedge, The Psychological Problems of College Men (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1958); R. R. Ramsey, "A Subcultural Approach to Academic Behavior," Journal of Educational Sociology, April, 1962, 355-76.

[13]B. Clark and M. Trow, "Determinates of College Student Subculture," The Study of College Peer Groups: Problems and Prospects for Research, 1962. (Mimeographed.)

[14]A partial version of this dissertation, including some of the results reported herein, was published in 1963, utilizing Clark and Trow's typology. This was the first attempt, to the author's knowledge, of any research effort utilizing this model. See David Gottlieb and Benjamin J. Hodgkins, "College Student Subcultures: Their Structure and Characteristic in Relation to Student Attitude Change," The School Review, Fall, 1963, 71:266-89.

a significant relationship exists between membership in student subcultures, and differences in the social origin, behavior, attitudes, and values of college students.

To effectively test our hypothesis, it is necessary to establish some common criterion upon which similarities and differences between college and student, and among students may be evaluated. Such a criterion, we believe, is found in the espoused goals of the students and higher education. For, as has been recognized by several sources,[15] goals are the end products of attitudes and values held by an individual or group toward an object, situation, or event. By identifying such goals in advance, our ability to understand attitude and value change, as well as to predict it, is thereby enhanced.

From the preceding discussion it is apparent that the crux of a solution to the problem, as stated, rests with the objective of developing an adequate explanatory model. To do so will entail a consideration of the nature of the student body in contemporary society, and of what constitutes its view of higher education; an identification of the major goals of higher education in contemporary society, and the means it creates for their attainment; and, finally, the manner in which the interaction of these factors leads to the emergence of subcultures. Much of the subsequent discussion, therefore, must be directed to ancillary but important antecedents to the real problem, which is that of determining the influence of higher education upon student attitudes and values. Furthermore, in the subsequent analysis to be reported, a large portion of the specific

---

[15]Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils, "Values, Motives, and Systems of Action," Toward A General Theory of Action, Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils, Editors, (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Harper Torch Book Edition, 1962), pp. 47-278; David Krech, Richard S. Crutchfield and Egerton L. Ballachey, Individual In Society: A Text Book of Social Psychology (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1962), pp. 68-102.

hypotheses will be directed toward establishing whether or not significant differences exist between the various subcultures.

As an exploratory study, the writer believes such research is necessary as a preliminary step in the process of understanding higher education's influence on students. Given this validation, hypotheses may be developed regarding differential change in several substantive areas on attitudes and values. A second general hypothesis, therefore, will be: significant differences exist between the various subcultures in the proportion of students evidencing attitude or value change in specified areas as a result of their college experience.

The value of this study rests upon its contribution to our limited knowledge of the effects of higher education upon student's attitudes and values. Should the above hypotheses not be supported, the study will still be significant in its contribution to a better understanding of the socialization process as it occurs within a complex social organization. And, further, as a first attempt to empirically test the concept of student subcultures, it will contribute to a better understanding of this phenomena in higher education.

The subsequent chapters, in their order of presentation, will deal with: (1) higher education and the student in contemporary society; (2) a review of literature related to this problem; (3) an explanatory model; (4) design and method employed in the empirical research; (5) results of the study; and (6) a summary and discussion.

CHAPTER II

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

> What the colleges . . . should at least try to give us, is a general sense of what, under various disguises, superiority has always signified and may still signify. The feeling for a good human job, any where, the admiration of the really admirable, the disesteem of what is cheap and trashy and impermanent--this is what we call the critical sense, the sense for ideal values. It is the better part of what men know as wisdom.[1]

It is the intent of this chapter to analyze, in cursory but accurate fashion, what are some of the major historical antecedents of higher education in American Society. And further, given these antecedents, to discuss the current position of such education in contemporary society. The purpose for doing so is primarily to identify the characteristics of higher education which will allow us to delineate its goals. Further, it is hoped that a more complete understanding of higher education, in terms of its interrelationship with the larger society, will be given the reader. As a second part of this chapter we shall draw upon previous literature to identify the goals of college students in contemporary American Society.

The historical origins of higher education, like the origins of our political or economic institutions, can readily be traced back to Europe. Unlike these institutions, however, higher education was not

---

[1]William James, "Democracy and The College-Bred," The Intellectuals: A Controversial Portrait, George B. de Huszar, Editor, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1960), p. 285.

quick to adopt to the requirements of its new environment. Firmly entrenched in the aristocratic tradition of the Old World, it clung tenaciously to its self image of limited service to an elite few. Hofstadter has observed that

> The first American Colleges were founded . . . to reproduce, so far as the means and conditions of America made possible, the traditional education of the Old World and particularly of the English University. . . .[2]

That such a purpose supported a desire to perpetuate the "classical knowledge" of Western Civilization is seen in the nature of the curriculum generally subscribed to. As described by Campbell,

> . . . the trivium (grammer, rhetoric, and logic) . . . . the quadrivium (geometry, arithmetic, music, and astronomy) was often reordered as the three philosophies of Aristotle and taught as advanced work. Those three philosophies were advanced logic and a kind of psychology which together were called mental philosophy, politics, ethics, law, and some economics were moral philosophy; and physics and biology which were called natural philosophy.[3]

Such curricula, considering the situation in earlier America, was designed not for mobility or occupational training but rather for the internalization of a particular ideology accepted as appropriate by the established elite. That, indeed, it effectively served such a purpose is suggested by the fact that as recently as 1870 only 1.68% of the total population, eighteen to twenty-one years of age, was enrolled in higher education.[4] Although empirical evidence is lacking, it seems reasonable to deduce that, with appropriate modification,

---

[2]Richard Hofstadter, "American Higher Education," College Entrance Examination Board, 3:16, 1956.

[3]Stewart Campbell, "The Place of Higher Education In A Changing Society," The American College, Nevitt Sanford, Editor (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), p. 918.

[4]Historical Statistics of The United States, Colonial Times to 1957. United States Department of Commerce (Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1960), pp. 210-211.

much of what is currently acclaimed as the desire to give contemporary students a broad education and instill in them a "critical" attitude, stems from the traditional aim of higher education in America.

With the growth of the society, however, and particularly with the Industrial Revolution, the same forces which radically altered our economic structure made new demands upon higher education. As early as 1820, national expansion and economic growth generated a need for a form of specialized training not heretofore considered necessary.[5] Concomitant with this need, and rising partly from it, was the press for mass education, characterized generally as the "Jacksonian Philosophy" of education for all.[6] It appears that as higher education succumbed to the more utilitarian needs of business and commerce, the strong equalitarian and individualistic beliefs of the larger society associated in most American minds the role of higher education with occupational and social achievement. For, if an individual was to stand or fall on his own abilities in the society, he must have an equal opportunity to develop those abilities. In so far as this was to be obtained through college training, it was a "right" of all.

As American Society has grown, then, in the complexities of industrial development, the original orientation of higher education has become less and less appropriate for the majority of students who partake of it. What, in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, had begun as an education concerned with the perpetuation of classical western thought and ideology, emerged in the twentieth century as an education trying desperately to meet the diverse needs of many.

---

[5]Campbell, op. cit., p. 922.

[6]Robin M. Williams, Jr., American Society: A Sociological Interpretation, Second Edition (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1960), p. 300.

Clark has observed that,

> In modern technological society . . . the education of the cultivated man is increasingly submerged by the education of specialists.[7]

We may summarize our brief consideration of its historical development by noting that higher education, like other social establishments, has been marked by increasing complexity. Such complexity has required a drastic alteration, if not a re-definition, of the goals held to be desirable in the advanced education of the societies' young. To ignore or dismiss this fact in considering the impact of higher education, as has frequently been done, is to fail in the consideration of a significant variable in the total process.

The role of values in determining the nature of a societies' social institutions has long been noted, but infrequently considered by sociologists interested in higher education. And yet it would seem their impact in shaping the educational goals of the higher education cannot be ignored. As Williams has noted, ". . . the continued existence of any particular system of institutions depends in great part upon the extent to which the pattern contains values actually invested with affect and meaning for the participants."[8] It appears, then, that to the extent that such dominant values can be identified in the society, the goals of higher education can be made more readily explicit and amenable to analysis.

Williams has presented what is, perhaps, the most adequate discussion of the various value themes dominant in American Society.[9] While he delineates fourteen such themes, all of which undoubtedly

---

[7]Burton Clark, Educating the Expert Society (San Francisco, Calif.: The Chandler Press, 1962), p. 38.

[8]Williams, op. cit., p. 399.

[9]Ibid., Chapter XI.

have their impact on higher education, three seem of particular importance. These are: Achievement and Success; Efficiency and Practicality; and Individual Personality. Each of these have had a unique affect upon educational goals giving them a distinctly "American" character.

If there is one value theme that is dominant in contemporary society it is that of achievement and success. Historically, its roots go back at least to the Reformation. Sociologically, Weber has related it to Protestantism and its influence on the growth of capitalism.[10] The idea that each man demonstrate his worth through temporal achievement is not uniquely American. Its American expression, however, has resulted in no small measure from advantages to be found in a new and economically growing society, wherein a man's worth is determined by his material wealth. This expression has been well stated by Williams

> The comparatively striking feature of American culture is its tendency to identify standards of personal excellence with competitive occupational achievement. In pure type, the value attached to achievement does not comprehend the person as a whole, but only his accomplishments, emphasizing the objective results of his activity.[11]

Such an emphasis upon occupational achievement with the growth of industrialization and its need for the highly trained specialists has had significant effects on higher education. Reaction to the needs of industry and to the Jacksonian Philosophy of education by higher education has been legitimized in no small measure by recognition and, indeed, endorsement of this theme. The rise of business schools,

---

[10]Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Talcott Parsons (trs.) (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958).

[11]Williams, op. cit., p. 418.

teacher's colleges, agricultural schools, and technical schools, which were to subsequently gain university status, was due in large part to their commitment to the achievement theme dominant in the society. In contemporary society, it would seem, the specialized needs generated by the industrial complex, and the value theme of occupational achievement and success has been associated by many Americans with higher education.

Closely aligned with the value theme of achievement and success is that of efficiency and practicality (or "rationality" in its most utilitarian sense). This theme, perhaps best exemplified in the vast and growing technology of automation, has focused upon the importance of the most logical means to attain specified ends. Thus, achievement in American Society tends to be closely associated with practical and efficient techniques for its attainment. So, also, this "purposive" approach to life has, as Williams observes, encouraged "The evaluation of sheer technique into something approaching a value in its own right. . . ."[12]

Its effect upon higher education has been manifest in what many refer to as the "pragmatic" approach to education. Veblen's satiric description of the business communities' control of academia, while somewhat distorted, does vividly portray the impact of this value theme upon higher education.[13] On a concrete level, the number of applied courses and the increasing proportion of technical and business majors among the student body attests to both Academia's pragmatism and the nature of its appeal to the populus.

---

[12]Ibid., p. 429.

[13]Thorsten Veblen, The Higher Learning In America (Stanford, California: Academic Reprints, 1954).

The final value theme, that of the individual personality, has rarely been considered in terms of its influence upon higher education. And yet, it is perhaps one of the most pervasive themes in Western, and particularly American, Society. Williams has described this theme in the following manner.

> The personality that is the object of high value in this particular tradition is something of intrinsic worth, not valued simply as a member of a group nor as a means to some ulterior end. There is no real paradox in saying that individuality can be a social product and a common social value; the development of individual personality is a shared value rather than a collective end in a group or social system.[14]

Such a theme, in part, is implied in much of the early emphasis upon the development of the "cultured gentlemen." Hofstadter, in tracing the source of the purpose of higher education in early America observes that,

> The American educational system . . . took over from the English an educational ideal . . . the notion that it is the business of institutions of higher education not merely to instill in their graduates intellectual skills but to cultivate character. . . .[15]

The distinguishing characteristic of the European nobleman, we would suggest, was not necessarily a greater knowledge than his commoner counterpart (although this may have been the case) but rather an "individuality" which set him off from the masses. In modified form, it is argued, this same theme has been diffused throughout American Society. The heritage of the Reformation on a theological plane has insured its acceptance on the social level.[16]

---

[14]Williams, op. cit., p. 463.

[15]Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 15.

[16]Weber, op. cit.

Its effect upon contemporary society is apparent. The heavy stress upon the "inalienable" rights of the individual and the previously mentioned emphasis upon individual achievement all point to what Durkheim has called, "the cult of individual personality."[17] This stress upon the worth of the individual is one of the more basic value themes of American Society, we would argue. Even within contemporary American psychology, the theories of Maslow, Lecky, and Rogers which stress the importance of the "self-actualization" of the individual, find much popular support. And while arguments frequently arise as to the dynamics of the personality, little question is raised as to whether or not a "self" actually is worthy of study. It points up, we would content, the basic acceptance of the value placed on the intrinsic worth of the individual personality.

Its particular effect upon higher education is most apparent in the continued emphasis upon the socially "well-rounded," reasonably sophisticated, "college graduate." Less apparent effects, we would suggest (for sufficient empirical evidence is lacking), may well be manifest in the manner in which the college community encourages the students to approach the whole area of learning in higher education. Thus, Stern's work points to "conformity versus autonomy" as one of the three major dimensions of the collegiate environmental press.[18] Were the individual qua individual not of high value, the dimension of conformity versus autonomy would have little meaning, either to the institution or the student. We conclude, therefore, that like achievement and practicality, the individual personality is a value theme of significant importance to higher education.

---

[17]Emile Durkheim, Suicide, John Spaulding and George Simpson (trs.) (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951), Book III, Chapter I.

[18]George G. Stern, "The Intellectual Climate of College Environments," Harvard Educational Review, 33:5-41, Winter, 1963.

Let us summarize, briefly, our discussion of the major value themes in American Society, as they are related to higher education. It has been noted that, among others, three value themes influence the nature of higher education. The value of achievement and success, as expressed in occupational mobility, has been instrumental in contributing a vocational cast to higher education. As the needs of the industrial complex have become more closely associated with specialized training, this training has been increasingly furnished by higher education. Co-existing and interacting with this value theme, has been that of practicality and efficiency. The effects of this theme upon higher education have been expressed in the "pragmatism" of the course content and degrees offered. Finally, the more subtle, but equally pervasive value placed upon the individual personality is manifest in the importance which higher education attaches to social as well as professional competence, and in the more evasive, but nonetheless real, environmental emphasis upon the individual student's role in higher education.

Having considered the historical antecedents of higher education and some of the major value themes and their consequences for higher education, generally, what major goals may be identified? From the preceding discussion three may be adduced. We shall identify each, briefly.

It is apparent that, like other social phenomena, higher education cannot be divorced from its past. Thus the concern with developing one's "critical sense," an appreciation for ideas, and a broad general knowledge of the history and culture of western civilization are still highly esteemed. To instill in students such qualities and knowledge is not only clung to by most, if not all colleges and universities, but most strongly emphasized as a "liberal education" by many. Supported by the value placed upon the intrinsic worth of the individual,

this goal we shall refer to as the "traditional academic goal" of higher education.

The second goal of higher education to be identified is that concerned with the "training" nature of the schools. The needs of the industrialized society, compounded by the Jacksonian philosophy of education, the achievement value in society, and the value placed upon efficiency and practicality have all contributed, we would contend, to a high stress upon the "vocational goal" as one of major importance for most colleges and universities.

The final goal we would derive from our earlier discussion is one difficult to distinguish from the traditional goal in higher education. Difficult in the sense that both goals place emphasis upon the development of the individual's personality. They are distinctive, however, in that in the case of this latter goal, it would seem its origins derive more from the value themes of achievement and the individual's personality than from the university tradition. For while the value of the cultural heritage is readily incorporated into this goal, it becomes interpreted in the highly instrumental sense of the development of the individual's social graces and personal characteristics necessary for subsequent achievement and success in post-college life. We shall refer to this goal as the "social" goal of higher education.

Each of these three goals, it is maintained, are present in the programs of all accredited universities and colleges in American Society. The difference between schools, we suggest, is a difference in the relative emphasis placed upon them, not as is frequently alleged, in their presence or absence at any given institution.[19] The fact that such institutions as Oberlin or Harvard, steeped in the academic

---

[19]N. O. Frederickson, "The Evaluation of Personal and Social Qualities," College Entrance Examination Board, 1:93-105, 1954.

tradition, prepare their students for teaching, business etc., while other, more land grant vocational institutions, such as Michigan State or Minnesota, insist upon their students taking courses in the area of a "broad liberal education" lends credence to this conclusion.

It should be noted, however, that we are not excluding the possibility of other goals being present, or that such goals are not important, but rather, that such goals as we have postulated are both of major importance to the institution and to an understanding of the changes in student attitudes and values.

The point should also be made that we are not suggesting that all members of a college community share equally these same goals. Differences undoubtedly exist between administrators and the faculty, or between the faculty of one department as opposed to that of another. Such differences, particularly in a large school, may well be important in evaluating the effects of higher education upon attitudes and values. These variations, however, do not deny the existence or importance of a more general goal orientation characteristic of a particular college or university. It is to this "orientation" and the goals associated with it that our comments are addressed. Variations within the faculty or between the faculty and administration on commitment to educational goals is most certainly a significant consideration, but one outside the scope of our present study.

Having identified what we believe are three major goals in higher education, let us turn to a consideration of the goals of the students who partake of it. In doing so we shall again limit ourselves to what appear to be the primary goals of students, recognizing that other goals are influencial determinates of their behavior as well.

Somewhat surprisingly, there has not been a great amount of

work done in this area.[20] Partly, it is conjectured, this is because few people have questioned the implicit assumption that most students are "committed" to viewing education as "that which is taught in college," or something which is good and therefore desirable. This idea of a rather diffuse commitment may be juxtaposed against the more "concrete" evidence which suggests that most students have a fairly well defined goal which dictates not only the choice of college attended, but what is learned as well.

Perhaps the most extensive study done in the area of student educational goals is that by Goldsen and her associates.[21] Taking eleven colleges and universities in various parts of the country, the authors were interested in college student aspirations, attitudes and values. While the scope of their findings was very broad, we shall concern ourselves only with those findings relative to educational goals at this point.

The table on the following page, adapted from this source is particularly relevant to our discussion.[22]

These results, taken from respondents at eleven universities, reveals at least three important points: the diversity of the students perception of the functions higher education should perform; the fact that three goals tend to be ranked "highly important" by the majority of respondents (88%); and the apparent lack of concensus regarding which goal is most important.

---

[20]Elizabeth Douvan and Carol Kaye, "Motivational Factors In College Entrance," The American College, Nevitt Sanford, Editor (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), p. 199.

[21]Goldsen, et al., What College Students Think.

[22]Ibid., p. 7.

Importance of Various Educational Goals
(Eleven universities: Total = 2975)

. . . Consider what educational goals you think the ideal college or university ought to emphasize	Percentages of Students Ranking Each Goal As: Highly Important			
	First	Other High	Medium	Low
Provide a basic general education and appreciation of ideas	35	39	24	3
Develop your ability to get along with different kinds of people	17	55	26	3
Provide vocational training, develop skills and techniques directly applicable to your career	36	24	31	9
Develop your knowledge and interest in community and world problems	3	47	44	6
Help develop your moral capacities, ethical standards and values	8	37	40	15
Prepare you for a happy marriage and family life	1	21	42	36

Taking only the three most strongly endorsed goals, it is apparent that college students, like the schools they attend, are strongly influenced by the same value themes mentioned earlier in our discussion of the goals of higher education. Thus, the posited educational goals of vocational training, social development, and the traditional academic goal, are reflected in the student bodies. What is of particular importance here, however, is the apparent lack of consensus as to which goal is most important. This lack of consensus suggests that dependent upon one's academic environment, any given student may or may not find it compatible with his preconceptions of college life. And further, dependent upon this compatibility, may or may not be subsequently influenced in terms of his attitudes and values.

Goldsen and her associates contend, that for many students such changes do occur and in the direction of what we have identified as the "traditional academic" position.[23] The college years, according to these authors "sharply undermine any tendency to assert that non-academic educational goals are of principal importance."[24] Their evidence, however, does not necessarily support such a conclusion, a point to which we shall return in the next chapter.

The authors introduce Reisman's inner-directed versus other directed dichotomy to explain the influence of "personality type" on the perceived function of the university by the student. Accordingly, they report that those who respond in an other-directed fashion tend to cite the social (called interpersonal educational approach) goal as most important. They note further that the vocational goal (referred to as the instrumental approach) is closely identified with subjects who stress the achievement and success theme in their responses.[25] Unfortunately, they do not cite what personality type or value theme is related to an academic view of college. They imply, and we will discuss the point in the next chapter, that this view of education's goal is largely a result of the influences of academia.[26] The point is not developed, however. Taken in total, nonetheless, these findings offer strong support to the position that college students are, indeed, a complex lot; a complexity which is reflected in their diverse views of the goals of higher education.

---

[23]Ibid., p. 13.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Ibid., pp. 19-21.

[26]Ibid., p. 22.

Finally, Goldsen and her associates found that a significant relation existed between the social class origins of the students and their perception of the principle goal of education.[27] Where those who identified themselves as upper class predominately chose the traditional academic goal, the lower class proved to be much higher on the vocational goal, with the middle class tending to fall in between. They found further support for this linkage in the fact that those schools having generally higher class student bodies were much more in favor of the traditional academic goal.

Taking a more psychological approach to the problem, Douvan and Kaye in a series of studies with adolescents and college freshmen report that both class and sex differences contribute to motivational differences in college attendance.[28] For the lower class adolescent, who is college bound, three motivational factors appear significant. First, and foremost, is social mobility obtained by vocational training. In addition, however, is the opportunity for independence and the attraction of college as a gay social life. Differences exist between boys and girls. Among boys, college represented a definite step toward independence. No such relationship was found for the girls.[29] Boys and girls both viewed college as a means to relatively clear-cut vocational or academic goals. The boys tend to be more instrumental in their views of college, however. Lower class girls, on the other hand, view college as a place for a major "self-change," to meet new people, or to meet a nice boy, as well as a place to become occupationally mobile.[30]

---

[27]Ibid., pp. 14-16.

[28]Douvan and Kaye, op. cit.

[29]Ibid., p. 211.

[30]Ibid., p. 208.

Not having male subjects of middle and upper class background, Douvan and Kaye restrict their discussion of these social classes to female adolescents and college freshmen. In this context they report that, "upper middle class girls most often view college as an end in itself; she wants an education and a lot of fun."[31] Those who do perceive it otherwise, like their lower class counterparts, view it as either a chance to meet a husband or a chance for internal growth.[32]

Douvan and Kaye note that some adolescents do have serious intellectual goals, but these students apparently are hard to distinguish from those with mobility motivation. Aside from having greater verbal facility, having a greater tendency to indulge in phantasy, and coming generally from small, closely knit families, their behavior and attitudes were much like the more instrumentally oriented.[33]

Generally, Douvan and Kaye's findings for females are supported for males, in terms of class differences in motivation, by the studies of both Kahl[34] and Davies.[35] These two studies, dealing with high school youth found, among other things, that working or lower class males and their parents viewed a college education as a means to occupational mobility. Middle class high school boys and their parents, while evidencing this view also, in addition perceived college as offering the student cultural and social training.

---

[31]Ibid., p. 207.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Ibid., p. 213.

[34]Joseph Kahl, "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys," Harvard Educational Review, 33:186-203, Summer, 1953.

[35]James Davies, "Social Class Factors and School Attendance," Harvard Educational Review, 33:175-185, Summer, 1953.

Sewell, in a recent study of the relation of community origins to college plans, reports that for males, community of residence is an important determinate of plans to attend college.[36] Even when intelligence and socio-economic status are controlled, rural males as a group are less likely to plan on higher education. Intelligence and socio-economic status appears to account for most differences in college plans for females from different size communities.[37] Sewell suggests that differences in the "opportunity structure" of the different size communities may be an important factor in male differences in plans for higher education. He notes, however, that other unknown factors are undoubtedly operating as well.[38]

One of these factors is suggested by the findings of Schwarzweller in an earlier study.[39] He reports that rural youth's value orientations were significantly related to college plans. A high value on mental work and service to society was positively related to plans for college. Conversely, a high value on security and hard work was negatively related to holding plans for college.

Munson, in a study of differences in personality among children from different communities of origin reports that suburban children scored higher on measures of self-worth and belonging.[40] Rural children, in contrast, while scoring high on measures of self-reliance,

---

[36]William Sewell, "Community of Residence and College Plans," American Sociological Review, 29:24-38, February, 1964.

[37]Ibid., p. 38.

[38]Ibid.

[39]H. K. Schwarzweller, "Value Orientations in Educational and Occupational Choices," Rural Sociology, 24:246-256, 1959.

[40]B. E. Munson, "Personality Differentials Among Urban, Suburban, Town and Rural Children," Rural Sociology, 24:257-264, 1959.

evidenced more tendency to be "anti-social," report more nervous symptoms, and show less social skills.

That these differences are reflected in subsequent college performance is suggested by the findings of Wolfle[41] and Washburne.[42] Wolfle reports that "at all levels of intelligence and at all levels of high school grades farmer's children are less likely to graduate than are the children of men in any other occupational group."[43] Washburne finds that "the more urban the residence background of the student the better his academic performance is likely to be."[44] He finds, however, that this relationship does not hold for large metropolitan area students, who vary from one extreme of performance to the other.[45]

Such differences in educational aspiration, personality, and academic performance suggest that, among other things, differences in values toward higher education may exist between individuals coming from rural and urban locales. Support for this possibility is offered by the findings of Hathaway, Monachesi, and Young.[46] These authors report that youth in rural areas are much more accepting of traditional attitudes and values, clinging to traditional attitudes regarding personal behavior, i.e., respectability, self-denial, thrift,

---

[41]Dael Wolfle, America's Resources of Specialized Talent, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954).

[42]A. F. Washburne, "Socio-Economic Status, Urbanism and Academic Performance," Journal of Education Research, 53:130-137, Dec., 1959.

[43]Wolfle, op. cit., p. 161.

[44]Washburne, op. cit., p. 136.

[45]Ibid.

[46]S. R. Hathaway, E. P. Monachesi, and L. A. Young, "Rural-Urban Adolescent Personality," Rural Sociology, 24:331-346, 1959.

individual success, independence, etc., than are urban youth. Bealer and Willits report that rural youth are much more traditional in attitudes and values than urban youth.[47] Further, that by occupational grouping among rural youth, farm youth exceed non-farm rural youth in holding traditional values and beliefs.[48] Finally, Lehmann and Dressel report similar differences in values among college students from different communities of origin.[49]

These findings point to a relationship between community of origin and the values identified earlier. Specifically, it appears that the more rural the origin of the person, the greater the tendency to value achievement, practicality, and the autonomy of the individual. The high emphasis upon such values strongly suggests the vocational view of higher education.

In summary of this brief discussion on student educational goals, we have seen that, like the schools they attend, students, view education from several perspectives. Consistent with our earlier discussion, the value themes which influence the nature of higher education's espoused goals, also appear to influence the students perceived goals. Generally, the traditional academic, the vocational, and the social goals are shared by many students who attend college. Additionally, it has been found that at least three variables, sex, social class, and community of origin contributed significantly to differences in the sharing of these multiple goals.

---

[47]Robert C. Bealer and Fern K. Willits, "Rural Youth: A Case Study in the Rebelliousness of Adolescents," The Annals, 338:63-69, November, 1961.

[48]Ibid., p. 67.

[49]Irving J. Lehmann and Paul L. Dressel, Critical Thinking, Attitudes, Values in Higher Education (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1962), pp. 30-31.

In this chapter we have identified what appear to be the major goals of higher education and those of much of the student body. In doing so we have not attempted to show how the two influence each other, as they are manifest in the actual situation of a student attending a college or university. The essence of the question of attitude and value change, we would contend, rests upon this interaction. For it is in the "adjustment" of the perception of educational goals on the part of the student, as it influences his attitudes and values toward education, that determines in large measure his subsequent change, or lack of it, on broader issues.

Before discussing this interaction, however, we will consider in the next chapter literature relevant to this problem for purposes of gaining a more complete insight into the dynamics envolved.

CHAPTER III

RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is not a review of all of the literature possibly germane to the problem. It is, rather, a chapter devoted to setting forth for the reader, in reasonable detail, significant literature dealing with the socialization process and higher education. Our purpose in setting aside the literature discussed in this chapter is twofold. To gain insight into the possible effects of higher education on student attitudes and values; and secondly, to identify those areas in the literature upon which there is general agreement and those areas where disagreement is to be found.

The structure of this chapter is in two phases. The first phase will address itself to key studies reported in the area of socialization in higher education, as well as to studies on attitude and value change. Relatively recent studies have been reported which compare and contrast students and academic environments. Phase two will deal with this literature.

Finally, it should be noted that our interest in this literature does not purport to cover all of the findings or points made by the authors. Rather, it attempts to cite only those which are relevant for the purposes at hand.

SOCIALIZATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Newcomb's study of the influence of the academic climate and particularly of the faculty upon student attitudes is, perhaps, a classical study in this area.[1] Conducted during the latter part of the depression, it consisted of a panel study of undergraduate girls (approximately 250) at Bennington College, a small liberally oriented, upper-class girl's school in Vermont. It was Newcomb's intent to study the influence of the environment generally, and the faculty specifically, upon the girl's political attitudes over a four year period. The fact that most of his subjects came from politically conservative home environments lent itself well to the studies' purpose.

Using a Likert type scale, identified as the Political and Economic Progressivism Scale (PEP), which dealt with public issues such as unemployment and the rights of organized labor, Newcomb reported a progressive reduction in conservatism among his subjects over the four year period.[2] Due to the nature of the school, in which faculty-student interaction was high, Newcomb attributed much of the change to the faculty as the most significant referent for his subjects.[3] It was also reported, however, that high non-conservatism was related to high sociometric standing among the students,[4] and high perceived integration in the college community.[5] These points

---

[1]T. M. Newcomb, Personality and Social Change (New York: The Dryden Press, 1943).

[2]Ibid., p. 23.

[3]Ibid., pp. 6-8.

[4]Ibid., p. 55.

[5]Ibid., p. 71.

suggest that factors other than simply the faculty influence were instrumental in attitude change.

Through interviews with the subjects and the faculty, Newcomb was able to identify four distinctive types of students relative to attitude change. Using extent of integration and extent of conformity to the college community, he identified: non-conservatives aware of the relationship between liberalism and status at the school; conservatives aware of this relationship; non-conservatives who were unaware of this relationship; and conservatives who were unaware of it. Describing the motivations of these students to change, he notes,

> Those most susceptible were characterized by habits of conformity, with varying degrees of passivity or personal initiative. The more passive among them had fewer social skills and lower social ambitions. Attitude change meant to them either intellectual respectability (the change was greater for this group) or an aspect of good citizenship. The more aggressive among them had greater social skills and ambitions. Attitude change was to them an aspect of the responsibility that goes with leadership. Those among them for whom the change was greater made conscientious attempts to assure themselves that the new attitudes represented genuine beliefs and not merely an avenue to success; they were intensely loyal and conscientious persons. Those individuals changed most, in short, who reconciled the need to conform with the need for independence, by making a greater than average change in attitude. Those whose change was less conspicuous did not face this conflict; they were above all anxious to please, and hence less change was necessary.[6]

From this study it can be seen that, at least within the confines of a particular type of academic setting, socialization does occur. Further, such change appears to be a function of several factors in the academic environment and not any one.

---

[6]Ibid., pp. 155-156.

The second study dealing with socialization in higher education is The Student Physician.[7] Designed as a prototype study for subsequent studies on student development in professional schools, the authors worked from the premise that, "adult socialization" includes more than what is ordinarily described as "education and training."[8] This premise led to a concern for the process of "indirect learning," through which attitudes, values and behavior are acquired. Such learning required that the investigators concern themselves not only with the faculty-student relationship, but with the effects of interaction with peers, patients and other professional people as well. Such a process was identified as "role acquisition."[9]

Consisting of six separate studies, directed toward what the researchers felt a-priori to be significant interactions in the student's training, the studies were carried out at three medical schools between the years 1952 and 1956. The techniques employed were numerous, dependent upon the context in which the particular study was made. Generally, these were: (1) observation; (2) sociological diaries; (3) focused interviews; (4) sociometric procedures; and (5) documentary records. The panel technique was employed in appraising change. Since these findings were reported separately by the various authors, our review will summarize, briefly, the relevant aspects of each.

Rogoff's study was concerned with the dynamics involved in choosing a medical career.[10] Her findings show that, while the choice

---

[7]Merton et al., op. cit.

[8]Ibid., p. 41.

[9]Ibid., p. 287.

[10]Natalie Rogoff, "The Decision to Study Medicine," The Student Physician, Merton et al., Editors (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 109-130.

of medicine as a career varied with individuals, insofar as when it was made and who was influencial in making it, those students who had an early interest in medical school were more likely to be influenced in their choice by their families. Further, these students were more likely to have a physician relative, suggesting that perhaps one individual acted as a role model for the potential medical student.[11] Conversely, those evidencing a late interest in medicine were more likely to be influenced significantly in their interest by their peers than by their family. The final decision to attend medical school in both cases, however, tended to be late in adolescence for most students.[12]

Thielens' study was concerned with similarities and differences in the social origins, attitudes, and interests of medical and law students.[13] His study indicated that medical students, as a group, came from higher class origins than did law students (42% of the medical student's fathers earned $10,000 or more as opposed to 9% of the law student's fathers).[14] Further, the students decision to enter law school was made much later than the medical students decision to enter medical school.[15] One reason for this, apparently, was the nature of the undergraduate training each had experienced. Since preparation for medical school required a highly specialized

---

[11]Ibid., p. 114.

[12]Ibid., pp. 124-125.

[13]Wagner Thielens, Jr., "Some Comparisons of Entrants to Medical and Law School," The Student Physician, Merton et al., (Eds.) (Cambridge, Mass.: The Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 131-152.

[14]Ibid., p. 137.

[15]Ibid., p. 132.

undergraduate program, an early decision was required. Undergraduate training for law school, however, was much less structured, allowing the student to take coursework in numerous areas without requiring a narrow specialization. Accordingly, Thielens found medical students considered their undergraduate program highly competitive, while for law students it was much more of a pleasant experience.[16] Their attitudes toward professional training, however, were reversed. Law school was viewed as highly competitive, while those who made medical school felt that the worst was over.[17] These attitudes, Thielens' observes, were due in no small measure to the actual policies of selection and retention practiced by the two professional schools.

The study of Kendall and Selvin was concerned with influences in medical school which tended to promote medical specialization.[18] The authors report that while over half of the students entered medical school with the intention of becoming General Practioners, only one-fifth still had this intention in their senior year.[19] At least a part of this shift the authors found to be associated with the student's academic performance. For the better students were offered, and encouraged to take, specialized internships. Equally important, the data suggests that the nature of the subject matter itself, of broad dimensions, encourages the students to find security in specialization.[20]

---

[16]Ibid., pp. 143-144.

[17]Ibid., p. 145.

[18]Patrica L. Kendall and Hanan C. Selvin, "Tendencies Toward Specialization in Medical Training," The Student Physician, Merton et al., (Eds.) (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 153-176.

[19]Ibid., p. 156.

[20]Ibid., pp. 164-174.

Of major importance in the "professionalization" of medical students is the development of the appropriate self-image. Huntington's study was directed toward the dynamics of its development.[21] Her data point to an increasing number of students developing the self-image of a physician over the four year period. Several factors were found to be instrumental in this process.

> We find that at each phase of their training, student's self-images tend to vary as they interact with faculty members, classmates, nurses, and patients, i.e., with the persons in their role set who have varying expectations of them . . . it was found that students who noted that their patients assigned them the role of physician were more likely than other students to begin to think of themselves as doctors, . . .
>
> It was further found that . . . the requirements of the patient also affected the development of a professional self-image. . . . students who felt they handled the problems of their assigned families without difficulty showed a greater tendency to develop their professional self-image.[22]

The adjustment of the medical student to the norms demanded by the medical profession through the development of appropriate attitudes was the focus of Martin's study.[23] It would appear that the development of such attitudes is significantly related to the student's self-confidence in the technical phases of their education. The more self confidence a student felt in medical practice, the easier and more readily he assumed the required attitudes.

---

[21]Mary Jean Huntington, "The Development of a Professional Self-Image," The Student Physician, Merton et al., (Eds.), (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 179-188.

[22]Ibid., pp. 186-187.

[23]William Martin, "Preferences for Types of Patients," The Student Physician, Merton et al., (Eds.) (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 189-206.

Emphasizing the uncertainty accompanying the physician's role in medical practice, Fox attempted to identify factors significant for the student's preparation toward such uncertainty in his training.[24] His findings suggest that such training is built into the nature of the curriculum and the limitations of medical knowledge. The sheer volume of that knowledge precludes total mastery, and a growing awareness of the limitations of that knowledge "condition" the student for uncertainty.[25]

What are the major points which can be drawn from these studies? First, of course, it would appear that socialization does occur. Both Kendall and Selvin's study, and Huntington's research points to changes occurring over time in the student's interests, attitudes, and self-image. Another point, however, which is equally important for the purpose of this study should be noted. The studies, taken as one, reflect the multiple agents which effect student socialization, even in such a controlled environment as that of medical school. Thus, while the respective authors interpret their findings in light of the faculty, patient, curricula, or peer influence, it appears reasonably certain that in the day to day activities of the medical student, no such clear-cut distinction can be made. One further point seems particularly relevant here. While there seems little question that socialization of some form is occurring, its nature and duration are unknown. Accordingly, one may question whether such changes are truly internalization of attitudes, values and beliefs deemed

---

[24]Renee C. Fox, "Training for Uncertainty," The Student Physician, Merton et al., (Eds.) (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 207-244.

[25]Ibid., pp. 239-241.

appropriate by the medical profession. While the authors choose to interpret such changes in this light, an alternative may be that they are simply instrumental adjustment to the school environment. Such an interpretation is made of similar results in the next study to be considered.

The Boys in White, as in the case of the preceding study, was,

> . . . to discover what medical school did to medical students other than giving them a technical education.[26]

Focusing on student perspectives, the authors utilized primarily participant observation and interviews with their subjects. Starting with an entering freshmen class at the University of Kansas Medical School, the authors participated with the students in classes, bull sessions, and other activities. Subsequently, they employed a similar technique in studying third and fourth year students. In this later phase of the study, however, they did not follow the same students, but selectively choose groups of students who were engaged in key phases of their advanced training. Thus, the total number of students involved at any one time in the study ranged from fifty-two to ninety-seven.

As used by the authors, the student perspectives contained several dimensions.

> . . . a definition of the situation in which the actors are involved, a statement of the goals they are trying to achieve, a set of ideas specifying what kinds of activities are expedient and proper, and a set of activities or practices congruent with them.[27]

---

[26]Howard B. Becker, Blanche Geer, Everett C. Hughes, Anselm Strauss, Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 17.

[27]Ibid., p. 436.

Individually, the various perspectives are oriented to specify objects or situations within the environment which are commonly important to the student. Taken together, they constitute the "student culture."

Three student perspectives were identified during the freshman year; the initial (the students perspective toward medicine and medical school); the provisional (the tentative adjustment based upon his experiences in the school); and the final perspective (a synthesis of his experiences and his initial perspective). In the advanced stages of medical training the authors identify five perspectives of importance. These are: responsibility (his view of his responsibilities as a physician toward patients); experience (the view toward other physicians and his own subsequent experience as a learning device); academic (the view of his role toward the faculty and what was required); collective (the view of his relationship with his fellow students); future (the view toward his career plans upon the completion of his training).

Their findings, like those of The Student Physician, show that factors quite independent of the formal system contributed significantly to the socialization of the student. Unlike the authors of the former work, however, the authors of Boys in White do not interpret their findings as evidence of a professionalization of attitudes and self-image. Becker et al., contend that the students are not "trained" for uncertainty, nor do they develop a professional self-image or necessarily the appropriate attitudes. While they are in medical school they perceive themselves as students right through the four years, because the formal system of the school does not allow them to do otherwise.[28] Further, since the appropriate attitudes and values

---

[28]Ibid., pp. 420-423.

for physicians, outside of general perspectives, have not been defined, assuming that the students "learn" these attitudes and values are not consistent with reality.[29] They conclude, then,

> Medical students come to medical school in order to be changed. They willingly submit to a long ordeal in order to come out of it something different from what they went in. Even in this case, however, . . . the effects of institutional participation are quite complicated. Going to medical school does have an effect on students, but this effect is not a simple one . . . they become 'institutionalized'; that is, they become engrossed in matters which are of interest only within the school and have no relevance outside of it. When their participation in the school ends, they give up these concerns. . . .
>
> Never the less, participation in the school has had some effect, for the long range perspective that students brought with them has remained and been transformed by the school experience, being made more professional and specific.[30]

It would appear, then, that these two major studies differ significantly in their conclusions. But do they? In both instances the data have shown that some form of change does occur. It would seem, rather, that the differences reported rest more on the author's interpretation of the data. The interpretation, of course, is made in terms of the theoretical framework utilized. The authors of The Student Physician viewed socialization as "role-acquisition," while those involved in Boys in White considered it as a more fundamental change in terms of long range goals and primary values. Thus, Becker et al., pose the existence of two sets of values, those situationally imposed and transitional in nature, and those more basic values which influence long range perspectives. It is the situational values which Becker et al., say change. The basic values are apparently modified, but not

---

[29]Ibid., pp. 430-431.

[30]Ibid., p. 432.

significantly changed. Some support for this position has been reported by Peterson. He found that physicians ten years out of medical school held or remembered few of the attitudes and values associated with medical school.[31] As defined by Becker, et al., it was the situational values for the most part to which the authors of The Student Physician addressed themselves. Thus, differences if viewed from this perspective are more apparent than real. The more basic problem of clearly defining what socialization is meant to include remains.

Two other findings of the authors should be noted here. The existence of a student culture and its consequences for student behavior, and the existence of differences among students within this culture. In the case of the culture, the authors contend that,

> We have shown that the students collectively set the level and direction of their efforts to learn. There is nothing unusual about such a finding. What is significant . . . is that these levels and directions are not the result of some conscious cabal, but that they are the working-out in practice of the perspectives from which the students view their day-to-day problems in relation to their long term goals. The perspectives, themselves, collectively developed, are organizations of ideas and actions. . . .[32]

Within this culture, however, the authors found diversity in spite of much apparent homogeneity.[33] The authors report that fraternity men with few exceptions were found to be single, gregarious, informal and approached their studies from the standpoint of "what pleased the faculty." The "Independents," on the other hand, were generally married, reserved, and approached their studies as more

---

[31]Osler Peterson, "An Analytical Study of North Carolina General Practice 1953-54," Journal of Medical Education, 31, part 2, Dec. 1956.

[32]Becker et al., op. cit., p. 435.

[33]Ibid., p. 59.

of a "total learning experience."[34] After considering several explanations, the authors found that the consistent factor seemed to be the students social origin. They suggest that, within the context of medical school, students carry "latent cultures" derived from other groups, which influence their perception and understanding of their role as students.[35]

Generally, it is maintained here, the Boys in White supports the earlier findings cited on The Student Physician and Newcomb's Bennington College. While the emphasis has been upon the students, it is apparent that the formal system and the faculty do constitute a factor in socialization as well. Additionally, differences among students in terms of their perception and behavior in a relatively "pure" learning environment have been noted. Finally, the role of the peer group in socialization, defined in terms of the student culture, has been clarified to an extent for us. The theme of these studies appears to be that socialization does occur; it is the result of many elements in higher education besides the formal system; and its scope and duration are as yet unknown.

The next study, dealing with the socialization process, is that of Lortie.[36] The emphasis in this study was upon the complex relationship between the educational system and the profession of law. Lortie states,

> The legal profession is more varied than it may appear. Its formal apparatus of training and certification pay little attention to the specialization which in fact prevails among members of

---

[34]Ibid., p. 143.

[35]Ibid.

[36]Dan Lortie, "Laymen to Lawmen: Law School, Careers, and Professional Socialization," Harvard Educational Review, 29:352-369, Fall, 1959.

> the urban bar. . . , It is this diversity which leads to the twin concerns of this discussion: the making of young lawyers is the making of different kinds of lawyers. To understand socialization . . . in law and the over-all structure of the training system, the analysis must be set within the context of internal diversity and the allocations which underlie it.[37]

Having taken cognizance of this diversity in discussing the various types of law schools (university, independent, and church affiliated), Lortie observes that they have emerged from two historical trends in the history of law training. As such, their curricula and preparation is distinctly different. Where the university law school emphasizes the broad theoretical aspects of law, the independent law school is applied and pragmatic. The church related law schools (Catholic) in his study tend to fall between the other types on this abstract to concrete continuum. Thus, two types of preparation for law result. This duality is carried beyond law school, however. Lortie points out that there are at least two types of law practice; that associated with an established firm, and that associated with private practice.[38]

Turning to his data, taken from interviews, correspondents, faculty interviews and census data, Lortie finds that law firm employment (monetarily more successful) is associated with attendence at the university law school, while private practice is associated with independent law school attendance.[39] Such differences are reflected in the composition of the student body at these schools as well. Those attending the university are from higher socio-economic backgrounds, have better academic grades, come from well known private colleges and are predominately Protestant. The opposite is generally true of

---

[37]Ibid., p. 352.

[38]Ibid., p. 355.

[39]Ibid., p. 358.

the student body at the independent law school.[40] Additionally, such differences carry over to placement practices as well. Upon graduation, 32 per cent of the university graduates are sponsored into a position, while among independent schools this is true of only 14 per cent of the placements. Further, while 36 per cent of the university graduates find positions through their own efforts, 71 per cent of the independent school graduates do.[41] It would appear, therefore, that distinctive differences in the total context of law school preparation and subsequent employment are characteristic of the law profession. What differences does this generate in the socialization process?

Lortie's interpretation of his findings, which he believes supports Hughes' thesis on professional education,[42] is that,

> Analysis of model images held of law as work discloses the gradual replacement of an exotic and dramatized image (of the lawyer) by one which takes account of the routine and pedestrian elements. The dominant initial image--'the courtroom version'--is highly theatrical. . . . The image is a prism of potent American values. . . .[43]

While this initial image Lortie finds to be affected by law school, its change is limited.

> Changes prior to law school graduation are primarily external, referring to the various roles played by lawyers. A subsidiary theme in changes during law school is the gradual realization that law work is both difficult and taxing.
>
> There is, however, a latent content which apparently persists until the young lawyers face the demands of practice. Asked

---

[40]Ibid., p. 361.

[41]Ibid., p. 362.

[42]Everett C. Hughes, Men and Their Work (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958).

[43]Lortie, op. cit., pp. 364-365.

> for the principal changes in the image that occurred after law school graduation, the largest percentage stressed that the tasks they do as practitioners are not what they expected upon graduation.[44]

Thus, while law school does modify the student's image of his future occupation in a more realistic direction, it fails to prepare him psychologically for his subsequent role. When queried on their evaluation of law school, Lortie found most respondents felt ill-prepared, both technically and socially, for their subsequent professional roles.[45] Again, differences were found among graduates of the different types of law schools. Where university graduates were split on whether Law School should have given them more "practical" or "theoretical" training, independent school graduates endorsed more practical training heavily (81 per cent).[46]

Lortie summarizes his findings on socialization by contending that his data "lends weight to the belief that law school had a limited and partial impact."

> In the main, they left law school with a hazy and incomplete conception of what lawyer's work consists of. . . . Since they did not have a grasp of what it took to do law work, they were forced to learn in terms of the positions they found themselves in after graduation. Law became essentially the tasks they had to do in their first position or positions. . . . It appears very much as if laymen become lawyers only partially in law school and that the important transformations take place in the hurly-burly of work after graduation.[47]

This study has several points of relevance for our consideration. Perhaps of major concern is the support it lends to Becker et al's., thesis that "socialization" in terms of learning the appropriate values, attitudes and norms of professional behavior is limited in professional training. While Lortie does not attempt to identify the

---

[44]Ibid., p. 365.

[45]Ibid., p. 366.

[46]Ibid.

[47]Ibid.

internal influences which contribute to the impact of the total learning experience for the law students, his study does highlight what is frequently overlooked. Namely, that the nature of the total socialization process in the educational system is influenced in no small measure by forces extraneous to that system. Thus, while educators may pride themselves on the "quality" of their particular unit, this self pride is only partially justified, for much of the success of their graduates is dependent upon the origins of their students (quite aside from their aptitude), and the nature of subsequent placement practices. Generally, however, Lortie's findings support those cited earlier.

Two studies dealing specifically with the process of occupational choice in higher education are relevant for our consideration of the socialization process. For they point to the influence of non-academic factors in the socialization process as they effect the perception of the student in the academic setting. While we will not consider them in the detailed manner of the preceding studies, insights can be gained from considering the dynamics involved in the process of choosing and internalizing the appropriate attitudes and values associated with that occupation.

One of the most comprehensive studies of occupational choice was by Ginzberg and his associates.[48] Using a sample of students from high schools, college and graduate school, the authors developed a paradigm for the study of occupational choice development, which identified three stages of decision making; the fantasy choice (six to eleven years of age); the tentative choice (adolescence); and the realistic choice (early adulthood).[49]

---

[48]Eli Ginzberg, Sol W. Ginsberg, Sidney Axelrad, and John Herma, Occupational Choice: An Approach to a General Theory (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951).

[49]Ibid., p. 60.

The authors report that college freshmen have not yet arrived at the realistic choice phase; but by the time they are seniors they have begun to "crystalize" their decision.[50] They report, also, that level of income is significantly related to the choice of "key persons" in the decision making process (particularly at the adolescent level). Those from high income families are strongly influenced by their parents, while those from low income families identify the advice of their secondary school teachers as being most significant.[51] They conclude, however, that while during adolescence, family and school are important in the decision making process, the "realistic" phase of the decision process is one in which the individual is largely on his own.[52]

Morris Rosenberg, in a study of the relation of values to occupational choice among college students, suggests that values have a greater effect on change of occupational choice than the other way around.[53] Approaching the occupation decision as a process by which alternatives are narrowed down, Rosenberg studied values, attitudes, and personality characteristics as they influenced this process.

Running coefficients of association between pairs of responses to items dealing with their reason for college attendence, Rosenberg identified three major value complexes; people-oriented, extrinsic reward oriented and self-expression oriented.[54] His findings suggest

---

[50]Ibid., p. 107.

[51]Ibid., p. 153.

[52]Ibid., p. 198.

[53]Morris Rosenberg, Occupations and Values (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957).

[54]Ibid., pp. 11-12.

that not only do values determine action, but are frequently determined by action taken on the basis of one's position in society. He reports, further, that occupational choices of college students are modified as they go through academia and become more aware of the compatibility, or lack of it, between their needs and values and those of various occupations.[55] Also, he finds that most students have a desire to "be productive." He suggests that the ability of the student to adjust to his future occupational role is probably facilitated by the process of anticipatory socialization while in college. His data suggests that,

> If the individual correctly learns the values, attitudes, and behavior appropriate for the occupational status he expects to occupy, and if he begins to internalize them, then he becomes 'partly' a doctor or engineer while still in college.[56]

These studies of occupational choice, as part of the ongoing socialization process, point to the impact of values, attitudes, and general maturation on the socialization process, as evidenced by the final career decision of college students. In the particular instance, Rosenberg's findings point to the manner in which the student's orientations influence their occupational choice in the academic environment and suggests the role played by that environment; a role of exposing the students to appropriate attitudes and values associated with a particular occupation, as well as knowledge of the subject matter associated with it. While Rosenberg suggests that the students become "partly" a professional in their chosen occupation, via this learning, the question still remains as to the extent to which such values and attitudes are internalized as a result of their academic

---

[55]Ibid., p. 20.

[56]Ibid., p. 126.

experience. Ginzberg et al's., findings suggest that this may well be a function of their social origins.[57]

Finally, Rosenberg's results further substantiates the existence of considerable diversity in orientation within the student group. Although his study was concerned with occupational choice, it strongly suggests that the holding of different "value complexes" may well have significant consequences for attitudes and behavior in other areas of the student's life as well.

Turning to studies dealing with the general impact of higher education on student attitudes and values, Philip Jacob has, perhaps done a most thorough review of them through 1957.[58] While ostensively considering the effect of "teaching" upon attitudes and values, Jacob's study tends to deal with the total impact of higher education upon the student. In a comprehensive review of over three hundred and fifty such studies through 1954, Jacob concludes that,

> The main over all effect of higher education upon student values is to bring about a general acceptance of a body of standards and attitudes characteristic of college-bred men and women in American Society.
>
> There is more homogeneity and greater consistency among students at the end of four years than when they begin. Fewer seniors espouse beliefs which deviate from the going standards than do freshmen. . . . throughout, no sharp break seems to occur in the continuity of the main pattern of values which the students bring with them to college. Changes are rarely drastic or sudden, and they tend to emerge on the periphery of the student's character, affecting his application of values, rather than the core of values themselves.[59]

---

[57]Ginzberg, op. cit., p. 153.

[58]Jacob, op. cit.

[59]Ibid., p. 4.

This conclusion, while patently dissatisfying to Jacob, does support the studies cited earlier in terms of the increasing homogeneity of student attitudes and values. It differs from Newcomb's findings, however, in terms of the "liberalness" of the product.[60] Here, again, it would seem to be a difference in interpretation, rather than the data itself. To Jacob, liberalism apparently refers to a specific set of ideas about the substantive world. Newcomb, however, uses more of a structural definition of liberalness. Gottlieb has noted that

> If liberalism be interpreted as the development of certain set ideas about the relation of capital and labor, the governors and the governed, America and the world, then the pattern of studies presented by Jacob does not seem to support a hypothesis that a college education has a liberalizing influence. On the other hand, if liberalism be read to mean an open-minded, flexible, tolerant and adaptive attitude toward the world . . . then even Jacob must admit that virtually every study of undergraduate is a replication of the finding that college experience increases the probability of liberalism.[61]

Such, it is contended, is the essence of the difference between the findings of Newcomb and those reported by Jacob. While Reisman has contended, quite correctly, that Jacob has given equal weight to methodologically unequal studies, it seems a trite point on which to take Jacob to task.[62] More germane is Reisman's comment that Jacob does not differentiate between the types of schools used in the large number of studies considered.[63] Jacob, however, qualified his general indictment of colleges by observing that,

---

[60]Newcomb, 1943, Personality and Social Change, op. cit.

[61]David Gottlieb, "Processes of Socialization in the American Graduate School," (unpublished, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., 1960), p. 28.

[62]David Reisman, "The 'Jacob' Report," American Sociological Review, 23, 1958, p. 732.

[63]Ibid., p. 734.

> Similar as the patterns of student values appear on a mass view, the intellectual, cultural or moral 'climate' of some institutions stands out from the crowd. The response of students to education within these institutions is strikingly different from the national pattern.[64]

We conclude, therefore, that Jacob's study, like those earlier ones cited, contributes to the picture which shows that changes occur. It brings out, further, the point that different schools do have different effects upon their student body.

A more recent review by Webster, Freedman, and Heist contributes further to our understanding of this influence.[65] They note that differences in the college student body studied, as well as differences in the statistical and analytical techniques employed have led to confusion as to the nature and extent of student personality changes during college.[66] They find, though, that certain consistencies are evident. Research carried out prior to World War II in this area indicates that ". . . students in college changed in the direction of greater liberalism and sophistication in their political, social, and religious outlooks. There was also evidence of broadening interest during college years."[67] More recent studies tend to support these earlier findings. Additionally, these studies point to significant differences between schools, as well as between classes within the same school. Thus, in a study done by Webster, Sanford and Freedman, on women college students at Vassar and Bennington, freshmen at Bennington College were more socially mature and ego expressive

---

[64]Jacob, op. cit., p. 9.

[65]Harold Webster, Mervin B. Freedman, and Paul Heist, "Personality Changes in College Students," The American College, Nevitt Sanford, Editor, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), pp. 811-846.

[66]Ibid., p. 811.

[67]Ibid., p. 824.

than seniors at Vassar.[68] In both cases, however, the change trend of the students was in the same direction over a four year period. Other findings seem consistently to show a significant reduction in ethocentrism and authoritarianism for the four years of college life, as well as changes in substantive attitudes and values.[69]

It would seem reasonable to conclude from the preceding that the majority of studies dealing with attitude and value change do support the position that the college experience contributes to such change. Further, it supports the notion that this experience is not identical in different academic environments. What is of particular importance here is that it is not simply an exposure to different knowledge which brings this about, but rather the particular academic situation and the nature of the student body composition which apparently contributes to this difference.

The next phase of our review will consider literature related but not identical to that previously discussed. It will be concerned with comparative studies in higher education dealing with differences in academic institutions and the students who attend them.

---

[68]Ibid., p. 830.

[69]See D. R. Brown and Denise Bystryn, "College Environment, Personality and Social Ideology of Three Ethnic Groups," Journal of Educational Psych., 44:279-288, 1956; H. Webster, "Changes in Attitudes During College Years," Journal of Educational Psych., 49:109-117, 1958; W. T. Plant, "Changes in Ethnocentrism Associated with a Four Year College Education," Journal of Educational Psych., 49:162-165, 1958; Nevitt Sanford, "Personality Development During the College Years," Journal of Social Issue, 12:3-72, 1956.

LITERATURE ON COMPARATIVE STUDIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Research efforts in this area, interestingly enough, are both relatively recent and of limited number. Also, sociologists have not been outstanding in their contributions to what essentially would appear to be primarily their domain. With few exceptions, it has been left relatively free to the educators and psychologists. This review, therefore, will deal primarily with research literature in non-sociological areas.

From an educational or psychological perspective, the key question motivating most research in this area has been; do colleges influence the students in performance, interests, and occupational choice, or is it a function of certain students being attracted to particular schools. In no small measure this interest was predicated upon the conclusions of Knapp and Goodrich,[70] and Knapp and Greenbaum[71] that social origins, particularly religious affiliation, contributed significantly to the selection of science as a profession and further, that certain colleges and universities are more productive of scientists than others.

Holland's study was one of the first to investigate these conclusions.[72] Using four samples of National Merit Scholarship winners, Holland was interested in finding out if differential productivity of

---

[70]R. H. Knapp and H. B. Goodrich, The Collegiate Origins of American Scientists (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1952).

[71]R. H. Knapp and J. J. Greenbaum, The Younger American Scholar: His Collegiate Origins (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1953).

[72]J. L. Holland, "Undergraduate Origins of American Scientists," Science, 126:433-437, 1957.

scientists by various institutions was a function of differential selection on the part of the students. And if so, what factors contributed to this choice. Using Knapp and Greenbaum's index to identify "high-productive" institutions, Holland found that these high-productive institutions attracted to themselves six times as many talented students as would have been expected by chance.[73] He reports further that, using the Minnesota Scale for Paternal Occupations, there was little evidence of a relationship between the social class composition of various student bodies and the institutional production of scientists. The decisions of these students to attend various colleges or universities were largely based upon such things as convenience, cost, family affiliation to the school and academic expectations.[74] He reports that high-productive colleges tend to attract students whose fathers work with their hands, scientific ideas or apparatus, or who have a commitment to social service, while low productive colleges tend to attract students whose fathers tend to be engaged in such things as business, law, or government.[75] Such differences, Holland suggests, may be due to differential values and attitudes toward achievement in American Society.

Moving from the assumption that "people work most effectively in situations that conform to their preferences," George Stern and his associates have conducted several interrelated and on-going studies in which an attempt was made to isolate the types of students and the elements of a given academic environment which influence

---

[73]Ibid., p. 434.

[74]Ibid.

[75]Ibid., p. 435.

learning.[76] Using what he has defined as the "ecological approach" to his subject matter, Stern has developed two instruments to identify what he calls "student personality types" and "environmental press." We shall briefly describe each, and the findings resulting from their usage in studies on higher education.

Working from the theory developed by H. A. Murray regarding organizational tendencies called needs, which give unity and direction to the individual,[77] Stern, Stein and Bloom, developed an Activities Index of 300 items, organized into thirty scales covering such needs as those for order, play, dominance, pragmatism, etc.[78] The magnitude of the need was inferred from the number of preferences the individual expressed on items designed to reflect the expression of that need. The average scale reliability (Kuder-Richardson) for both the Activities Index and the College Characteristic Index was .67.[79]

To measure the "environmental press" (academic climate) of a particular situation, Stern and Pace developed a 300 item index,

---

[76]George G. Stern, "Environments for Learning," The American College, Nevitt Sanford, Editor, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), p. 691. See, also, the following articles by the same author. "Assessing Theological Student Personality Structure," Journal of Pastoral Care, 18:76-83, 1954, "Pediatric Lions and Gynecological Lambs," Journal of Medical Education, 33, part 2:12-18; "Congruence and Dissonance in the Ecology of Medical Students," Student Medicine, 8:304-339, 1960; "Student Values and Their Relationship to the College Environment," Research on College Students, H. T. Sprague, Editor, (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960).

[77]H. A. Murray, Explorations in Personality (New York: Oxford University Press, 1938).

[78]George G. Stern, Morris I. Stein, and Benjamin S. Bloom, Methods in Personality Assessment (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956).

[79]Stern, 1962, p. 707.

matching in effect, the substantive needs of the Activities Index.[80] The nature and magnitude of the press of any specified environment was inferred by the responses of subjects to descriptive statements such as "professors usually take attendance in class."

Numerous studies have been made utilizing these indexes or earlier versions of them. Among the findings important to this study are the following:[81]

1. Students or professionals in the same field have needs profiles that differ significantly from those students or professionals in other fields.

2. Students with different backgrounds (public school versus private) at the same institution have distinctive needs profiles, regardless of the field of study selected.

3. Students from the same institution have press scale scores which are uncorrelated with their corresponding needs scale scores. The students description of the school is apparently not a function of the description he provides of himself.

4. The press profiles obtained from student responses are highly consistent with those obtained from faculty and administration at the same institution.

5. Profiles describing the expected press obtained from incoming freshmen at the same college are highly consistent with one another, regardless of the high school backgrounds of these incoming students.

6. Freshmen press profiles describing the expected college press stress intellectual activities at an unrealistically high level as compared with senior press profiles from the same institution.

---

[80]C. R. Pace and G. G. Stern, "An Approach to the Measurement of Psychological Characteristics of College Environments," Journal of Educational Psychology, 49:269-277, 1958.

[81]Summary Statements taken from Stern, 1962, pp. 710-712.

Additional relevant preliminary findings on a national survey of sixty-two schools suggest the following, according to Stern:[82]

1. Students enrolled in the same institution have need scores significantly more alike than students at different institutions.
2. The average level of specific needs among students at a given college tends to match the average level of the corresponding press at the same college.
3. Students enrolled in different programs in a complex institution describe the press of the institution in significantly different ways.

Considering the numerous studies done employing these instruments, Stern suggests that three general dimensions appear to be important in delineating a student body or environmental press. These are: depending needs versus autonomy; emotional expression versus control (impulse expression); and an intellectual dimension. The greatest difference between schools, Stern's findings suggest, appears to occur along the intellectual dimension. Most schools have strong tendencies toward dependency and conformity, with the exception of small liberal arts colleges. Stern identifies three types of institutions.

> The vast majority of institutions examined thus far are characterized by environments that emphasize some degree of conformity and constraint. . . . the major source of diversity among these institutions lies on their intellectual press; modesty in human relation appears to be more uniformly emphasized than modesty in intellectual aspirations.
>
> There are two major exceptions to this pattern of short term constraint . . . there are the small but elite private liberal arts colleges, which appear to be distinguished by their high level and breadth of the intellectual press and emphasis on personal freedom . . . (and) . . . the third type of schools place a double emphasis on the practical virtues of their curricula; as a hard headed virtue to their clientele (who are presumed to be anti-intellectual) and as a practical necessity to themselves (considering the qualities of the student body).[83]

---

[82] Ibid., pp. 713-714.

[83] Ibid., p. 726.

Stern concludes that while the academic quality of the student body undoubtedly contributes to the intellectual or non-intellectual nature of the environment at a particular school, it is a combination of students, faculty and administration which determines the nature of the environment. Low intellectual climates, according to Stern, are generally found at public universities, with a pragmatic student body emphasizing vocational preparation.

C. R. Pace has attempted to identify the "educational and psychologically functional environment of a college."[84] Using the College Characteristics Index, described earlier, Pace identifies two major factors which contribute to differences in college environments.

> One is intellectual; the other is social, the intellectual dimension runs from high stress on abstract, theoretical, scholarly understanding up to high stress on practical, status-oriented concerns. The social dimensions runs from a high stress on group welfare to a rebellion against group life.[85]

Using these two dimensions, Pace was able to identify five types of academic environments: the intellectual; the practical and status oriented; the human relations oriented; the group welfare oriented; and the rebellious.[86] Each varied from the other in terms of the emphasis placed upon the two factors previously identified.

One of the few non-psychological approaches to the study of higher education in this area was done by Reisman and Jencks,[87] who describe their study as follows:

---

[84]C. R. Pace, "Five College Environments," College Entrance Examination Board Review, 41:24-28, 1960.

[85]Ibid., p. 26.

[86]Ibid.

[87]David Reisman and Christopher Jencks, "The Liability of the American College," The American College, Nevitt Sanford, Editor, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), pp. 74-198.

> Our hope . . . is to give the reader a sense of the various kinds of institution that are called 'colleges' in America. Our method has been primarily anthropological. We have tried to look at colleges as complex wholes, describing in an impressionistic manner the different sorts of students, faculties, administrations, and publics that have practiced and ideological stakes in the colleges. . . .[88]

Viewing the college as a subculture, the authors chose three schools for study; the University of Massachusetts, Boston College, and San Francisco State College. In each of these schools, the public interest groups concerned, ecological pressures, the recruitment of students, the student culture, and the faculty values were studied.

Each institution was successively described in vignette fashion, in terms of its historical emergence and contemporary position in academic life, relative to other academic institutions. While some interviewing was done at these schools, the authors depend mainly upon subjective impressions gained in these several substantive areas. Yet, it appears reasonable to infer a substantial intuitive validity to much of their descriptive material and analytical insights.

Granting this limitation, the authors find that the historical tradition and experience of these diverse schools contribute a great deal to their present position in academic life. Suffering in some ways and gaining in others from their more prestigeful neighbors, each of these schools reflect an environment characterized by administrative efforts to raise themselves academically. Student bodies at all three institutions tend to be of a lesser caliber both socially and academically, than those found at the more distinctive schools nearby. The faculties, on the other hand, tend to be characterized by a totality of commitment to an academic life, not facing the research demands associated with higher caliber universities.[89]

---

[88]Ibid., p. 74.

[89]Ibid., pp. 110-114.

Differences between the schools appeared to emerge from differences in local pressures on the administrations, and the inherited goals of the institutions. While all three subscribed to traditional academic excellence, Boston College was strongly influenced by its religious affiliation and desire to maintain Catholic Ideology and Belief. Its development of the students "character" was of high importance.[90] Massachusetts, on the other hand, suffering from the "residual role" assigned to it, because of its proximity to Harvard, M.I.T., etc., has emphasized vocational training.[91] San Francisco State, emerging from the history of a "teaching college" is strongly influenced by both its "commuter status" and the more structured system of higher education in California, which has relegated it to a somewhat secondary role in academic circles.[92] It would appear, then, that while all three schools share similarities in the student bodies academic position, and the status of their faculty, they differ appreciably in the type of environment offered the student.

Using a recent survey by the National Opinion Research Center of close to 34,000 seniors in 135 colleges and universities, James A. Davis studied the relationship between the "true value climate of intellectualism" and the "perceived climate of intellectualism" at the various schools.[93] The "true" climate was operationally defined as the percentage of seniors on a given campus who endorsed the

---

[90]Ibid., pp. 147-158.

[91]Ibid., pp. 143-147.

[92]Ibid., pp. 158-179.

[93]James A. Davis, "Intellectual Climates in 135 American Colleges and Universities: A Study in Social Psychophysics," Sociology of Education, 37:110-128, Winter, 1963.

alternative of "Basic general education" as most important of the possible reasons for attendance at college. The "perceived" climate was determined by the percentage who endorsed the same alternative as most important to the typical student.[94]

Davis reports that at all but four of the schools, more than half of the senior student bodies endorsed the "General Education" alternative, personally, by more than half. He notes that "while intellectualism is the 'dominant' value in almost all schools, in some schools other values are rare and in many schools other values (usually vocationalism) constitute a considerable portion of the true climate."[95] He found that "true climate" is related to the quality of the school, as measured by the academic ability test scores of freshmen at those schools. Specifically, the more selective schools were more likely to have "true" intellectual climates (as measured by the percentage of students response). The relationship was stronger for private than public schools, however, and more true of smaller than larger schools. He reports, further, that a significant relationship exists between the "perceived" climate and the "true" climate, but that students with high grades tended to give lower estimates of the intellectuality of their campuses than students with poor grades.[96]

Davis interprets his findings in terms of the perceptual assimulation and contrast. Specifically, he suggests that students who do well in school work, perceptually contrast themselves to others, and feel themselves intellectually superior which results in their underrating "true" intellectual climate. On the other hand those students

---

[94]Ibid., p. 113.

[95]Ibid., p. 114.

[96]Ibid., pp. 115-117.

who do less well assimulate the group standard and tend to rate the "true" climate higher.[97]

Another recent study by Rose entailed a survey of students at twenty-five public and private universities in Western Massachusetts.[98] As stated by Rose,

> The survey was designed to challenge the conclusions of Philip Jacob and others that American College Students have a 'striking homogeneity of basic values throughout the country' and the idea that 'where students differ, they split in about the same proportions at most institutions.'[99]

Using a forty-nine per cent return (1337) on 2750 mailed, one-hundred item questionnaires, Rose reports significant differences between the twenty-five student bodies in terms of socio-economic composition, religiosity, extent of attitude change on political matters, and perceived goals of college attendance.[100] Of particular interest here is the point that his data shows little effect of any institution on student attitudes toward domestic and international "critical issues."[101] While the general tendency in these areas is for seniors to be more liberal than freshmen, the proportions varied among the different schools and with such factors as socio-economic status, religiousness, and political affiliation. He concludes, therefore, that students are not strikingly homogeneous in values,

---

[97]Ibid., p. 128.

[98]Peter I. Rose, "The Myth of Unanimity: Student Opinions on Critical Issues," Sociology of Education, 37:129-149, Winter, 1963.

[99]Ibid., p. 131.

[100]Ibid., p. 132.

[101]Ibid., p. 147.

as Jacob contends. And further, that the proportion varies, significantly, depending on both the school considered and the various social origins of the student body.[102]

Let us summarize what our review of relevant literature has revealed to us.

1. Higher education does significantly influence students' attitudes and opinions, but not necessarily in all areas of concern. What appears to change in most cases is the student's general tolerance of differences, and a more non-rigid and open perception of life in general, regardless of the school attended.

2. The extent and duration of this "change," however, is unknown. Much ambiguity has arisen over the interpretation of studies in this area because of differences in how the terms "socialization" and "liberal" have been defined and used.

3. Student bodies differ from one school to another, and even though there is a degree of homogeneity within student bodies, significant differences exist as well.

4. These differences among and between students appear to be closely related to their social origins. These origins, in turn, influence their attitudes and values toward college.

5. Differences have been found between institutions as well. Such differences seem to rest upon intellectual, social and vocational emphases.

6. No single influence within the academic environment appears to be responsible for changes which occur within the student body. Rather, it appears to be more a cumulative effect of administration, faculty, peers, and experiences which result in change.

---

[102] Ibid.

7. The socialization process, itself, appears to be significantly related to the type of emphasis generated by this environment.

8. Finally, it is apparent that such changes, or lack of them, cannot be divorced from the influence of the larger social context, which through historical circumstance, informal pressures or formal controls, effectively influence not only the student body but the academic environment itself.

This chapter has considered previous literature dealing with the impact of higher education upon students. It has, we would contend, supported the discussion set forth in Chapter II. For it has pointed to a differential affect on students occurring both within a given institution and between institutions of varied type. Further, it has established that even with such variation the effect tends to be uniform insofar as its direction, pointing to the basic similarity of goals in most institutions. The differential emphasis placed upon these goals has been noted in the work of Stern, Pace, Rose, and others, we would argue, not their presence or absence.

Further, this review has supported our view in Chapter II that social origins are significant in determining the differential impact of higher education within a given academic environment.

What this review has not revealed, however, is the manner in which such differential effects are produced. Quite obviously throughout the literature considered, no clear-cut explanation was advanced or even suggested as to why students from some backgrounds do well or poorly in particular academic environments. It is to this problem that Chapter IV addresses itself.

CHAPTER IV

AN EXPLANATORY MODEL

It is apparent that when considering higher education one cannot divorce it from the larger society of which it is a part. At the same time it has long been recognized that higher education has a distinctive social structure and culture.[1] Emerging from higher education's historical antecedents and the needs of contemporary society is a normative system with sanctions, a distinctive social structure, and a well-defined set of roles within which are found rights and obligations peculiar to the academic setting.

We have maintained that all colleges and universities, as members of the same socio-cultural system, share the same educational goals. This is not to suggest, as Reisman and others have pointed out,[2] that all colleges and universities are identical. Rather, it is contended that differences which do exist between schools are differences resulting from the emphasis a particular college or university places on one of the three educational goals discussed in Chapter II. Thus, the "snake-like procession" to which Reisman refers.[3]

---

[1]E. Y. Hartshorne, "Undergraduate Society and the College Culture," American Sociological Review, 8:321-332, June 1943.

[2]David Reisman, Constraint and Variety in American Education (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1956); T. R. McConnell, A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962).

[3]Ibid., p. 35.

This point is made since the impression is frequently given by interested educators and social scientists that many "elitest" schools somehow hold different educational goals. Little is found in even the description of Vassar, Harvard, or Swarthmore, which acknowledges the "vocational" or "social" goals reflected in some of their curricula and the nature of many degrees granted. Conversely, much is made of the same elements present in schools of lesser repute, even though these schools may well have strong departments in non-vocational areas, or programs designed to give students a more traditional academic education. A more accurate portrayal, it would seem, is one in which three dimensions of emphasis are visualized for any school. No school is totally committed to one goal, nor would it totally ignore another. Stern's work, discussed earlier, most closely approaches this view. Unfortunately, his emphasis upon the intellectual dimension and his psychological frame of reference, precluded his consideration of many of the sociological implications of his data. The important point here, however, is the underlying unity of higher education in American Society.

Granting this underlying unity, differences between schools must not be ignored. While many reasons have been advanced as to why such differences exist from one college community to another,[4] it appears generally true that most reasons can be classified under the ruberic of differences in the "environing systems"[5] which press upon the particular college community. Thus, state supported colleges and universities are much more likely to respond to the

---

[4]Goldsen, "Recent Research on the American College Student," op. cit.; McConnell, op. cit.; C. R. Pace, op. cit.

[5]Talcott Parsons, "An Outline of the Social System," Theories of Society: Foundations of Modern Sociological Theory, Vol. I, pp. 30-78 (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961), p. 39.

demands of state governmental bodies, than private universities. Likewise, Catholic academic communities are more likely to accede to the wishes of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Neither college nor university, however, will ignore the overarching value themes we have discussed in terms of the educational goals. Differences stem, we believe, from the emphasis insisted upon by the relevant environing systems, and the college communities' flexibility in meeting those demands within the broad orientation of the academic socio-cultural system.

We have argued for a similarity of educational goals, shared by all academic communities, with varying emphasis. How are these goals manifest in the orientation of the college community toward the student? Ideally, it is suggested, the college community as a total entity aspires to produce a graduate who is "well-rounded," a graduate who is intellectually curious, socially adept, and vocationally prepared to face the realities and demands of the larger society from whence he came. While this ideal may be seldom realized for many students, it does function to set the broad framework within which the curriculum and student life is ordered. For example, it is a rare school which does not have a social events calender, or does not sponsor "cultural programs"; and it is equally rare for schools, if they emphasize the vocational goal, not to insist upon a modicum of liberal arts courses for their students. That such efforts are not always successful in no way negates the existence of the goal which motivated the effort initially. Thus, we would contend, the value orientation of the college community, considered in total, is a broad one, insofar as it attempts to meet the educational goals identified. As a basic postulate, then, upon which this model rests is the assumption that higher education is a distinctive socio-cultural system within the larger society, having several educational goals differentially

emphasized by the various colleges or universities. The general orientation, within which these goals are expressed, manifests itself in a press for the "well-rounded" graduate.[6]

Turning to the student body, our review of the relevant literature has shown a heterogeneity of types, even within highly selected groups, such as medical students. While McArthur has shown that a "selective screening" occurs in student attendance at various schools,[7] it is quite apparent in the work of Goldsen and her associates that such screening is far from effective.[8] Although it must be readily admitted that some colleges and universities attract a student clientele tending to be intellectually superior[9] (as measured by psychological tests and high school G.P.A.), most schools do not share in this "windfall" except by chance. When intellectual ability is controlled, such factors as geographic accessibility, cost, and family ties are, for most students, more instrumental in their choice of school.[10] Accordingly, for most schools of reasonable academic repute, non-academic considerations appear to be instrumental in attracting a socially and intellectually heterogeneous student body. Our earlier discussion has suggested that, like the colleges or

---

[6]This is not to suggest that particular segments of any college community may not emphasize a different orientation. We are speaking here only of the orientation representative of the school taken as a whole.

[7]Charles McArthur, "Subculture and Personality During the College Years," The Journal of Educational Sociology, 33:260-268, Feb., 1960.

[8]Goldsen et al., op. cit., p. 7.

[9]R. H. Knapp and H. B. Goodrich, op. cit.; R. H. Knapp and J. G. Greenbaum, op. cit.

[10]Donald Thistlewaite, "College Press and Student Achievement," Journal of Educational Psychology, 50:183-191, 1959; James A. Davis and Norman Bradburn, "Great Aspirations": Career Plans of America's June 1961 College Graduates (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, Sept. 1961); John L. Holland, op. cit.

universities attended, these students share similar educational goals to those of the school. As with the college communities, however, some students emphasize some goals more than others. Thus, the diversity of student educational goals, related in part to diverse social origins, becomes the second important factor to be considered.

Our problem, then, becomes one of considering the consequences of interaction which transpire between the particular college community and its usually diverse student body. It is at this point, we have argued, that most earlier studies have failed, by either avoiding the problem or by treating the total student body as a homogeneous group. There is need, therefore, for an adequate explanatory model which reflects to a reasonable degree the academic socio-cultural system and the diversity of the student body.

The use of the term "model" should be clarified. As Koch has observed, this term has been equated and used interchangeably with such terms as "theoretical framework," "hypothetic-deductive system;" "viewpoint," "dimensional system," and so forth. All of these terms Koch subsumes under the more general ruberic of a "systematic formulation."[11] It is in this sense that the term "model" is employed. As such, it serves several purposes, including that of helping us to understand the phenomena (in this case college-student interaction) with which we are dealing. It has the additional advantage of allowing one to formulate new relationships within its framework.

Caution should be observed, however, in not confusing the term "theory" with that of "model." While they have been used interchangeably, a model is, in a sense, distinctive from theory. As pointed out by Chapanis, "A model is an analogy . . . a statement

---

[11]Sigmund Koch, "Appendix: Suggested discussion Topics for Contributors of Systematic Analyses," Psychology: A Study of A Science, Vol. 3 (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959), p. 713.

that in some ways the thing modeled behaves 'like this' . . . . theory, on the other hand, is a conceptual system which attempts to describe the real thing."[12] Recognizing this difference allows a tolerance for deviation from empirical reality not allowed a "theory" as such. As a symbolic model, that which is developed here employs concepts or ideas drawn from basic theories currently employed in the social sciences. It is not intended as a rigorous model, in the mathematical sense, but rather as a relatively unique method of approaching the problem at hand. As such, we shall be discussing "ideal types." It is recognized of course, that in doing so we are taking on "theoretical blinders" to other possible relationships which may very well exist. While this is an acknowledged shortcoming of our approach and should be kept in mind as the model develops, it does allow us to reduce a very complex social phenomena to more manageable terms for purposes of analysis.

There are several theoretical orientations one may employ in developing such a model. The one most frequently favored by sociologists is that associated with the concepts of reference group and anticipatory socialization. While this approach is undoubtedly fruitful where the situation is such that a strong personal commitment is required, such as in medical, law or graduate school, we would contend it is of limited value in the situational context with which we are concerned.

Our contention is based upon the sociological observation that modern American colleges and universities, like American society, no longer require such a specific commitment on the part of their undergraduate student body (this is not to say they may not desire it).

---

[12]Alphonse Chapanis, "Men, Machines, and Models," American Psychologist, 16:113-131, March, 1961.

As McKee[13] and Selznick[14] have noted, industrialized society has grown in sufficient size and complexity as to strongly influence the nature of institutional-individual relations. With the proliferation of membership groups in modern society, the school cannot expect, nor the individual give, the strong commitment required in a more "mechanical" social arrangement.[15] At best a "partial commitment" obtains. In discussing this phenomena, as it occurs in higher education, Selznick says,

> The student will no longer feel his relation to a community of scholarship; he is not concerned about--indeed, is impatient with--the traditional values of university life. He does not look forward to becoming a new kind of man; he expects to retain his commonness and to be distinguished from the multitude only by a certain technical competence. Like his highly specialized professor, his participation is segmental; . . .[16]

McKee has observed that much which has been written in the area of large scale social organization, somehow connotes the "badness" of it, in terms of its consequences for the individual.[17] We would suggest it is this same "wistfulness," when viewed from a sociology of knowledge perspective, which has influenced many students of higher education to consider total commitment to the school as an important variable in their research efforts. Because of the complexity of modern university life, we would suggest, that while

---

[13]From notes taken in a Lecture by Professor James B. McKee, April, 1964.

[14]Philip Selznick, "Institutional Vulnerability in Mass Society," America As a Mass Society (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1963), pp. 13-29.

[15]Emile Durkheim on the Division of Labor, George Simpson (tr), (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933).

[16]Selznick, op. cit., p. 16.

[17]McKee, op. cit.

ideally the college community desires a strong personal commitment on the part of the student, it does not require such a commitment. Thus, within limits, a student may interpret his role in the system to meet his particular needs and values, i.e., it is not really necessary to curry the favor of the faculty, be socially active, or intellectually curious to survive in the system; although these acts are implicitedly or explicitedly encouraged.

Is this to suggest that the sociocultural system has little control or influence? Definitely not. The previously mentioned normative structure requires that approved means to goal attainment must, at least in some minimal fashion, be adhered to. Outside of academic performance, however, the choice beyond minimum requirements is largely left up to the student as to whether he desires to strive for the other goals supported by the system. Further, as Parsons has observed, the various groups of which an individual is a member form a series of subsystems within his "total system of action."[18] Although the individual's commitment may be partial, his orientation toward the community insures it of his fulfillment of the minimum requirements demanded by the system. Through the internalization of minimum role requirements, minimum control is assured. Whether or not such minimal control assures effective influence on attitudes and values, however, is another question. We would contend it neither assures it, nor precludes it. The use of reference group theory as a base for model development accordingly is rejected. The absence of either the need, or the requirement, for other than a partial commitment by the student precludes its appropriateness for the problem at hand.

---

[18]Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils, "Values, Motives, and Systems of Action," Toward A General Theory of Action, Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils, Editors, (New York: Harper and Row, 1951), Torch Book Edition, pp. 101-102.

A more feasible alternative, as we have argued, rests in the recognition of the complex nature of the academic sociocultural system and the diverse nature of the undergraduate student body. The concept of subculture seems particularly amenable to these considerations.

The concept "subculture," as Yinger points out, is poorly defined in the literature.[19] Yet its utility in the study of complex societies is readily apparent. For purposes of this discussion we shall define the concept of subculture as a group of individuals with a normative system, within the context of a larger sociocultural system, which distinguishes it as a distinctive segment of the total culture.

From another perspective, this quasi-independent normative system may be viewed as a variant of that larger ideology which Americans share as members of the same culture. Such an ideology, one would anticipate, would be expressed toward higher education in many ways given the highly complex society in which it exists.

A normative definition of culture traditionally in the literature relates personality in terms of a conflict between the individual and the norms of the culture. Such a conflict, says Yinger, results in "the creation of a series of inverse or counter values."[20] While this may be frequently the case, we would disagree that it is invariably so. Given the situation as described thus far, in which only a partial commitment to the culture obtains and compliance to the existing norms is minimally required, normative variations can develop which, while not in harmony with those of the total socio-cultural system, do not necessarily contradict it. This, it is suggested, is exactly

---

[19]Milton Yinger, "Contraculture and Subculture," American Sociological Review, 25:625-635, Oct., 1960.

[20]Ibid., p. 627.

what does occur among the student body at a given college or university. Variants of the college communities normative system emerge, not contradictory to it, but sufficiently modified to be considered as distinctive from the total pattern of norms, attitudes, and values.

The use of the concept subculture in studying college students is not original in the context of this dissertation. Ramsey, using Harvard Law Students in an exploratory study, sought to ascertain the influence of cultural background on academic behavior.[21] Using biographic information, test scores, and G.P.A. he performed a multivariate analysis on his data. His findings suggest that cultural variation in value orientations was significantly related to academic performance.

A second approach to college student behavior, utilizing the concept of subculture, is that of Clark and Trow.[22] As described by the authors, the evolvement of student subcultures resulted from the differential identification of the students with the college and the differential willingness to become involved with ideas.[23] On these dimensions Clark and Trow developed a typology of student subcultures, identified as; academic, collegiate, nonconformist, and vocational. In tabular form it is presented as follows:[24]

---

[21]R. R. Ramsey, op. cit.

[22]Clark and Trow, op. cit.

[23]Burton R. Clark, op. cit.

[24]Ibid., p. 210.

		Involved With Ideas +	Involved With Ideas -
Identify with The College	+	Academic	Collegiate
	-	Nonconformist	Vocational

They describe the characteristics of each in the following manner.[25]

Academic - Present on every college campus . . . is the subculture of 'serious students' . . . . The essence of this system of values is its identification with the intellectual concerns of the serious faculty members. These are the students who work hard, get the best grades, but also talk about their coursework outside of class and let the world of ideas and knowledge reach them. . . . For these students, their attachment to the college is to the institution which supports intellectual values and opportunities for learning.

Collegiate - The most widely held stereotype of college life in America, pictures the 'collegiate subculture,' a world of football, fraternities and sororities, dates, cars, drinking, and campus fun. . . . In content, this system of values and activities is not hostile to the college, to which, in fact it generates strong loyalities and attachments. It is, however, indifferent and resistant to serious demands emanating from the faculty, or parts of it, for an involvement with ideas and issues over and above that required to gain the diploma.

Vocational - The vocational students usually have little attachment to the college. . . . For them college is an adjunct of the world of jobs, and like the participants in the collegiate subculture they are resistant to intellectual demands beyond what is required to pass the courses. To many of these hard driven students, ideas and scholarships are as much a luxury and distraction as are sports and fraternities.

---

[25]Ibid., pp. 203-210.

Nonconformist- These students are often deeply 'concerned,' in part with the ideas they encounter in the classroom, but more largely with issues current in the art, literature, and politics of the wider adult society. To a greater degree than the academically oriented, these students use off campus groups and currents of thought as points of reference over against the official college. Often critical of the 'establishment,' they seek to be independent.

. . . . The distinctive quality of this student style is a rather aggressive nonconformism. . . .

The authors recognize the influence of social class in determining which subculture a student will probably become a member of (collegiate and academic attracts middle and upper class; vocational attracts lower class).[26] The social origins of the nonconformist, however, are not identified. The author's essential thesis is that students come to college with different orientations. They subsequently form subcultures which reflect these orientations--the academic for knowledge, the collegiate for fun, the vocational for a diploma, and the nonconformist for a self identity. These goals are the expressions of their orientations toward college. The extent to which one subculture or another emerges predominate on any campus is dependent upon the nature of the particular college.

This model, while having limitations, is commendable on several points (as judged by our previous discussion). The authors acknowledge both the distinctiveness of the academic sociocultural system, and the college and university diversity within it. Additionally, they note the social heterogeneity of the student body and its influences in terms of the students behavior in the academic milieu. And, finally, the subcultural types delineated reflect to a large extent the educational goals

---

[26]Ibid., pp. 211-213.

previously identified as the primary ones within the academic socio-cultural milieu. Thus, it comes close to reflecting most of the points we have considered highly relevant to an adequate model of undergraduate behavior.

Their model, however, while theoretically promising and closely aligned with much of our discussion to this point, differs somewhat from our view of the emergence of student subcultures. This difference will be explained in the following paragraphs.

We begin by noting that, much like Clark and Trow, social origins do influence the individual's view of higher education's purpose. The studies cited in Chapter II are suggestive of the nature of such differences. Considered, also, is the diverse nature of higher education in terms of its three primary goals. With these points in mind, it is necessary to consider the nature of the academic situation in which the incoming student finds himself and his manner of adjustment to it, given his perceived educational goals.

The academic situation in many colleges and universities today is, as described earlier, one in which the necessity of a strong commitment is not required on the part of the student.[27] The very size and complexity of many schools militate against it. Yet, some form of commitment must obtain, it would seem, if the student is to maintain himself in the system. The nature of such a commitment, we would argue, may be related to the three primary goals identified earlier. If, as we have maintained, all colleges and universities share these goals, with differences stemming from a greater or lesser emphasis upon one goal as opposed to another, it is possible to identify

---

[27]It is necessary, of course, to recognize that the physical size of the college or university would doubtlessly have a significant effect on the extent of commitment required of the student, as would also the schools location.

orientations within the academic milieu related to them. These orientations are, in one sense, alternatives available to the student in his adjustment to higher education.

Let us consider the adjustment of the student. For most students, it would seem to us, undergraduate life begins as a struggle for adjustment to a relatively alien way of life. Part of the process, undoubtedly, is related to such factors as homesickness, strange food, different customs, lack of privacy, etc. In part, however, it is related to the student's perception of himself as a student. Such a self-concept would include, among other things, his perception of "why" he is in college, and the role he must play in order to validate his purpose for being there. Initially, as pointed out, social origins seem instrumental in answering this question for him, or at least in furnishing him with a vague orientation. The fact of his entrance into a new environment, however, will tend to result in some conflict as to the extent of its appropriateness. This conflict may emerge from his exposure to new ideas via his readings, faculty, peer group, or elsewhere. The individual may consciously perceive it as such, or not. The important point here is that some form of adjustment generally results. It is to this adjustment we address our attention in terms of the emergence of subcultures.

The need for adjustment, we believe, rests to a large measure upon the differential emphasis of educational goals by the academic system and by the students, and in the manner in which such differences are resolved. Psychologically, the individual's need for self consistency is a well-known phenomenon. Newcomb has observed that, "the self, as a supremely valued object is valued in considerable part for its consistency."[28] Festinger finds that inconsistencies in the cognitive

---

[28]Theodore M. Newcomb, The Acquaintance Process (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961), p. 22.

system may be quite dramatic, "but they capture our interest primarily because they stand out in sharp contrast against a background of consistency."[29] Lecky has presented one of the most insightful discussions of the theme of consistency (or unity as he terms it).[30] It is his contention that the need to maintain the consistency of the personality system is the prime source of motivation for the individual.[31] For, as the individual moves from one situation to another throughout life, he is continually faced with new values he must either incorporate or reject, which allow him to maintain a consistent valuation of himself.

Within the context of the academic setting one expression of this strain for consistency centers around the similarities and differences which obtain between the student's perception of the goal of higher education and his role within it, and that adhered to by the college community generally. While it is possible that the two expectations may be congruent with no conflict emerging, it is doubtful that such a relationship obtains for most students. Where it does not obtain, the need for consistency exists. What alternatives are available? Following Festinger, there are three primary ways for an individual to regain consistency:[32] (1) by changing some of the elements in the dissonant relation; (2) by adding new elements consistent with his existing structure; or (3) by reducing the importance of the dissonance. Let us consider each possibility in the academic setting.

---

[29]Leon Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1957), p. 1.

[30]Prescott Lecky, Self-Consistency: A Theory of Personality (New York: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1961).

[31]Ibid., p. 152.

[32]Festinger, op. cit., pp. 264-266. It should be noted that, like many things, individual differences are important in tolerating inconsistency. Thus Festinger observes, "For some people dissonance is an extremely painful and intolerable thing, while there are others who seem to be able to tolerate a large amount. . . ." (p. 266).

Since it is fairly evident that the student cannot change the college community, any change to be made must be on his part. Accepting the multiple educational goals of the university or college in order to gain consistency means, for the student, that he must do well academically, prepare himself vocationally, and partake in the system approved student social and formal events, to develop fully his potentialities.

The second alternative of adding new elements consonant with the existing valuation, and the third alternative of reducing the importance of the dissonance both, we believe, are devices used by students in lieu of change to an orientation consistent with that of the college community. The utilization of these psychological techniques, we believe, are the basis for the emergence of student subcultures. By decreasing the importance of the other educational goals emphasized through selective perception and avoidance of activities or behavior associated with them by the college, and by looking for support from his peers, family, faculty members and others who share an orientation similar to his (thereby adding new elements to his existing value system), the student effectively reduces the dissonance. Having done so, a relatively consistent view of the goals of higher education is maintained.

It is this "strain toward consistency," we believe, which is the basis for the emergence of student subcultures, a strain generated by differences in the emphasis placed upon the educational goals by the student and by the college community.

The normative sub-systems, which emerge as a result of this strain, find support in peer, home, and perhaps faculty associations.

The work of Coleman,[33] Smith,[34] and others has suggested the effect of peers upon adolescent attitudes and values. Newcomb reports that over a period of time college students delineate and are attracted by "mutually shared orientations" among their peers.[35] The diversity of faculty attitudes and values is suggested by the work of Caplow and McGee,[36] and Gouldner.[37] The ability of these individuals to influence student perceptions of the goals of higher education is undoubtedly related to the major of the student, and the consensus of views regarding the goals of higher education by faculty members within that major. Such circumstances contribute to the growth and maintenance of student subcultures on the campus. In effect, they lend sustenance to the value orientation and thus educational goal hierarchy of the student.

If the preceding explanation of the emergence of student subcultures is correct, it allows us a basis for evaluating the impact of higher education upon student attitudes and values. Since goals are an expression of more fundamental beliefs, values and attitudes, the failure of the student to accept certain goals advocated by the college as important to his education, gives indication of the likelihood of his acceptance of attitudes and values related to those goals. Besides psychologically reducing their relevance, selective inattention to the means

---

[33]James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961).

[34]Ernest A. Smith, American Youth Culture (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1962).

[35]Newcomb, The Acquaintance Process, p. 261.

[36]T. Caplow and R. J. McGee, The Academic Market-Place (New York: Basic Books, 1958).

[37]Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward An Analysis I and II," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2:281-306; 444-480, Dec. and March, 1958.

established by the community for their attainment tends to be employed. Accordingly, little effort is made to understand or appreciate such things as fine art by the college student holding the vocational goal as most important. Conversely, the student who subscribes to the academic goal will evidence much less of an interest than the vocational student in courses or guest lectures dealing with the business world.

It is important to note that changes in goal orientation may well occur as the result of exposure to various ideas or individuals. Such changes need not be to the broad orientation of the total college community. We would anticipate, however, that insofar as they do occur, changes in related attitudes and values would be likely to occur also. Such changes, we believe, would be less common than changes to the broad orientation ascribed by the college community because of the over-all pressures of the community toward acceptance of the broad orientation.

To summarize, students approach higher education with similar but differentially emphasized educational goals. This differential emphasis has developed, characteristically, in a social environment supported by family and friends. When they arrive on campus, a transitional adjustment process frequently results from conflicts generated by differences between their perceived educational goals and those of the college community. The nature of the response to such situations, plus the particular educational goal emphasized, increases the probability of those students of the same sex and similar social origins will respond in a similar fashion. This response, aided and abetted by others who have preceded them from the same origins or who share similar perceptions, manifests itself in the emergence of a normative system within the academic milieu, related to but distinctive from the larger normative pattern of the total college community.

Such a normative system constitutes a student subculture within the sociocultural system of the college community. Taken together, these subcultures form the student culture found on the campus.

From the above discussion we may delineate four types of student in terms of the adjustment made and the educational goal held most important.

Academic Conformist:[38] These students are those who have obtained consistency by adopting (if they have not already held it) the general value orientation, with its multiple goals, of the college community. Thus they emphasize a "well-rounded" approach to education. Dependent upon the particular goal stressed by the college or university, they will express a primary interest in one of the three goals, but they will insist that the other two goals are also very important and strive to reach them during their academic stay. Thus, these students will strive for good grades, vocational preparation, a broad general education, and social sophistication through active participation in the student administrative and social offices. These are the students who are most likely to run for student government, administrative office, and feel a "responsibility" for acting in a creditable manner, not only academically, but socially as well.

---

[38]It is important to note that the term "conformist" does not imply that all individuals who chose this mode of adjustment have a general personality trait of conformity (although in individual cases this may be true). As viewed here, conformity is a "situational behavior." Kretch, Crutchfield and Ballachy, op. cit., point out that . . . we cannot properly speak simply of the 'conformist' or the 'independent' person. Rather, we must speak of the conforming person or the independent person as described within a specified range of situations." See also, Edward L. Walker and Roger W. Heyns, An Anatomy For Conformity (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962); and Solomen E. Asch, "Issues in the Study of Social Influences on Judgment," Conformity and Deviation, Irwin A. Berg and Bernard M. Bass, Editors (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961), pp. 143-158.

Vocational: [39] These students have gained consistency by minimizing the importance of academic and social interests. In doing so, they will tend to express indifference to college social affairs and academic activities but will recognize the necessity to perform reasonably well in the class-room. Higher education, for these students, is a very narrow affair, perceived in a highly instrumental, "job oriented" fashion.

Collegiate: As the vocational students have gained consistency through minimizing the importance of the traditional academic and social goals, these students have minimized the importance of the traditional academic and vocational goals. Placing high value upon the individual, and the development of his ability to interact successfully with others, these students view social activities as highly important. While they may enroll in courses aimed toward a "broad general education," they do so with the idea of developing their social self, not for the "ideas" set forth in the material. Grades, for these students are important only insofar as necessary to remain in school; a "Gentleman's C" is reasonable.

Academic Intellectual: These students have minimized the vocational and social goals of the system, but they hold, or have accepted the traditional academic goal of the college community. These are the students who are truly interested in ideas and who tend to minimize

---

[39]In one sense, all students are vocational in that the particular training received is viewed as necessary for the assumption of a specific occupational role, be it that of engineer, artist, or sociologist. In the sense employed here, however, vocational is intended to connote a very specific instrumental view of higher education as "job training" and little else. (As an anonymous undergraduate student in an advisor-advisee interview expressed it to the author, "I just want to take the courses necessary for me to get the information required to qualify for a good job in industry.")

the social and vocational goals of the college community. Being the intellectually curious, they extend their efforts beyond those normally required for academic performance. They look for a broad general education and tend to develop the "critical" attitude so frequently lauded, but not always supported by a large part of the faculty and administration. Thus, while they perform well academically, they do not necessarily follow the prescribed pattern of academic success. Accepting the academic goal, they value highly individuality.[40] They are not necessarily "beatnicks," but may well share many of the same general values.[41]

These four types of student subcultures, then, may be differentiated on the basis of their educational goals, reflecting a particular orientation to higher education, and upon the type of adjustment made to gain consistency in the academic milieu. It must be emphasized that we are not maintaining that in a particular subculture, only those aspects of higher education germane to the primary goal of the subculture will be influential. Rather, that their effects will be substantially reduced. It will be remembered that we are positing a shared set of educational goals and, therefore, value will be perceived in other academic system goals as well. The difference, again, is one of emphasis.

---

[40]Veblen, op. cit.; Logan Wilson, The Academic Man (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942).

[41]Sharing the beatnick's general values in some instances means their behavior patterns and responses to various situations, i.e., political issues and values, dress, linguistic expressions, etc., may be similar. This does not mean, however, that the nihilist philosophy of life, usually ascribed to "beatnicks" is also shared, nor their perception of educational goals. Intuitively, we would believe that beatnick students do not successfully adjust to higher education, should they attend. They tend to be, rather, one type of dropout from higher education.

The point has been made, earlier in this discussion, that the normative systems identified as subcultures are, in effect, variants of a particular ideology. The expression of such an ideology toward higher education by the total society is not, it is suggested, manifest on a concrete level in total subscription to one particular goal by all members and subsystems found within the larger social system. The goals vary, rather, with the individual or group's position in the social context. Parsons has aptly commented that any complex system has several goals and must be viewed accordingly. And, further, that all social systems must maintain some scale of goal importance.[42] This "scale" of importance is determined in large measure by the "environing systems."[43] This does not, however, invalidate our conception of the distinctiveness of the academic socio-cultural system any more than does the acknowledgment of the restrictions placed upon a society by the physical environment negate the importance of culture in human development. What it does acknowledge, rather, is the inseparable link between the two.

It is necessary, also, to reiterate that the general nature of the socio-cultural system is such that the emphasis of the particular college or university undoubtedly contributes appreciably to the manner of adjustment made by the student. It is necessary, therefore, to consider the particular college or university in discussing the nature and extent of subsequent attitude and value effects achieved in the course of the student's undergraduate career.

Finally, we would observe that in our model we are dealing with only a segment, albeit an important one, of the total life space of the

---

[42]Parsons, op. cit., p. 39.

[43]Ibid.

individual student. Accordingly, it is not purported that membership in a subculture will necessarily explain all variation in the effects of academic life upon the student. The very complexity of society eliminates any such illusions. Rather, we contend, such membership contributes to the probability that the college experience will, or will not, be meaningful to the student in different areas as he progresses through it. To a large extent, it would seem, individuals in any context will look toward those groups or other individuals who, in some fashion, are perceived as being potentially able to reward them.[44] These rewards, following the logic of our discussion, over the long stretch are related to the attainment of goals relevant to the situation in which the individual finds himself. It would appear reasonable, therefore, to anticipate that in social experience the ability (or lack of it) of such groups or individuals to influence the person in question is contingent upon his perception of their relevancy for goal attainment. Furthermore, the means to be utilized in any given context to attain such goals would be dependent upon whether or not they were perceived as appropriate for the goals desired. In academia, students "apathy" relative to such things as social or cultural events or student government would seem to be partially a reflection of the "inappropriateness" of the affair for the attainment of most student's goals.

To summarize we have attempted to set forth a meaningful conceptual framework, within which the effect of higher education upon attitudes and values may be assessed. We have observed both the unity of the academic socio-cultural system and its diversity; the social heterogeneity of the student body and its consequences in terms of the differential emphasis placed upon educational goals. Further, we have

---

[44]David Gottlieb, "Youth Subculture: Variations On a Theme" (Paper read at the Fifth Social Psychological Symposium, The University of Oklahoma, May 6, 1964).

theorized that the discrepancy between the general educational goals of the college community and those of the students lead to a "strain for consistency." It is upon this basis that student subcultures emerge. Their perpetuation is primarily a consequence of peer support. The consequence of such membership, we have suggested, is a de-emphasis of those aspects of higher education considered important to specific educational goals, thus reducing the influence of higher education upon the student in those areas.

The validity of any theoretical model, in the final analysis is dependent upon empirical evidence for support. In the next chapter we will set forth a research design, intended to test in preliminary fashion, expectations concerning student behavior, attitudes and values, which logically should follow if our model is appropriate.

CHAPTER V

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

The preceding chapters have considered the nature of higher education in contemporary American Society in terms of: the complex nature of the academic sociocultural system; the diverse nature of the student body who partakes of this system, and previous literature dealing with the effects of the sociocultural system upon student attitudes and values. From these considerations a conceptual model was developed, utilizing the idea of subcultures, by which at least part of the differential effect of higher education upon students could be explained. Essentially, the diverse educational goals of the academic system, differentially emphasized by the various colleges and universities, lead to different modes of adjustment on the part of members of the student body. Postulating a "strain toward consistency" on the part of the student, in which either conformity or deviation from the general goal orientation of the college or university obtained, student subcultures emerged within the context of the student body.

These subcultures were differentiated on the basis of the emphasis they placed upon the three primary educational goals. They are sustained, it was suggested, by the support of peers, family, and faculty who share a similar goal orientation toward higher education. A consequence of these subcultures, among other things, is the de-emphasis, in many cases, of the academic areas designed as means to the attainment of certain educational goals, and, accordingly, a lessening of the probability of their influence upon student attitudes and values.

It is the purpose of this chapter to describe the design used in preliminary research employing this model. In doing so, tentative hypotheses will be set forth, the confirmation of which will lend indirect support to our general hypotheses as stated in Chapter I.

The Population

The data for this preliminary study was taken from that collected by Lehmann and Dressel[1] on a group of college freshmen, enrolling at a large, state supported, midwestern university in the fall of 1958. Excluding transfer students and readmitted students, it numbered 2526 students (92 per cent of the enrolling freshmen class). Of this original group tested, 1476 students remained on campus and in attendance in Spring Term, 1962. On a voluntary basis, 1051 (71 per cent) of these students were at that time retested. Of that group, 977 had sufficient data on them for the analysis to be described in this chapter. The balance of 74 students did not complete the items required for this analysis. The 977, therefore, became our research population.

Because the sample used is, in a sense, an "accidental one,"[2] dependent upon accessibility, any inferences drawn from the findings reported must be judgmental and not statistical in nature, insofar as they apply to the real parent population of 1476. The sample used may be construed, however, as itself a hypothetical parent population for

---

[1]Irving J. Lehmann and Paul L. Dressel, op. cit. The author wishes to acknowledge the permission given by these authors for use of the data contained in this dissertation.

[2]C. Selltiz, M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch, S. W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Henry Holt and Co., Inc., 1959), revised edition, p. 516.

purposes of analysis.[3] As a hypothetical population it must be considered as: all new students who entered this particular institution in the fall of 1958 and remained enrolled through the spring of 1962, and who were willing and/or able to complete the paper and pencil items requested. Inferences made to the real parent population, i.e., the 1476 students, must be judgmental, therefore, and premised on the contention that a sample of 66 per cent of the total population, while non-random, is reasonably representative of the group, and possible biases present tend to be random and minimized by the size of the sample.

A second consideration relative to this sample is that, in a very particular sense, it is purposive.[4] Its purpose is to establish the feasibility of a particular model of student-institution interaction in terms of explaining the differential impact of higher education upon student attitudes and values. As such, given the identification of student subcultures, differences in attitudes, behavior and proportion of attitude and value change become meaningful for purposes of this dissertation. That we cannot, other than on a judgmental basis, infer such differences to the real parent population, however, is a readily recognized shortcoming of this study.

The Setting: In the analysis of possible change, the nature of the particular college communities goal orientation is a key element in predicting the differential effects it may have upon the student body. The school in this study is a large, state supported, midwestern university with an enrollment in excess of 20,000 students.

---

[3]E. F. Lindquist, Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1956), pp. 73-75; Selltiz et al., op. cit., pp. 541-544.

[4]Selltiz et al., op. cit., p. 438.

To determine the general orientation of the university, in terms of its goal hierarchy, a content analysis of the stated purposes of the various departments' programs and general statements of the administration was made. This analysis was restricted to statements in the university catalogue. The bases for identifying the primary goals of the department was a subjective evaluation of the stated intent of the programs offered within the context of the three goals described. Six variations were identified. Along with examples of each, they were:

1. Vocational: "training for the home building industry"; "prepare for work in all areas of dairy production and allied services."

2. Vocational and Academic: "Provide for a broad cultural education as well as to prepare graduates for professional careers"; "broad training in the science and arts with particular emphasis on biology and the world of insects."

3. Academic: "(develop) a thorough understanding of the spatial organization of the earth's physical and cultural phenomena"; "a concern with the development and character of the civilization of all peoples."

4. Academic and Social: "Provides a broad liberal background for the understanding of and professional employment in the field of human relations."

5. Social: "stimulate and develop the intellectual, social and personal growth of the individual through oral communication."

6. Social and Vocational: "Focuses on administrative decision making in areas peculiar to business competition."

Proportionately, the various departments of the university were categorized according to goal emphasis as follows.

EDUCATION GOAL EMPHASIZED

(By Per Cent)

	Vocational	Vocational & Academic	Academic	Academic & Social	Social	Social & Vocational	Total	N
Dept.	43	26	8	5	6	12	100	65

While the above analysis is crude, it does allow us to suggest that the primary goal of this university is vocational. This would follow, logically, from its position as a state supported institution. The analysis points as well, however, to the variation in emphasis from one department to another within the same university setting.[5] Such variation is encompassed in the total orientation of the university toward its responsibility to the student.

> Here the student may obtain a liberal arts education, in the broadest sense, or may specialize in the narrower technical areas. If he chooses to specialize, he still will not lose breadth, for by requiring our University College courses we make certain that every student becomes familiar with the general principles of natural science, social science, the humanities, and American thought and language.

The presence of numerous cultural and scientific facilities, an excellent lecture-concert and foreign film series, a large graduate student body, and support for basic, as well as applied, research by the faculty and administration supply evidence that the academic goal, while not carrying the weight of vocational training, is a meaningful element of the Universities' general goal orientation.

The social goal, pervasive throughout the system, carries the stress upon the development of personal characteristics thought desirable and necessary for the college graduate. Such an emphasis is found especially in the stress upon athletics and social participation.

> Every student is encouraged to become an active member in some organization. Each of the approximately 200 existing student organizations has its activities and membership requirements.

---

[5]This content analysis attempted to delineate the "primary" emphasis, recognizing the other goals may also be important to the departments considered. Thus, from the statement by the Engineering School of the University, ". . . the student is urged to develop his skill in communication and his ability to work with others."

That these goals are not considered independent, but as part of an integrated whole, designed to develop the "well-rounded" student may be seen in the following quotations:

> The University seeks in every way to provide its students with a rich and well-rounded college experience, so that as they develop academic and professional competence they also gain experience and insight into many different activities and relationships.
>
> . . . we do not think so much of graduating engineers or chemists or teachers or home economists or agriculturalists or businessmen, as of graduating educated men and women, trained to be effective citizens . . . men and women ready and willing to assume the duties of leadership. . . .

We conclude, therefore, that while the vocational goal receives primary emphasis in this school's goal orientation, the academic and social goals do receive emphasis as well. Based upon the preceding considerations, we would judge the academic goal to rank second to the vocational in importance, while the social goal would run a close third in the goal hierarchy of this institution. While our analysis is admittedly subjective, it does allow us a basis for anticipating the nature of possible changes in attitudes and values.

Before describing the method of analysis, tentative specific hypotheses, logically deduced from our model and relevant research literature, will be made relative to differences between the various student subcultures. Because of the exploratory nature of this study and the limitations of the data, we cannot directly test the general hypotheses as stated in Chapter I. Should our specific hypotheses be largely confirmed, however, indirect evidence of the validity of these general hypotheses may be inferred.

HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses to be made will be in the form of differences between subcultures on specified dimensions. The direction of these differences will not be stated in the hypothesis itself. In the rationale following each hypothesis, the reasoning advanced as to why such differences should obtain will suggest the manner in which particular differences should be expressed.

Hypothesis I: Significant differences exist in the proportion of students from different socio-economic status origins found in the various student subcultures.

The research by Goldsen, Douvan and Kaye, Kahl, and Davies cited in Chapter III have all reported the strong vocational nature of low status youth's perception of higher education. As the "socially mobile" element of the student body, their initial approach to higher education may be characterized as narrowly vocational. In contrast, while high status youth may value the vocational goal, other goals are important as well.

Given this initial difference, what consequences ensue from the college communities general goal orientation pressure upon the student? Faced with an inconsistency in terms of emphasis the lower status youth may modify his educational goal orientation to reflect that of the college communities. This is likely to be done by a fair segment of the lower status group. But many others would not. This would be so, it is suggested, for at least two reasons. The work of West[6] and Adorno et al.,[7]

---

[6]P. S. West, "Social Mobility Among College Graduates," Class, Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification, R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, Editors (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953), pp. 465-479.

[7]T. W. Adorno, E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), pp. 384-389.

strongly suggests that lower status individuals, particularly socially mobile ones, tend to be more rigid in attitudes and values than do high status individuals. Their willingness to change, consequently, should be proportionately less. It is likely, therefore, that many such lower status students will adjust simply by reducing the importance of those aspects of college life associated with the academic and social goals, thereby accentuating the vocational nature of their education. Additionally, to accept the broad educational goal orientation of the college requires both time and money. We would infer, from the lower status position of these students, that both are in short supply in the majority of cases.

The most logical change to occur, if it should transpire, would be one in which that which can be most afforded, pragmatically, would be given. For lower status youth this factor would tend to be "time," rather than "money." It would be expected, because of this, that should the student seek adjustment through change, the academic intellectual goal would be most logical, the collegiate least so.

Higher status youth are more likely, in contrast, to be found in the academic conformist subculture than in any other one subculture. As a group, not having the restrictions of time and money, being more flexible in their attitudes and values, tending in many instances to already stress more than one of the goals in question, and, finally, the closer amenability of the academic milieu to the general value orientation of the middle class student, suggests that they should find conformity a much more acceptable manner of adjustment.

In lieu of academic conformity, it is expected that the tendency will be for many high status students to be found in the collegiate subculture. While undoubtedly, a proportion of them will be attracted to the vocational subculture, in view of the emphasis on such a goal advocated by the school, and others may become associated with the

academic intellectual subculture, the collegiate subculture will tend to be more attractive. The rationale here is, that as a consequence of the prevalence of what Bendix has referred to as the "managerial ideology" in the homes of many of these students, the social goal is very important.[8] It is in Elton Mayo's words,

> The ability of a man to develop unemotional control over himself in order to master the technical operation and organize the human cooperation indespensable to the success of an enterprise.[9]

In the context of college life, such success would be defined in terms of developing the desirable "personality characteristics" to not only be accepted by others, but to effectively influence their behavior. Holding such an ideology, closely compatible, if not a part of, the academic social goal, an individual would find the collegiate subculture appealing. Too, in many cases, the better financial position of the family reduces the limitation faced by the low social status student, thereby enhancing the probability of finding high status students in this subculture.

Hypothesis II: Significant differences exist in the proportion of rural, small town, and large city, students found in the various subcultures.

Research cited by Schwarzweller, Dressel and Lehmann, and others indicates that rural and small town students tend to emphasize the vocational goal of higher education. While the college community would undoubtedly encourage a portion of them to conform to its expectations, we would anticipate a greater proportion of them would tend to minimize the importance of the non-vocational academic and

---

[8]Reinhardt Bendix, Work and Authority in Industry (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 319.

[9]Ibid., p. 311, citing Elton Mayo, The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization (Boston: Harvard University, 1945), p. 120.

social goals. Previous research[10] suggests that, compared to urban youth, rural youth were shy, self-deprecating, and have greater withdrawal tendencies, as well as a poorer personality adjustment. Such a personality syndrome is not, it is reasoned, compatible with the more sophisticated and urbane setting of academia. Thus, we would anticipate these students would tend to gain consistency by minimizing the importance of the non-vocational aspects of higher education.

For the same reason, a change in educational emphasis, should it occur, would be more likely toward the academic goal, than any other. Such a change would lead, we believe, to emersion in the academic intellectual student subculture and tend to minimize the requirements for social interaction by the student.

Large city and urban youth, in contrast to rural and small town youth, come to higher education with quite a different set of life experiences. While they may well share the vocational goal as primary with this latter group, their experiences in an urban setting are far more compatible with the academic social-cultural system.[11] Additionally, tending to be more aggressive, independent, and self confident, the probability of internalizing the requirements for academic conformity are increased.

It should be noted that being more "independent," as opposed to "submissive," suggests that the obverse of the above argument might be more correct. We would argue, however, that such personality traits are relative to the situation considered. By this is meant that,

---

[10]A. O. Haller and C. E. Wolff, "Personality Orientation of Farm, Village and Urban Boys," Rural Sociology, 24:331-346, 1959; B. E. Munson, op. cit., S. R. Hathaway, E. P. Monachesi, and L. A. Young, op. cit.

[11]Haller and Wolff, op. cit.

for a person to be submissive or independent in any given context, one must know to what he is submitting or against what he is rebelling. In higher education, following our earlier discussion, the segmental involvement demanded by the system minimizes, we contend, the total type of submission or rebellion characterized by these personality traits. All must submit minimally--none totally. One can be submissive, within the prescribed framework of the system, without compromising his independency, if the system is broad enough. In like fashion, one may submit to the minimal demands of the system without committing oneself to the goals prescribed by it. When this is considered, along with the prior experiences of these groups, it seems reasonable to anticipate that conformity to the educational goals is more likely to occur among urban students than rural or small town.

The same experiences and personality traits, along with the greater awareness of a necessity to successfully interact with and influence others in the context of life's experiences, would lead us to expect that the more urbane city dweller would find the social goal as more appropriate for his college life than the traditional academic one. We would expect, therefore, that a greater proportion of urban students would be attracted to the collegiate subculture, as a manner of adjustment to the demands of the college community.

Hypothesis III: Significant differences exist in the proportion of male and female students found in the various subcultures.

Douvan and Kaye's work suggests that differences in educational goals for males and females stem in large measure from their general social roles, both as children and later as adults. Having, in most cases, to look toward a role of family provider, more males would be expected to emphasize the vocational goal in higher education and be less inclined to conform to the full goal orientation of the academic system. Female students, on the other hand, having less concern for

the goal of vocational preparation, are more likely to perceive of their college experience as fulfilling several needs. Thus, the probability of their orientation being such as to be compatible, or readily adjustable, to the general orientation of higher education should be much greater.

In those instances where an alternative to academic conformity is utilized in adjusting to college life, the social goal seems most amenable to the female role in American Society. Emphasizing the development of a pleasing personality and socially approved behavior as desirable for feminine success in adult life, the social goal of higher education seems "natural" among female students.[12]

Male students, while they undoubtedly share such social goals in many instances, tend to have a broader choice of possible orientations to which they may successfully apply themselves. Thus, the academic intellectual subculture should hold more attraction, relatively speaking, since careers in science, research and academia itself may result from such a goal.

It is necessary, when inferring the likelihood of students from diverse social origins belonging to one of the four student subcultures identified, to point out that students attending a particular college or university may well be "academic conformist" simply by virtue of emphasizing the educational goals initially in the same manner as the college or university. An adjustment in such a case would be unnecessary, as we are speaking of it here. Such individuals would not necessarily be rare due to the "screening" employed by both the student and the school. Since we are ultimately interested in the consequences of such membership in terms of subsequent attitude and value change, we shall not concern ourselves with the problem of discerning what factors are instrumental in determining such compatibility.

---

[12]Coleman, op. cit.

Having set forth our hypotheses relative to the type of social origins associated with membership in student subcultures, we now consider differences in attitudes and behavior derived from the nature of these subcultures. There are several such areas one may expect differences to be manifest in. We shall restrict ourselves in this discussion to four: (1) differences in academic performance; (2) differences in attitudes toward the fine arts; (3) differences in attitudes toward individual freedoms, and (4) differences in occupational expectations. Each of these four areas, it is believed, are important in considering the influence of higher education upon the student body.

Hypothesis IV: Significant differences will exist between student subcultures in their academic performance. (As measured by Grade Point Average.)

The basis for evaluating performance in academia depends, in most instances, upon one's ability to do well in the classroom. This, in turn it seems reasonable to assume, is closely related to one's perception of the relevancy and appropriateness of the subject matter, other things being equal.[13] Accepting the validity of this assumption,

---

[13]This is not to imply, however, that differences in intelligence or academic aptitude are unimportant. While evidence of the relationship of measured tests of intelligence to academic performance is well-known, it has become increasingly clear that values, attitudes and beliefs also contribute heavily to an individuals performance in education. Thus, while Brookover and Gottlieb observe that ". . . there is some correlation, though limited, between ability as measured by intelligence tests and school achievement. . . ," they go on to point out that the extent of this relationship is uncertain and that other factors are influential also. Wilbur Brookover, and David Gottlieb, A Sociology of Education, 2nd Edition (New York: American Book Company, 1964), pp. 170-173; see also, Fred Strodtbeck, "Family Interaction, Values and Achievement," Talent and Society, David C. McClellend, Alfred L. Baldwin, Urie Bronfenbrenner, and Fred L. Strodtbeck, Editors (New York: D. VanNostrand, 1958), pp. 135-194; Bernard Rosen,

we would argue that both the academic conformist and the academic intellectual perceive such relevancy for themselves and would, accordingly, strive to do well in the classroom. Differences between them, we believe, would stem in large measure from the concentrated approach to learning by the academic intellectual, as opposed to the more limited approach of the academic conformist. The academic conformist, striving to be "all things to all men" must spread his efforts. In contrast, the academic intellectual is concerned primarily with knowledge, as advocated by the traditional academic system. Such differences in emphasis, we expect will be reflected in their academic performance.

In contrast to the two former subcultures, the vocational and collegiate subcultures have less concern with high academic performance. While the vocational student wants to be adequately prepared for occupational success, this is not necessarily interpreted to mean high grades and performance in what is to him a transitional environment. Thus, while he will wish to do well, he will be less likely to "over extend himself." The collegiate student, on the other hand, finds little time to devote to his studies. His social life is demanding, and he is quite willing to accept a "C" as the result of his minimum scholastic efforts.

Hypothesis V: Significant differences will exist among the various subcultures in the proportion of students placing a high value on the fine arts.

"The Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, 21:203-211, 1956; Samual A. Stouffer, "Social Forces That Produce the 'Great Sorting,'" College Entrance Examination Board, 2:1-7, 1955. Dana M. Farnsworth, "Some Non-Academic Causes of Success and Failure of College Students," College Entrance Examination Board, 2:72-78, 1955.

The fine arts have been intimately associated with the traditional goals of academia. As the most obvious expression of our cultural heritage they have become an integral part of the "broad liberal education" in American Society.[14] It is anticipated, therefore, that those subcultures holding the academic goal as important should tend to be most appreciative of them.

The vocational subculture, on the other hand, de-emphasizing the academic goal and the phases of college life associated with it, would have little opportunity to develop a favorable opinion of such phenomena. The collegiate subculture, in this instance, must be considered a special case. For the high value placed upon the individual is, in part, evaluated in a context which holds knowledge of, if not appreciation for, the fine arts as desirable. Thus, to an extent, it is anticipated that a greater proportion of this group than the vocational subculture will evidence a high value toward the fine arts.

Hypothesis VI: Significant differences will exist among the various subcultures in the proportion of students evidencing a liberal attitude toward freedom of expression.

It is necessary here to define a "liberal attitude" toward freedom of expression as one in which the individual is highly tolerant of others expressions, and feels any attempt to suppress such expressions is undesirable.

While our review of the literature has shown that generally students become more tolerant over a four year period, the nature of our model would suggest that the proportion who do so would vary considerably between the subcultures. Specifically, those subcultures

---

[14]James, op. cit., David Reisman, "The Spread of 'Collegiate' Values," The Intellectuals: A Controversial Portrait, G. B. de Huszar, Editor (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960), pp. 505-509.

emphasizing the academic goal should evidence a higher proportion of students favoring such freedoms.

The vocational subculture, being less exposed to the influences associated with the academic goal, should tend to have fewer students favorably disposed to it. The academic "marginality" of this group, also suggests that a more conservative attitude toward such freedoms would be common.

The collegiate subculture, also, should evidence a smaller proportion of its students favoring unfettered freedom of expression. The higher social origins of this group, if our earlier hypothesis is correct, also, would lead us to expect a more conservative view in this matter.

There are several dimensions of possible "career plans" that could be considered. The following hypothesis is meant to apply only to the student's immediate plans upon graduation and the type of activity they anticipate will constitute the major portion of their duties in post-college careers.

Hypothesis VII: Significant differences will be found among the various subcultures in the proportion of students with different types of "career-plans" upon graduation.

From our model we would anticipate that a greater proportion of students in the academic intellectual subculture would anticipate graduate school. The vocational students, on the other hand, would be more likely to plan on entering a position in their chosen profession. The collegiate, while sharing this desire for a career, should tend to be most expectant of assuming duties in which their talents with people can best be employed. The academic conformists, having endorsed the "balanced approach" to higher education, would tend to be more evenly distributed among the various alternatives.

To this point hypotheses have been directed toward anticipated differences among the various subcultures. The remaining hypotheses will be concerned with changes in the student's attitudes. The areas chosen to evaluate changes among the subcultures are as follows: the student self-concept; attitudes toward education; religion; politics; authority; the future. Generally, while it is anticipated that changes will occur among some students of all subcultures, it is expected the proportion and direction of such changes will vary from one subculture to another.

Hypothesis VIII: Significant differences in the proportion of students indicating a change in their student self-concept will be found among the various subcultures.

To anticipate the manner in which such differences would obtain it is necessary to consider the academic milieu in which students exist. In this instance, the institution in question is strongly vocational in emphasis. Accordingly, those students who had originally perceived themselves as a vocationally oriented student, should evidence less propensity to change their self-concept. Conversely, the students found within the academic conformist subculture have, by and large, adopted the broad goal orientation of the college community. Thus, a greater proportion of students in this subculture should evidence a change in self-concept relative to their student life.

There are several aspects of one's attitude toward education that may be considered. In this instance we have chosen to consider the student's attitude toward class attendance. Specifically, we are concerned with whether or not the student has changed his attitude toward class attendance as a necessity for learning in higher education.

Hypothesis IX: Significant differences in the proportion of students indicating a more favorable or unfavorable attitude toward classroom attendance for the purpose of learning will be found among the various subcultures.

While in the course of four years of college we would anticipate that most students would change their attitudes toward the value of classroom attendance, it does not necessarily follow that they would all change in a similar direction. It seems reasonable to anticipate that, given the goals of these students, there will be a tendency for students in some of the subcultures to be more favorably disposed to classroom learning after four years than students in other subcultures.

We would anticipate, by way of contrast, that while the tendency would be for the vocational students to perceive the classroom as the primary vehicle for learning, the academic intellectual students would both perceive and utilize to a greater extent independent reading, faculty contact, and various other devices as fruitful in their learning experience. The latter group, therefore, would tend more toward de-emphasizing the importance of the classroom as a learning device.

It would be anticipated that the academic conformist subculture would tend to de-emphasize the importance of the classroom for learning also, but not to the extent of the academic intellectual group. The collegiate group, on the other hand, should tend to perceive the classroom experience as more meaningful for learning, since little effort outside of the classroom is directed toward the academic requirements of the formal system.

Hypothesis X: Significant differences in the proportion of students indicating a stronger or weaker attitude of commitment toward religion will be found among the various subcultures.

If, as James,[15] Reisman,[16] and others have argued, one of the primary purposes of higher education is to develop the student's ability

---

[15]James, op. cit.

[16]David Reisman, Constraint and Variety in American Education, op. cit.

to think critically and logically, then to the extent that this value is existent within what we have called the academic orientation to higher education students adhering to it should tend to change their attitudes toward a commitment to a formal religious belief system. While such a change may result in a rejection of all commitment toward religion, it is more likely that it would entail more of a selective de-emphasis of one's attitude toward commitment than a total rejection as such. Thus, the commitment of the academic intellectual and the academic conformist to this academic goal of higher education, particularly in a secular school, would lead us to expect a tendency for a stronger emphasis upon the "rational" elements of man's relationship to the supernatural, and a de-emphasis upon the necessity for commitment to a formal religious belief as such.

It has been suggested that the secular nature of the school may well be instrumental in the tendency for students generally to feel less of a commitment toward and need for a religious belief. It is necessary to point out that we are not suggesting that religiosity, in the broadest sense of the word, may be lost as the result of a college education in a secular school. But rather that the unquestioning acceptance of a particular religious ideology, espoused by a church or sect, would tend to be reduced in an environment which is itself committed to a non-biased presentation of knowledge and ideas, regardless of their origin.

The more limited commitment of vocational and collegiate students to the academic goal would result in a tendency to either not change their attitudes of commitment toward religion, or might even engender a "reaction" on their part toward a stronger commitment to religion. This would tend to be more likely, it would seem, among the vocational students. If our hypotheses relative to their lower status

origins is correct, then previous research[17] would lead us to expect a stronger commitment to religion than students hold who come from higher status homes.

Hypothesis XI: Significant differences in the proportion of the students indicating a change in the nature of their political attitudes will be found among the various subcultures.

The emphasis upon the traditional academic goal, with its stress upon critical thinking and intellectual curiosity, would it is believed, lead more students of the academic intellectual and academic conformist group to alter their political attitudes. On the other hand, having little such emphasis, vocational and collegiate students should have much less propensity to change.

Hypothesis XII: Significant differences in the proportion of students indicating a more favorable or unfavorable attitude toward their own future and the future of civilization generally will be found among the various subcultures.

Generally, it is anticipated that vocational and social students will be more "sure" of their role in life, and of the brightness of both their own future and that of society generally. Having a fairly clear-cut image of what they aspire to, it is expected to be apparent in their confidence in the system's ability to both deliver it and perpetuate that deliverance. An optimistic attitude, therefore, would be consistent with their goal.

In contrast, knowledge and a "broad" preparation for life is not usually conducive to sureness of one's position or specific goal within it. Nor, generally, is it supportive of a complacent attitude about the

---

[17]Gerhardt Lenski, The Religious Factor (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1961); Will Herberg, Protestant, Catholic, Jew (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1955).

state of the world. The desire and ability to think critically carries with it the responsibility of the appraisal resulting therefrom. We would anticipate, therefore, particularly in the case of the academic intellectual subculture, a relatively high proportion of students indicating a change toward a less optimistic attitude about their own future and that of civilization generally. To a lesser extent, this would be true of the academic conformist subculture also.

Hypothesis XIII: Significant differences in the proportion of students who indicate an increase or decrease in their attitudes of respect toward authority will be found among the various subcultures.

It is anticipated that while students generally, in the course of social maturation, will tend to evidence a change in the nature of their "respect for authority" from that associated with childhood, the proportions doing so in the various subcultures should differ. The academic intellectual would, in his development of a critical attitude, be the most likely to change, as also would the academic conformist, and in the direction of less respect.

The vocational student, more narrowly committed to job success, would tend to either maintain his attitudes toward authority, or perhaps even increase his attitude of respect in some instances. The tendencies of the collegiate student, however, are more difficult to anticipate. With emphasis upon the development of personal characteristics necessary for the successful manipulation of others, it is possible that attitudes of respect for authority could be substantially reduced over a period of four years. On the other hand, lack of a critical attitude by these students could well result in little change in either direction. We expect, therefore, that while proportionately fewer collegiate students change their attitudes, of those that do change, the greater proportion will tend to be less respectful.

Having stated the specific hypotheses being tested, the techniques employed to test them will now be considered.

Instruments

Biographical Data Sheet:[18] A twenty-five item questionnaire from which information on the subject's social origin was obtained. This instrument was administered during the subjects first week on campus.

Senior-Year Experience Inventory: A two hundred and sixteen item paper and pencil inventory of forced choice questions dealing with the student's attitudes and experiences in several areas. Generally, these areas dealt with various aspects of student life, political attitudes and social issues, religion, and family-subject relations. It was administered to all subjects retested in the spring, 1962.

Procedure

The most critical methodological problem in this study was the development of a means whereby students could be categorized as belonging to one of the subcultures. The absence of phenotypic criteria and of previous research to draw upon necessitated the creation of an adequate tool. As discussed in our chapter on theory, the emergence of subcultures was a consequence of the manner of adjustment the student made to the college community, given his educational goal. Such an adjustment, furthermore, was manifest in his attitudes and behavior toward academic life. Following this reasoning, it seems logical to conclude that a technique whereby the subject could indicate

---

[18]See Appendix A for examples of the instruments used.

those attitudes and behaviors in academia which best typified his own, but at the same time were representative of the behavior associated with specific student subcultures would be most suitable.

There are several methods by which such information could be obtained. The method utilized in this study involved the development of four descriptive statements, through a series of pre-tests, which incorporated those dimensions of possible student attitudes and behaviors focused upon the particular goals associated with higher education and expressive of the ideological varient described in Chapter IV. Original statements were constructed based upon the author and Dr. David Gottlieb's knowledge of previous literature in this area.[19] These were then submitted to an introductory class in sociology, about equally divided between freshmen, sophomores and juniors, with a few seniors. The students were asked to write down which one of these statements was most appropriate to themselves, and why it was. From their replies, new statements were developed, incorporating as nearly as possible the verbatium expressions of the students. These new statements were then pre-tested on students in a fraternity and a second group of students, all of whom were judged, a-priori, to fall into specific subcultures. Approximately 80 per cent of the responses agreed with the a-priori judgment of the judges. For purposes of preliminary analysis it was decided that the statements were reasonably valid. They appeared and were administered as part of the Senior-Year Experience Inventory in 1962. They are as follows:

Type "W" (Vocational).--This kind of person is interested in education, but primarily to the point of preparation for his occupational future. He is not particularly interested in the social or purely intellectual phases of campus life, although he might participate in these activities on some limited basis. This person does his homework so

---

[19]The author is indebted to Dr. Gottlieb for his assistance in this phase of the study.

that grades can be maintained, but otherwise restricts his reading to the light, general entertainment variety. For the most part, this person's primary reason for being in college is to obtain vocational or occupational training.

Type "X" (Academic Intellectual).--This person is interested in learning about life in general, but in a manner of his own choosing. He is very interested in the world of ideas and books, and eagerly seeks out these things. Outside the classroom, this person would attend such activities as the lecture-concert series, Provost lectures, foreign films, and so forth. This person wants to go beyond the mere course requirements and will frequently do extra reading in order to obtain a more complete understanding of the world in which he lives. From a social point of view, this person tends to reject fraternities, sororities, and the social events that are a part of campus life. When this person does join, it will usually be one of the political or more academic campus organizations. For the most part, this person would consider himself to be someone who is primarily motivated by intellectual curiosity.

Type "Y" (Academic Conformist).--This person is in many respects like Type X noted above. He is concerned with books and the pursuit of knowledge, but is also the kind of person who does not cut himself off from the more social phases of campus life. He is interested in getting good grades and usually tries to maintain a fairly high grade-point average. He is the kind of person who will work with student government, the campus U.N., and activities of this type. He is the kind of person who feels that the social side of college life is not the most important but is certainly significant for his general development.

Type "Z" (Collegiate).--This is the kind of person who is very much concerned with the social phases of college life. He identifies closely with the college and tries to attend as many of the campus social and athletic events as possible. This person may be interested in intellectual kinds of things but will, for the most part, find greater satisfaction in parties, dances, football games, and so forth. He is concerned about his education but feels that the development of his social skills is certainly important. His college years are centered about fraternity and sorority activities even though he might not be a member. This person attempts to "make grades" but will rarely go out of his way to do extra or non-assigned reading.

Several things should be noted about these statements. They are not mutually exclusive. This is in keeping with the point made earlier that differences between students in educational goal orientation were differences of degree not kind. The intent in developing these statements was not to force the subject into a category which may have distorted his response, but to make the scope of the statement sufficiently broad to allow relatively easy recognition of similarity on the part of the respondent.

It should be observed, also, that these statements are, in a general sense, variations on the student's self-concept in the academic milieu. They were subsequently used, as shall be discussed, in this capacity. This again, however, logically follows from our earlier discussion on the need for self consistency.

The determination of subcultural membership, then, was operationally defined as the respondent's identification of one of these four statements as most nearly representative of himself. While the technique is, admittedly, crude, the pre-tests conducted suggest sufficient validity for our preliminary study.

To increase the analytic power of the study, item responses in those substantive areas dealing with the student's attitudes toward public issues, and the fine arts were factor analyzed.[20] The purpose in doing so was to develop general indices having both face and construct validity. The rationale in this instance was that the saliency of attitudes and values in these areas could be better evaluated by the use of several items sharing a common psychological factor.[21] Factor analysis was

---

[20]The factor analysis was programmed on the CDC 3600, Computer Laboratory, Michigan State University, using the Quartimax Technique, with the Kiel-Wrigley Criteria.

[21]J. P. Guilford, Psychometric Methods (McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1954), Chapters 13 and 16.

thought to be most appropriate for this purpose. In each case an index was derived by selecting those items with the heaviest factor leading. Briefly, they are as follows:

Cultural Values Index:[22] Consisting of five items identifying such things as an art museum, foreign films, etc., the subjects were requested to express the extent of their dissatisfaction with a community which did not have these facilities available. The alternatives and their assigned scores were: (1) extremely dissatisfied, (2) dissatisfied, (3) somewhat dissatisfied, and (4) would not bother me. The possible range of scores was from five to twenty. A low score indicates a tendency for the subject to value highly the fine arts. A high score indicates a tendency for the subject to hold the fine arts in low esteem.

Political Insecurity Index:[23] Composed of four items which were statements dealing with possible constraints upon individual freedoms, the subjects were given the following alternatives (with their assigned scores) (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) disagree, (4) strongly disagree, (5) scores as zero--no opinion. The possible range of scores was from zero to sixteen. A low score would tend to indicate an attitude of political insecurity. A high score would tend to indicate an attitude of political security.

For purposes of analysis, the median score for the total sample was used as an arbitrary cut-off point for high and low scores on these indices. To avoid confusion each subject's score was inverted, i.e., a low raw score indicated a high value of the fine arts and freedom of

---

[22]See Appendix B for the items used and their Factor Loadings.

[23]See Appendix B for the specific items and their Factor Loadings. It should be noted that while a low score could also indicate "no opinion," the nature of the items were apparently salient enough that upon inspection less than 5% of the total responses answered in this fashion, with no one subject having more than one "no opinion" response.

expression. Those scoring above the median were operationally defined as high on the particular dimension being considered. Those scoring below the median were operationally defined as low on that dimension. The subsequent analysis, therefore, is concerned with a relative comparison of the subcultures in terms of their performance on these indices. Information on the subject's religious attitudes, and career plans was obtained from the subjects response to single items in the Experience Inventory.

The subject's sex and community of origin was obtained from items on the biographical data sheet. The subject's socio-economic status was determined by their father's or head of the household's occupation. For purposes of comparative analysis the Duncan socio-economic index was used.[24] This index, adjusted for occupational age, income and education, allows one to stratify individuals in terms of the social prestige assigned to various occupations within the society. Its range is from one to one hundred. The occupation of the student's father or head of household was assigned a score from this index which, for purposes of analysis, became the socio-economic ratings of the subjects.

The data used to test the hypotheses dealing with a change in the students attitudes toward self, education, religion, authority and the future, were obtained from the students responses to questions on whether he felt his attitude had changed in these areas. There is an inherent danger in using the student's own evaluation of change that such responses will reflect his general attitude on "change" itself. The interpretation of our results, therefore, must bear this qualification in mind.

To test the significance of the differences in the proportions of students scoring high or low on the indices identified, as well as subcultural differences on the various attitude changes, the X^2 test was employed. The next chapter will report the results of this analysis.

---

[24]Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Occupations and Social Status (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961), Chapters VII and VIII.

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS

It is the purpose of this chapter to report the results obtained in the analysis of the data gathered from the research population described in Chapter V. The first section of Chapter VI will report the statistical results obtained on tests of the specific hypotheses. We will then evaluate these results in terms of the degree to which they offer support to the general hypotheses.

Hypotheses I through III were concerned with relating the sex and social origins of the subjects to their identification with a particular subculture. These hypotheses, and the results of analyses testing them, are as follows:

Hypothesis I: Significant differences exist in the proportion of students from different social economic status origins found in the various student subcultures.

Using the occupation of the subject's father, or head of the household, the subjects were assigned an occupational socio-economic score. For purposes of analysis, the group median for the research population was computed and designated as the arbitrary midpoint in terms of high or low social status. Operationally, those subjects having status scores above the group median were defined as having high social status. Those subjects having status scores below the group median were defined as having low social status. Controlling by social status, the proportions found in each subculture are as follows:

Table I. Proportion of Students in Each Subculture by High and Low Socio-economic Status (As Measured by Father's Occupation)

Socio-economic Status	Subculture					
	Collegiate	Academic Intellectual	Vocational	Academic Conformist	Total	N
High	14	17	24	45	100	(478)
Low	8	23	34	35	100	(478)

Range: 6-93

Population socio-economic status median: 49.43

$X^2 = 24.850$; $P < .05$

From the data in Table I we conclude that hypothesis I is accepted. Inspection of the data reveals that lower status subjects tend to be found in the vocational or academic intellectual subculture as expected. Also, higher status subjects tend to choose the academic conformist subculture or collegiate subculture to a greater extent than their lower status counterparts. While such differences are not great, the effect of social origins upon subculture membership is apparent.

There are several possible explanations for such differences. The rationale advanced in Chapter V is one. Another may be the influence of social status upon choice of college major, which in turn influences subcultural membership. It is known that lower status youth, in addition to perceiving higher education vocationally, express this predilection by choosing such highly vocational fields as engineering or accounting.[1] Committing oneself to such a narrow field early in one's academic career may preclude a change in one's value of higher education. Indeed, Rosenberg's study suggests that such may well be the case. According to his findings, particular attitudes and values

[1]Davis and Bradburn, op. cit., p. 57.

may be a consequence and not an antecedent of occupational choice for the college student.[2] While, unfortunately, access to such information on the subjects was not readily available, the implications drawn from Rosenberg's thesis do not contradict the logic of the explanatory model as developed. It suggests, rather, that for many of these students, particular aspects of the academic milieu may well contribute to their manner of adjustment to the total environment.

The tendency of higher status youth to choose the academic conformist subculture suggests the more general compatibility of this group of students to the total environment of the college community. The existence of a strong vocational emphasis at the particular school studied could well be an effective determinate of this choice. Previous research has shown that state supported schools tend to attract a large number of middle class youth, strongly committed to social mobility. It is possible, therefore, that the higher status youth in this study may well be "higher" relative only to their lower class counterparts.

Such a relationship would tend to support what Davis and Bradburn have referred to as the "pipe-line" theory of higher education.[3] Specifically, this is the idea that social origins and aptitude determine where students attend school and academia simply channels them through it, while exerting little influence upon them in terms of attitude or value change. Our subsequent analysis of change should shed some light on the validity of this position.

While the above considerations can only be suggestive, they do point out the intricate relationship existing between social status and subcultural membership.

---

[2]Rosenberg, op. cit., pp. 124-126.

[3]Davis and Bradburn, op. cit., p. 42.

Hypothesis II: Significant differences exist in the proportion of rural, small town, and large city students found in the various subcultures.

Drawing from the Biographical Data Sheet, the subject's community or origin was identified by their response to the question: "Before coming to college, in what kind of a community did you spend most of your life?" The alternatives were: Farm, Village (250-2,499), Town (2,500-24,999), City (25,000-99,999), and City (over 100,000). Inspection of the data on those respondents indicating "farm" revealed many subjects whose parents could not be readily classified as farmers or rural non-farmers. For purposes of analysis, therefore, the term "rural" was employed for respondents answering this alternative. Also, for purposes of analysis, the respondents indicating "village" and "town" were placed in one category, as were the two responses dealing with the "city." The results of the analysis are in Table II below.

Table II. Proportion of Students in Each Subculture Having Rural, Small Town, or Large City Origins

	Subculture					
Origin	Collegiate	Academic Intellectual	Vocational	Academic Conformist	Total	N
Rural	4	23	44	29	100	(132)
Small Town	10	22	29	39	100	(404)
Large City	14	17	25	44	100	(439)
				$X^2 = 30.911$; $P < .05$		

The results obtained support hypothesis II and therefore it is accepted. Inspection of the distribution confirms our expectations regarding the nature of expected differences. Rural subjects definitely

prefer the vocational subculture; while subjects from the large city are attracted in the same proportion to the academic conformist subculture. Also, rural subjects are least attracted to the collegiate subculture and are most prevalent among the academic intellectual proportionate to their numbers. The more urban the subject, apparently, the less likelihood he may be found in the academic intellectual subculture, and the more likely he is to be found in the collegiate subculture. Although the differences in regard to the collegiate and academic intellectual subcultures are not great, the tendencies observed appear consistent with our expectations.

As with differences in social status, these differences, based upon community of origin, are consistent with Davis and Bradburn's finding regarding choice of major.[4] If, as suggested previously, the student's major is influential in the support or modification of one's view of higher education, the strong propensity for rural subjects to select majors consistent with goals learned from childhood would explain much of their strong vocational predilection.

It is possible that the reluctance of the rural students to become academic conformists, and their tendency to choose the academic intellectual subculture is a function of the value placed upon autonomy by them. While, as pointed out previously, rural students tend to be more submissive,[5] this does not preclude a strong need for personal autonomy on the part of the student. If rural students not only find adjustment difficult, but hold personal values which are strongly traditional in nature, i.e., that ideology consistent with what Reisman has called "inner directiveness" and associated with early America

---

[4]Davis and Bradburn, op. cit., pp. 58-59.

[5]Haller and Wolff, op. cit.

by him,[6] then their greater propensity toward vocationalism or academic intellectualism seems logically consistent. For both the collegiate and the academic conformist subculture membership requires a degree of "other directedness" not amenable to such an orientation. This explanation, further, is suggested by the high propensity of large city students to choose these subcultures.

The intermediate position of small town students would seem to reflect the transitional nature of their orientation. The relative close proximity of this group to the proportions reported for large city subjects, however, suggests the gap is much more one-sided than suggested by earlier studies.[7] This may well be one area where the consequence of modern technological improvements in communications and transportation are most quickly manifest. In contrast to early America, small towns are not the socially isolated units of society they once were. While they cannot hope to offer the urban culture of large cities to their young, they can more quickly avail themselves of the attitudes and values prevailing in metropolitan society via mass media, education, and good transportation facilities. Thus, the close similarity of their orientation to that of urban students toward higher education.

Hypothesis III: Significant differences exist in the proportion of male and female students found in the various subcultures.

Using data from the Biographical Data Sheet the following results were obtained.

---

[6]David Reisman, The Lonely Crowd: A Study of The Changing American Character (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1953). Doubleday Anchor Book abridged Edition.

[7]Lee G. Burchinal, "Differences in Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Farm, Small Town and City Boys," Rural Sociology, 26:107-121, 1961.

Table III. Proportion of Male and Female Students Choosing Each Subculture

	Subculture					
Sex	Collegiate	Academic Intellectual	Vocational	Academic Conformist	Total	N
Male	12	19	35	34	100	(564)
Female	10	22	20	48	100	(394)
				$X^2 = 35.128$; $P < .05$		

The data above show significant differences exist among the proportion of males and females in the various subcultures, thereby confirming hypothesis III. Inspection of the distribution supports our expectations regarding the preponderance of males in the vocational subculture and the female preference for the academic conformist subculture.

The data do not show that females are more likely to emphasize the collegiate goal as was expected. While the difference is slight, males are proportionately in greater numbers in this group. The obverse of this is true of the proportion of males or females emphasizing the academic intellectual goal. Why this should be so is not clear. It is possible, however, that the female attraction to the academic intellectual goal may in part be a function of personal inadequacies felt by many females in a sex role where such characteristics as good looks, nice clothes, and a pleasing personality are both desirable and important.

It is possible, also, that less chance for involvement on the part of the female, by the very nature of her defined role in American Society, increases the attractiveness of the academic goal in higher education. This same role, in addition, lessens her opportunity for

social mobility which may well contribute to the low proportion of females choosing the vocational subculture.

On the other hand, the heavy concentration of females in the academic conformist subculture suggests that even in higher education, a dual standard is adhered to. More stringent controls of female behavior on campus may lead not only to conformity of behavior, but conformity of educational goal orientation as well. Remembering that all of our subjects have successfully maintained themselves through four years of college under relatively close surveillance, it would lead one to expect that many females who were not willing to conform may have voluntarily left school at an earlier time.

Yet another possible explanation may well be that the relative freedom of females from the necessity of considering subsequent career responsibilities beyond academic life allows a breadth of goal selection not granted her male counterpart. Certainly, the strong vocational emphasis of the male students would seem to attest to the "practical" orientation many males appear to associate with higher education. On the other hand it is possible that the initial decision of many females to attend college is based upon their prior commitment to what we have here described as the broad academic orientation. Where many males may well be "pragmatically" oriented in terms of their future occupational roles and the need for college, the majority of females with a similar motivation may find it more easily fulfilled outside of academia and accordingly never attend.

The slight tendency for more males to ascribe to the collegiate group is not clear. It may be that the relatively high numbers of males of upper status and urban origins in this group are determinate of the difference. Another explanation may be that the nature of the social goal, as described, precludes its primary appropriateness for females. If we are correct in ascribing a high interest in social skills

to these students; and more specifically, social skills of a decidedly instrumental nature, then its value to most college females might be perceived as rather limited. The ability of females to perform better than males in college, may result in an encouragement of the well-rounded approach associated with conformity, and an avoidance of emphasis upon any one goal, including the social.

The results obtained in the analysis of the relation of the social origins and sex of the students to subcultural membership have generally supported our model. We turn next to a consideration of differences in the behavior, attitudes, and values of these subcultures within the academic milieu. If the model as set forth in Chapter IV is correct, such differences should obtain between the subcultures.

Hypothesis IV: Significant difference will exist between student subcultures in their academic performance. (As measured by grade-point average.)

Using the students actual cumulative grade-point average (G.P.A.) obtained from the University, as a measure of academic performance, an analysis of variance was performed, controlling for subcultural membership.[8] The results are shown in Table IV:

Table IV. Mean Cumulative Grade-Point Average of the Student Subcultures

	Subcultures				
	Academic Intellectual	Academic Conformist	Vocational	Collegiate	Total
G.P.A.	2.72	2.66	2.49	2.32	
N	193	384	280	106	963

$$F_{o(3,\infty)} = 26.10 > F_{t.05(3,\infty)} = 2.60$$

[8]H. Scheffe, The Analysis of Variance (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959), p. 362.

The results reported in Table IV allow acceptance of the hypothesis. Inspection of the data indicates that our expectations concerning the nature of such differences were correct. This analysis is particularly important in that the data used were objectively derived from an independent source and not from the subject. The confirmation of the hypothesized differences, it is believed by the writer, offers the strongest evidence of true differences between these groups.

There are several reasons, in addition to the rationale set forth in Chapter V, why such differences could obtain. As mentioned, the proportionately higher number of females in both the academic conformist and academic intellectual subculture undoubtedly contributed to the differences in grade-point average obtained. If this were solely the case, however, the academic conformist group should have the highest G.P.A., for it has the largest proportion of females.

Another possibility would be the type of majors predominant in the various subcultures. The existence of "hard" subjects as opposed to "easy" ones are well-known to both faculty and students. While we can only speculate, it is possible that vocational students may be primarily located in majors where grading is unusually hard, while the academic intellectuals thrive on courses where maintaining a high grade point average is relatively easy. Or, it may be that there are indeed differences in academic aptitude among these four groups.

All of these alternatives are possible, taken separately or in conjunction. Even so, as contributing factors to differences in academic performance, they are also contributing factors to the mode of student adjustment and subcultural choice. It is evident that future research on student subcultures must take such variables into account in the design of their study.

Hypothesis V: Significant differences will exist among the various subcultures in the proportion of students placing a high value on the fine arts.

Using the scores obtained on the Cultural Values Index, for purposes of analysis, the total group median score was used as an arbitrary midpoint to determine those who held a high or low value toward fine arts. Operationally, those subjects having scores on the index above the group median score were defined as placing a high value on the fine arts. Those subjects having a score less than the group median were defined as placing a low value on the fine arts. The results are reported in Table V.

Table V. Proportion of Students in Each Subculture Evidencing a High or Low Value of Fine Arts

Subculture	Value of Fine Arts		Total	N
	High	Low		
Academic Intellectual	71	29	100	(188)
Academic Conformist	59	41	100	(376)
Vocational	31	69	100	(277)
Collegiate	34	66	100	(108)
Range: 5-20				
Population Median: 14.55		$X^2 = 95.292$; $P < .05$		

The results obtained are significant and the hypothesis is accepted. Inspection of the nature of the differences indicate that in the manner expected, the academic intellectual is much more likely to place a high value on the fine arts. The academic conformist, while more likely to than not, falls considerably below the academic intellectual in the likelihood of holding the fine arts in high esteem. Both the collegiate

and the vocational subcultures have proportionately few individuals holding such values.

It was noted in the hypothesis rationale in Chapter V that the fine arts have been closely associated with the academic goal. The strong endorsement of them, therefore, by the academic intellectual subculture points to the appropriateness of the title for this group. More than this, however, it is strongly suggestive of the general orientation of all four subcultures. The pragmatic and practical value orientation of the vocational group is clearly evident, and closely followed by that of the collegiate subculture. The intermediate position of the academic conformist tends to support our view of this group as moderates, encompassing several goals as having value within the academic setting.

While it is impossible from these data to discern how much of this difference is due to academic influence, our previous finding of the nature of differences in social origins suggests that a fair amount may be attributed to academia. The relatively large proportion of lower status and rural students in the academic intellectual subculture points to the likelihood of a post-entrance development of this high valuation of the fine arts. The small proportion of collegiate students holding such values, in spite of their higher status and urban origins may be due to an alienation from the fine arts subsequent to college attendance. Logically, however, the lack of a high value seems to follow from our knowledge of the value orientation of upper middle class American business, where the emphasis tends to be upon the material, the profitable, and the practical.

Hypothesis VI: Significant differences will exist among the various subcultures in the proportion of students having a liberal attitude toward freedom of expression.

Using the subject's score on the Political Insecurity Index as indirect indication of the conservativeness or liberalness of the subject's political attitude toward freedom of expression, the total group median score was used as an arbitrary mid-point to differentiate those with liberal attitudes from those with conservative attitudes. Operationally, those students holding scores which exceeded the median score of the research population were defined as liberal. Those students whose scores were below the median score of the research population were operationally defined as conservative. Table VI shows the results obtained.

Table VI. Proportion of Students in Each Subculture Indicating a Liberal or Conservative Attitude Toward Freedom of Expression

	Attitude			
Subculture	Liberal	Conservative	Total	N
Academic Intellectual	65	35	100	(191)
Collegiate	51	49	100	(109)
Academic Conformist	49	51	100	(381)
Vocational	41	65	100	(282)
Range: 1-16				
Population Median: 11.11		$X^2 = 27.389$; $P < .05$		

The results indicated in the above table are significant and the hypothesis is accepted. Inspection of the nature of such differences only partially support our expectations, however. While it is patently clear that membership in the academic intellectual subculture is associated with a liberal political attitude, and vocational subculture membership is associated with a conservative political attitude, being

an academic conformist or a collegiate does not appear to be related to either. It is possible that the sheer act of situational conformity implies an inherently conservative approach to the political aspects of one's environment, even though the traditions of academia substantively are liberal in nature. On the other hand, the lack of differentiation between the proportion of academic conformist and collegiate subculture members who hold a conservative or liberal attitude, as measured here, suggests that similar social origins may be the significant element in this relationship.

Following the latter reasoning of similar social origins influencing one's political attitudes, it is particularly interesting to note that both the vocational and the academic intellectual subcultures have high proportions of students from lower status and rural origins; yet they are the two groups most divergent in proportions falling above or below the total group median score. The greater proportion of males in the vocational subculture could well contribute to this difference, at least for these two groups. Lehmann and Dressel's finding that males are more dogmatic and stereotypic in attitudes would support this explanation.[9] Why the same relationship does not hold for the academic conformist and collegiate groups, where similar sex differentials obtain, however, is unknown. We would speculate that while sex roles may well be operative in determining political attitudes for some segments of society, they may not be for other groups. Thus, it is possible that membership in rural and lower status segments of society is much more influential in shaping a relatively conservative political attitude for male college undergraduates than would be an urban, middle or upper status background. Indirect support for this reasoning is found in the study of Greenblum and Pearlin

---

[9]Lehmann and Dressel, op. cit., p. 28.

who report "that mobility, up or down, results in an increase of prejudice."[10] Recognizing that a prejudiced attitude usually is found with an attitude favoring restriction on freedom of expression, the mobility aspirations of these youth may be explanatory of such differences among the four groups. It is obvious however, that further research in this area is necessary for any corroboration of this reasoning.

Hypothesis VII: Significant differences will be found among the various subcultures in the proportion of students with different types of "career-plans" upon graduation.

The items used to test this hypothesis were taken from the Senior-Year Experience Inventory. To evaluate differences in the subjects immediate expectations upon graduation, the question was asked, "Regarding your immediate career plans upon graduation, which of the following is most likely to occur?" The alternatives were as follows: (a) Working full-time at a job which I expect to be my long-run career field, (b) Non-career military service, (c) Working full-time at a civilian job which will not be my career field, (d) Being a full-time housewife, (e) Begin graduate study in a professional field, (f) No idea, (g) Other (specify). Because of the strong influence of sex upon career expectations, the results for male and female are reported separately.

As a second dimension of career-plans, the subjects were asked; "the following activities cut across a number of specific jobs. Which one do you anticipate will be the most important part of your long-run career work?" The alternatives were: teaching, research, administration, service to patients and clients, none of these. The results

---

[10]Joseph Greenblum, and Leonard I. Pearlin, "Vertical Mobility and Prejudice: A Socio-Psychological Analysis," Class, Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification, R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, Editors (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953), pp. 480-491.

with sex of the subjects controlled, are shown in Table VIIb.

Table VII. a) Proportion of Students, by Sex, in Each Subculture Indicating Immediate Occupational Expectations Upon Graduation

Subculture	Occupational Expectations--Male: Career or Non-Career Job	Military Service	Graduate School	Other	Total N
Vocational	49	27	17	7	100 (199)
Collegiate	33	39	17	11	100 (72)
Academic Conformist	35	24	28	13	100 (184)
Academic Intellectual	31	24	34	11	100 (99)

$X^2 = 25.301$; $P < .05$

Subculture	Occupational Expectations--Female: Career of Non-Career Job	Housewife	Graduate School	Other	Total N
Vocational	70	3	5	22	100 (77)
Collegiate	78	0	3	19	100 (32)
Academic Conformist	66	5	12	17	100 (178)
Academic Intellectual	47	4	28	21	100 (85)

$X^2 = 26.356$; $P < .05$

Table VII. b) Proportion of Students in Each Subculture, by Sex, Indicating Expectations of Major Activities in Their Careers

Subculture	Teaching	Research	Administration	Service	Other	Total	N
Expectations--Male							
Academic Intellectual	29	18	25	22	6	100	(105)
Academic Conformist	14	13	40	20	13	100	(196)
Vocational	13	18	43	16	11	100	(202)
Collegiate	6	8	57	18	12	100	(72)
$X^2 = 38.305$; $P < .05$							
Expectations--Female							
Academic Intellectual	41	18	5	16	20	100	(88)
Academic Conformist	55	7	10	18	10	100	(191)
Vocational	57	10	14	16	3	100	(81)
Collegiate	62	5	11	17	5	100	(37)
$X^2 = 20.794$; N.S.							

For both males and females, with one exception, significant differences exist. Hypothesis VII, therefore, is accepted.

Considering only the males, much as anticipated, the vocational students are most likely to expect to embark upon a career (only 3 per cent indicated non-career), while the academic intellectual was most likely to anticipate graduate school.

While the results follow in the manner anticipated, are their other explanations possible? The subject field of the student is one possibility. Looking at Table VIIb for males gives us an indirect indication of what the major may be. If we assume, for males, that teaching, or research require graduate training, then we find 47 per cent of the academic intellectual group indicating that this is the type of work which they expect will constitute a major portion of their careers. In contrast, only 32 per cent of the vocationals, 27 per cent of the academic conformist, and 14 per cent of the collegiate males respond in this fashion. Knowledge of the different requirements in the various departments lead us to infer that most likely these expectations are associated with the humanities, the social sciences and natural science. If this is correct then the differences between expectations or non-expectations of graduate school among the various subcultures is in part a function of the subject's major. This interpretation is further supported when alternative proportions are considered in these data. The collegiate and vocational males, who appear to have the least propensity for graduate school are the most likely to view administrative work as constituting the major proportion of their future careers. Business, Education, Agriculture and Engineering seem most closely related to such expectations for males.

The fact that 40 per cent of the academic conformists considers themselves as future administrators, while only 27 per cent see teaching or research in their future suggests the possible consequences of a "well-rounded" approach to education. When we consider that 28 per cent, second only to the proportion of academic intellectuals, expects to attend graduate school we may speculate that a fair number of those seeking advanced education have a very "applied" view of its purpose, i.e., education majors who hope to become principals, engineers desiring management positions, and so forth. How much of this

speculation is valid, however, remains to be established by future research. The present findings do suggest that the student's major may well predict his subculture within certain limits of probability. The importance of this point will be made clear in the subsequent findings to be reported on attitude and value change.

Turning to the data on female career expectations we find the differences far more accentuated between the proportions in each group viewing a career versus graduate school as part of their future. It is only among the academic intellectual females that a significant percentage expects to go on to the graduate level.

It is apparent that in all cases but the latter one, the vast majority of females in this population view a career as most likely. This is particularly interesting when the proportions expecting to be housewives are considered. We would suspect that since the item dealt with immediate expectations, many of the females responding "career" had little intention of remaining in a position for an extended period. This explanation is only partially supported by the data on females in Table VIIb. While the proportions drop, they do not do so to the extent expected if most female respondents were planning marriage.

A second possibility is that most college females who remain four years in a university and subsequently graduate, plan to combine marriage and a career. The high percentage expecting to teach in Table VIIb, where such an arrangement is both feasible and commonly done, suggests the validity of this latter interpretation.

A particularly interesting point from these data centers around the high proportion of collegiate females planning to teach. As one of the few professional occupations that is dominated by females, we had anticipated most females to reply on the teaching alternative. Why the collegiate should be the most likely, however, is not clear. It is possible that those who have survived through college in this subculture

are atypical of females in this group, in that the rigors of an active social life rapidly deplete the ranks. On the other hand, teaching as a major has never been considered as a "hard" subject by college students. Given what we know of the academic performance and behavior of these groups, the overwhelming selection of teaching by the collegiate females as a future career seems most logical. If this be true, the selection and training of teachers may well be more happenstance than most educators would like to admit.

The preceding four hypotheses have dealt with differences in behavior, attitudes, and values among the four subcultures. The results, while not always dramatic, supported the hypotheses. Further, and of equal importance, the nature of the differences between subcultures was generally as anticipated. Such differences, taken in total, consistently point to different normative patterns operating within the context of the broader academic culture. This is not to suggest that differences necessarily exceed similarities in the final analysis, but rather that such differences do influence attitudes, values, and behavior, and are worthy therefore of our attention.[11]

The final series of hypotheses are concerned with the manner in which such subcultural differences are reflected in the differential rate of change in attitudes and values among the student body.

Hypothesis VIII: Significant differences in the proportion of students indicating a change in their student self concept will be found among the various subcultures.

Drawing from the responses to the item in the Senior-Year Experience Inventory which asked the student to identify which subcultural paragraph was most nearly descriptive of himself as a

---

[11]A similar point is made by Gottlieb and Reeves in discussing the utility of the concept of "adolescent subculture." See, David Gottlieb and Jon Reeves, Adolescent Behavior in Urban Areas: A Bibliographic Review and Discussion of the Literature (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963), Chapter II.

freshman, the responses were used as one indication of the student self concept. By controlling on their response to the preceding item, which allowed us to type the students as members of one of the four subcultures, a measure of the number of students in each group who changed their self concept was obtained. The results are given in Table VIII.

Table VIII. Proportion of Students in Each Subculture Indicating a Change in Their Student Self-Concept

Subculture	Student Self-Concept		Total	N
	Change	No Change		
Academic Intellectual	65	35	100	(193)
Academic Conformist	70	30	100	(385)
Collegiate	64	36	100	(109)
Vocational	45	55	100	(284)
		$X^2 = 45.446$; $P < .05$		

The differences obtained are significant and the hypothesis is accepted. Considering the nature of these differences, it can be seen that, as anticipated, the academic conformist subculture had the highest proportion of students reporting a change. In contrast and in keeping with previously stated expectations, the vocational subculture evidenced the least proportion of such change.

While these changes have been explained in terms of the nature of the particular college community considered and the manner of student adjustment, it may be that the change or lack of it in self concept is a function of the individual's exposure to the faculty or to the content of his major, which are particular segments of the total

community environment. Certainly, if educational goals maintained by some of the students are reinforced by the type of information and emotional support received from their department and faculty, little predilection for change in one's self image is likely. In the same manner, information learned and faculty encouragement of change may be instrumental in affecting it.

It is possible, also, that students enter college with such an ill-defined student self image, that for many the gradual emergence of a more clearly defined role constitutes a major change. The failure of the majority of vocational students to report a change in their self concept, therefore, may be explained in terms of their relatively narrow but clearly defined view of higher education as a method of gaining higher occupational status in society.

It is of interest to note that virtually the same proportion of students reported change in both the academic intellectual and collegiate subcultures. While the relatively high proportion was anticipated from the academic intellectual subculture, it was not from the collegiate. One may speculate that such similarity may be due to the secondary nature of the academic and social goals on this particular campus, both exerting about the same pressures on the students with about the same amount of success. On the other hand, these particular subcultures may be residual groupings of students who, because of their particular social origins, find this manner of adjustment to the academic climate most suitable. Our earlier findings suggest that this latter explanation may be more tenable.

Hypothesis IX: Significant differences in the proportion of students indicating a more favorable or unfavorable attitude toward classroom attendance for the purpose of learning will be found among the various subcultures,

Data to test this hypothesis were taken from the subject's response in the Senior-Year Experience Inventory to a series of questions dealing with the influence of college upon various attitudes and beliefs. The specific question was "dependence on class attendance for learning." The alternative answers were (a) more (i.e., I tend to possess more of this quality), (b) less (I tend to possess less of this quality), (c) same (I an not conscious of any change).

Table IX. Proportion of Students in Each Subculture Indicating A Change in Attitude on Class Attendance for Learning

	Necessity of Class Attendance for Learning				
Subculture	More Necessary	Less Necessary	No Change	Total	N
Vocational	33	35	32	100	(282)
Academic Conformist	26	42	32	100	(383)
Academic Intellectual	24	45	31	100	(192)
Collegiate	24	49	27	100	(109)
		$X^2 = 10.111$; $P < .05$			

The results obtained are significant and the hypothesis is accepted. Much as anticipated, the vocational students were the most likely to view classroom attendance as "more necessary." Our anticipations, however, were not met for the collegiate group. While it was expected that this group would view classroom learning much in the manner of their vocational counterparts, the tendency is in the opposite direction. It would appear that giving primacy to the social goal tends to militate against a perception of formal learning in the classroom as necessary.

This explanation would be consistent with our previously described view of this student as perceiving college as a place primarily of personal and social development and not of learning in the traditional sense.

While the difference between the academic conformist subculture and the academic intellectual subculture is slight, they are as anticipated. It would seem, however, that both groups tend to perceive college as a total learning experience. Although our data do not indicate it, we would speculate that the reasons why these latter two subcultures tend to perceive of the classroom as less necessary for learning are different from the reasons behind the tendency of the collegiate group for responding similarly. With the academic groups, we believe, it is more of a recognition of the several sources available for learning. With the collegiate group, however, the same tendency is more of a reflection of the student's concern with social development. That dissimilar values in one area lead to similar attitudes in another is well-known. While we believe that such is the case in this instance, further research is necessary to confirm it.

Over all, the tendency in all four groups is toward a reduction in perception of the classroom as necessary for learning. One of the most interesting points in this table, however, is the fact that over one-quarter of the students report that they feel that classroom attendance is more necessary for learning now than when they were freshmen. While this would be undoubtedly pleasing to many members of the faculty, it does raise a question as to whether or not the general picture of the senior as "academically sophisticated" is as applicable as is generally believed. One may argue, of course, that sophistication in higher education has little to do with one's view of classroom attendance. On the other hand, the argument can be made that as a result of four years of college, seniors should have developed a more mature, broader sense of the function of the classroom in the learning process and

become less dependent upon it as the basis for learning. If we combine those subjects who responded "more necessary" and those who responded "no change," we find that in all subcultures better than one-half of the students did not develop this independence of the classroom. Whether this is desirable depends upon one's view of education. There seems little question, however, that for many students the classroom is still the locus of their academic endeavors.

Hypothesis X: Significant differences in the proportion of students indicating a weaker or stronger attitude of commitment toward religion will be found among the various subcultures.

Data to test this hypothesis were taken from the subjects responses in the Senior-Year Experience Inventory to a series of questions dealing with the influence of college upon various attitudes, and beliefs. The specific questions used here were "Feeling of the necessity for religious faith for living in modern times," and "Commitment to a set of religious beliefs." The alternative answers to these questions were (a) More (i.e., I tend to possess more of this quality), (b) Less (i.e., I tend to possess less of this quality), (c) Same (i.e., I am not conscious of any change).

The results obtained as shown in Table Xa and Xb are significant and the hypothesis is accepted. Inspection of the data in Table Xa on the following page indicates that the tendency among these subjects is toward a change in commitment to religious beliefs. And, further, that this tendency is toward becoming less committed. It is of interest to note that the collegiate subculture is second only to the academic intellectual group in this regard. It would seem that, while they are the least likely to change their commitment, when they do, it is generally away from religious beliefs. This is even more pronounced than among the academic intellectuals who are more likely to change, but evidence a fair probability of becoming more committed.

Table X. a) Proportion of Students in Each Subculture Indicating a Shift in Commitment to Religious Beliefs

Subculture	Commitment to Religious Beliefs: Less	More	No Change	Total	N
Academic Intellectual	41	21	38	100	(192)
Academic Conformist	32	25	43	100	(383)
Vocational	30	21	49	100	(283)
Collegiate	36	14	50	100	(108)

$X^2 = 12.642$; $P < .05$

b) Proportion of Students in Each Subculture Indicating a Shift in Attitude Toward the Necessity of Religious Faith

Subculture	The Necessity of Religious Faith: Less	More	No Change	Total	N
Academic Intellectual	37	32	31	100	(192)
Academic Conformist	23	38	39	100	(383)
Vocational	24	36	40	100	(283)
Collegiate	24	32	44	100	(108)

$X^2 = 14.771$; $P < .05$

Of interest, also, when the proportions in Table Xa are compared with the proportions in Xb, it appears that many students are saying that while they are less committed, they are more aware of the necessity for religion. This suggests that many of these subjects would desire commitment themselves, even though their college experience has militated against it. For those students, Erich Fromm's thesis may have real importance.[12]

It is Fromm's thesis that modern man has escaped, to a large extent, the ideological and psychological bonds of earlier societies. In doing so, while it has brought him independence and rationality, it has cost him psychological security. This isolation has led him to a loss of self identity, but a desire to belong in order to regain some measure of that security. In the case of our subjects, who apparently have less commitment but increased recognition of the need for religion, it is possible that having lost their religious identity, they perceive of a need for such affiliation not yet found.

While the academic intellectual subculture evidenced the most change, as was expected, it differed appreciably from the academic conformist group. This is particularly evident in Table Xb, where the academic conformist proportion who saw "more necessity for religious faith" was the highest proportion among the four subcultures. In contrast, the academic intellectual subculture had the highest proportion, feeling religious faith was less necessary. While it appears that such a result does not support our theory of the commitment to the academic goal on the part of both of these subcultures, it is possible that the manner of adjustment to academia by the academic conformist is indicative of a latent personality structure which predisposes the individual to accept the validity of existing social systems.[13]

---

[12]C. F. Erich Fromm, Escape From Freedom (New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1941).

[13]Ash, loc. cit.

In other words, conformity may be a dominant personality trait in the life-style of many of these individuals, regardless of the situation considered. This, of course, is speculation but it does suggest paths that future research in this area might follow.

Hypothesis XI: Significant differences in the proportion of students indicating a change in their political attitudes will be found among the various subcultures.

The item responses analyzed were taken from the Senior-Year Experience Inventory. The question asked was--"Since you have entered college, how have your political views changed?" The alternatives were: (a) From liberal to more conservative; (b) From conservative to more liberal; (c) From liberal to more liberal; (d) From conservative to more conservative; (e) Not at all. For purposes of analysis, responses to alternatives a and d were combined, and b and c. The results are presented in Table XI.

Table XI. Proportion of Students in Each Subculture Indicating a Change in Their Political Attitudes

	Political Attitudes				
Subculture	More Conservative	More Liberal	No Change	Total	N
Academic Intellectual	11	71	18	100	(187)
Academic Conformist	16	57	27	100	(375)
Vocational	14	50	36	100	(278)
Collegiate	15	49	36	100	(109)

$X^2 = 28.123$; $P < .05$

The data in Table XI confirm the existence of significant differences and the hypothesis is accepted. By inspection, we see that the general tendency is to change and in the liberal direction. What is of particular importance here, however, is the differential proportions. As anticipated, membership in either the academic intellectual or academic conformist subcultures increases the likelihood of change. Particularly in the academic intellectual group is such the case.

Considering these results against those reported by Newcomb, Jacob, and Goldsen et al., the significance of subcultural differences becomes apparent. In spite of the "vocational" nature of the environment, changes in political attitude are apparently occurring at least as indicated by the subjects themselves. The fact that a significant proportion, particularly in the collegiate and vocational subcultures, reported no change and a smaller percentage report becoming more conservative, lends credence to the general validity of the responses. Political liberalness, long associated with higher education in this society, appears to influence students, even in a large state supported institution.

If our explanatory model is correct, the differential rates of change among these four groups reflect their susceptibility to those phases of the college community associated with the academic goal. It is possible, of course, that even though a more liberal trend exists, it is liberal only relative to a highly conservative background. Comparative studies are needed to evaluate this possibility. The earlier findings reported on the liberal or conservative attitude toward freedom of expression, however, suggest that this is not the case. While the total median score on the Index used in that analysis was slightly on the conservative side of the continuum, it did not appear to be significantly so.

Hypothesis XII: Significant differences in the proportion of students indicating a change in the nature of their attitudes toward their own future and the future of society generally will be found among the various subcultures.

While there are several ways in which this attitudinal dimension may be tapped, in this instance responses on two items in the Senior-Year Experience Inventory were employed. The students were asked whether as a result of their college experience, they possessed more, less, or the same feeling about an "Optimistic outlook for my future" and an "Optimistic outlook for the future of civilization." Their responses to these items were considered as an indirect indication of their more general attitude about their own future and the future of society. Table XII on the following page indicates the results obtained.

The differences obtained, in both cases, were significant and the hypothesis is accepted. Inspection of the data, however, shows that our expectations as to the nature of such differences are only partially supported. While the academic intellectual group changed their own attitudes in the manner anticipated, i.e., being relatively more likely to view their own future and society's generally in a less "optimistic" fashion, the academic conformist group went in the opposite direction, i.e., proportionately more optimistic. One explanation for this difference may be that once having conformed, the latter group is, in a sense, "better adjusted" to their environment and more favorably disposed toward its future. On the other hand, this may indicate a confidence on the part of the academic conformist in his own ability to "fit in" to any type of situation. The significant drop in optimism when considering society's future by this group suggests that this may be the case.

While the differences are slight, the greater tendency for members of the vocational and collegiate groups not to change in their appraisal of society's future is in line with our stated expectations. This same

Table XII. Proportion of Students in Each Subculture Indicating a Change in Attitude Toward Their Own Future and That of Society

	Attitude Toward Own Future				
Subculture	More Optimistic	Less Optimistic	No Change	Total	N
Academic Conformist	73	6	21	100	(386)
Collegiate	65	10	25	100	(108)
Vocational	61	11	28	100	(283)
Academic Intellectual	58	15	27	100	(192)

$X^2 = 19.558$; $P < .05$

	Attitude Toward Future of Society				
Subculture	More Optimistic	Less Optimistic	No Change	Total	N
Academic Conformist	47	24	29	100	(382)
Vocational	43	18	39	100	(283)
Collegiate	38	20	42	100	(108)
Academic Intellectual	36	34	30	100	(191)

$X^2 = 16.770$; $P < .05$

tendency, however, does not hold in terms of their attitudes about their own future. It had been expected that, if they should change, it would be in a more positive direction and this tendency is present. But the proportion indicating no change is little different from the academic intellectual group. This suggests that changes in this area dealing with one's life chances are reasonably uniform, regardless of subcultural membership, but the direction of such change is influenced, to an extent, by that membership.

The dynamics which determine one's attitude toward his own future, however, apparently are considerably different than those which determine one's attitude toward society's future. Here, it would seem the commitment to the academic goal becomes more meaningful, as evidenced by the lower proportions in the academic intellectual and academic conformist groups indicating no change, as well as the higher proportions holding a less optimistic view than their opposites in the vocational or collegiate subculture.

Hypothesis XIII: Significant differences in the proportion of students who indicate a change in attitude toward authority will be found among the various subcultures.

Several dimensions of a subject's attitude toward authority may be considered in a discussion of possible change. In this instance, consideration is restricted to change in attitude toward (a) rules and regulations and (b) persons in authority. Using responses in the Senior-Year Experience Inventory to questions as to whether, from their college experience, they felt their "respect for rules and regulations" and "respect for persons in positions of authority" had become more, less or remained unchanged, the following results were obtained.

Table XIII. Proportion of Students in Each Subculture Indicating a Change in Their Attitude Toward Authority

Subculture	Rules and Regulations: More	Less	Same	Total	N
Academic Intellectual	19	34	47	100	(192)
Academic Conformist	27	24	49	100	(383)
Vocational	26	19	55	100	(283)
Collegiate	21	25	56	100	(109)

$X^2 = 16.668$; $P < .05$

Subculture	Persons in Authority: More	Less	Same	Total	N
Academic Intellectual	22	28	50	100	(192)
Academic Conformist	31	14	55	100	(382)
Vocational	31	12	57	100	(283)
Collegiate	27	15	58	100	(109)

$X^2 = 25.550$; $P < .05$

The above results are significant and the hypothesis is accepted. Inspection of the nature of those differences show that generally they were in the manner anticipated. Thus, the largest proportion of students indicating a change is found in the academic intellectual subculture. The lowest proportion is in the collegiate and vocational subcultures.

An interesting point here is that the academic conformist tends to have more respect for persons in authority after four years than less respect. Such differences, from the academic intellectual, supports the idea that the "well rounded" approach to education, as the dominant ethos, indeed attracts a basically conforming type of individual.

The lower proportions found in the collegiate and vocational subcultures who report change supports the notion of a very limited commitment to the system as such, and, accordingly, a lesser probability of being influenced by it.

To summarize this section of Chapter VI, it may be said that in those areas considered, significant differences in the proportion of students in the four student subcultures were obtained on: social origins, attitudes, values, behavior, and proportions evidencing attitude and value change. With one exception, all such differences met or exceeded the .05 level of statistical significance. Let us turn now to a consideration of the general hypotheses, given this information.

It will be remembered in our discussion in Chapter I it was pointed out that the crux of studying the influence of higher education upon student attitudes and values lay in the development of an adequate theoretical framework. Chapter IV was devoted to the development of this framework, and hypotheses I through VIII were directed toward the confirmation of its validity as a significant tool in differentiating values, attitudes and behavior within a specified student body. The confirmation of these hypotheses, in all cases but one, furnishes us with sufficient indirect evidence for the acceptance of the first general hypothesis. Beyond this, however, their general confirmation set the stage upon which the results obtained for the hypotheses VIII through XIII could be evaluated in terms of the acceptance of the second general

hypothesis. Confirmation of these latter hypotheses allows, we believe, an adequate basis for acceptance of the second general hypothesis.

As our original thesis, we had maintained that the nature of the impact of higher education upon student attitudes and values was dependent upon the nature of the college community and the orientations found within the student bodies. To maintain that one or the other was responsible, or that all were the same, ignored the realities of higher education in modern society. Further, and not in contradiction, it was pointed out that commonalities were present within this same diversity, which allowed an evaluation of the influence of higher education on attitudes and values, if the diversities were recognized and controlled for. Our results in utilizing this approach are, we believe, both encouraging and challenging.

Using a student group from one college community we have been able to demonstrate that membership in one of the four subcultures identified does appear to be associated with differences in attitudes and values on such substantive matters as the fine arts, political beliefs, and occupational expectations, as well as on academic performance. In addition, and perhaps more important in the final analysis, an explanatory model was developed by which attitude and value change to a limited extent could be predicted. Although the techniques were methodologically crude, significant differences were consistently found among the four groups in the proportions reporting such change.

In evaluating the importance of these findings, however, the preliminary nature of the study must be kept in mind. Taking a theoretical concept, upon which much has been written, but little research accomplished, an explanatory model was developed for the purpose of gaining a better understanding into the socialization process of college students, in terms of the influence of higher education upon their attitudes and values. From this model, and knowledge of research in related

areas, hypotheses were developed on the nature of differences among the four subcultures on attitudes, values, and behavior, as well as the probability of change in attitudes and values during the course of the subject's academic career. The evidence obtained, we believe, offers reasonable support for both the basic soundness of the model and its ability to predict the influence of higher education in effecting changes in attitudes and values among college students. While the results are strongly suggestive, further research and development of the model are definitely required.

The acceptance of the general hypotheses should not be construed as an unqualified acceptance. Limitations of methodology, analysis and theory are readily acknowledged, and will be considered in the following Chapter. It is readily admitted, also, that the suggestiveness of the results obtained rest, in part, upon our a-priori explanatory framework as developed. As Sanford has mentioned,[14] however, the lack of such a framework has led to a failure of many earlier efforts in this area. It is possible that other rationales could be used to explain the differences obtained. Indeed, alternative suggestions were made at several points in this study. The point to be made is that this study furnishes a bench mark against which other theories and techniques may be compared. Such a bench mark, combining both theory and research, has been lacking on studies dealing with the influence of higher education on college student's attitudes and values.

---

[14]Nevitt Sanford, "Epilogue," op. cit.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Basic to an understanding of the influence of higher education upon college student attitudes and values, is the necessity of considering the complex nature of contemporary higher education and the diverse social origins of the college student bodies. Recognizing this, an explanatory theoretical model dealing with these dimensions was constructed. Three primary educational goals were identified as important to both higher education and the student body. These goals, the academic, vocational, and social were described as varying from school to school in terms of their relative emphasis, dependent upon the nature of the social pressures exerted upon a particular school. Within the student body, the variation in goal emphasis was attributed to the varying social origins of the student body.

The dynamics of interaction between the college community and the student were explained within the context of the organizational character of contemporary higher education and the personal need of the student for self consistency. Specifically, it was argued the very size and complexity of higher education precluded the requirement for a high degree of commitment on the part of the student to the academic milieu, thereby allowing considerable variation in the nature of the student bodies' commitment to it. This variation arose in large part from the discrepancy between the student's perception of what the purpose of higher education was, and that espoused by the college community, which led to a need for some adjustment in terms of a more consistent self image on the part of the student. This "strain for

consistency" was closely related to the student's view of the primary goal of higher education. It is within this framework that the emergence of subcultures are discussed.

Following Festinger, and utilizing the primary educational goals identified as the basis for differentiation, four distinctive subcultures were delineated, based upon the mode of adjustment of the student. These were--the vocational, the collegiate, the academic intellectual, and the academic conformist. Only in the latter instance, it was theorized, did the college student accept the total orientation of the college community, thus acknowledging the relative importance of all goals. Each of the other emergent subcultures tended, as a group, to emphasize one of the three goals to the relative exclusion of the other two. These subcultures were defined as normative systems, characterized by a particular ideology toward higher education, which attuned them to those dimensions of academic life relevant to their perceived educational goal or goals. Individuals within these various groups were sustained and, in a sense, controlled by peers, family and faculty sharing the same view of higher education. Accordingly, the influence various aspects of academic life had upon them was either restricted or enhanced insofar as possible changes in attitudes or values.

To test the general hypotheses regarding the relationship of social origins to subcultural membership and, in turn, the relation of subcultural membership to changes in attitudes and values, a preliminary analysis was performed. Using a research population of 977 college seniors at a large mid-western university, paper and pencil items were administered to obtain data on the subjects social origins, academic performance, and attitudes and values. The population used constituted 66 per cent of those remaining in college of an original freshman class after four years. As part of a larger study, data were available in some areas for these subjects from their freshman year in college.

Using pre-tested descriptive statements of attitudes and behavior typical of students in each of the four subcultures, the subjects identified themselves as belonging to one of the four subcultures specified. For the subsequent analysis this data was used in comparing subcultures in terms of hypothesized differences.

To establish the validity of the general hypotheses, thirteen specific hypotheses dealing with differences in social origin, attitudes and values, academic performance, and changing attitudes and values were stated. These hypotheses were derived from the explanatory model and knowledge of previous research findings in related areas.

With one exception, the specific hypothesis were supported. Based upon these findings, it was stated, the general hypotheses too could be accepted. Therefore, for the research population studied, a significant relationship is said to exist between social origin, subcultural membership and the influence of higher education upon student's attitudes and values.

Limitations of the Study

Before making conclusions, based upon the analysis contained herein, specific limitations, suggested or implied in the preceding pages must be made explicit. The following appear most significant.

1. The instruments used in this analysis may or may not be measuring with an adequate degree of sensitivity the variables considered. The descriptive statements used for subculture identification are admittedly crude, from a methodological standpoint. While pre-tests point to a reasonable degree of validity, evidence of reliability is lacking. So, also, for the indices used. Having face and construct validity, reliability and predictive validity are absent. Finally, in all cases but that dealing with grade point average, the data used was self-reported. As such, its accuracy is impossible to evaluate. Any appraisal of the results obtained must be made with these facts in mind.

2. The nature of the population used in this study restricts our conclusions to that population. Ideally, either the sample should have been random or all seniors at this particular school should have been included in the analysis. Even if this were possible, however, the conclusions drawn would be limited to the type of university setting and student body found at the school studied. Our conclusions, therefore, must be tentative in nature.

3. Lack of stringent controls on such factors as the subjects major, religious background, geographic origins, and intelligence, make any conclusions drawn from this study tentative as well. Such controls would have allowed much more definite conclusions to be drawn. Unfortunately, as only part of a larger study, access to most of this information was not available.

These limitations, while not entirely restrictive, do point to the weaknesses inherent in the studies design and emphasize the need for developing a more systematic and effective methodology in this area.

Conclusions

Within the theoretical framework and limitations described, several conclusions may be reasonably drawn from the findings reported in this study. These are as follows.

1. While evidence was presented supporting the existence of subcultures within the student body, such evidence is indirect. Still it is meaningful that differences in attitudes, values and behavior, among the four groups so identified, were consistently significant. The idea that the differential impact of higher education upon student's attitudes and values may be studied employing such an explanatory model, regardless of the previously stated limitations, seems strongly supported. Obviously, further research of both a methodological and

substantive nature is required. As a first attempt, however, the results are positive and highly encouraging.

2. The impact of higher education upon student attitudes and values, as theorized, varies significantly. One of the most important considerations highlighted by these findings is the relationship of social origins to such variation. It is apparent that such a relationship is not of a one-to-one nature. Being of lower status does not necessarily minimize the influence of higher education, as evidenced by the change found among the academic intellectual group who came proportionately more from lower social status than from higher social status backgrounds. What appears to be important, in the case of social origins, is the probability of perceiving higher education in a particular fashion and adjusting to it in a special manner. Being from lower social status, rural origins and a male, it would appear, lessens the probability of higher education having much influence upon one's attitudes and values in certain areas. But, given the acceptance of what we have defined as the traditional academic goal as appropriate, individuals from these same origins seem most likely to change. So, also, individuals from higher status, urban backgrounds and of the female sex seem most likely to accept the broad goal orientation of the college community as appropriate. Having done so, however, does not apparently enhance, to a marked extent, the influence of higher education upon their attitudes and values in many areas.

The key to this anomaly, we would suggest, lies in the distinction made earlier on the type of socialization being discussed. What Becker et al., have described as situationally relevant values[1] are more readily adopted by the students from higher social status, urban origins and of the female sex. In the very act of doing so, however, the

---

[1]Becker, loc. cit.

situational conformity obtained appears to reduce the total possible impact of higher education. Such a situationally relevant adjustment to the academic milieu, while insuring the control of the formal organization over student behavior, may actually hinder the attainment of goals held up as meaningful by that organization for the student. As interpreted here, this situational conformity alleviates the necessity to consider in depth the true significance of such phrases as "intellectual maturity," "creativity," "a broad general knowledge," or "social maturity." Further, by conforming to this broad orientation, the student plays a very active role in campus life which precludes, in many instances, the possibility of even having time to consider the importance of these phrases. Thus, while social origins play a significant role in determining the impact of higher education upon a student's attitudes and values, this role is perhaps more indirect than frequently described. While it is important in determining how higher education is perceived, it is equally if not more important in determining how the student will adjust to the situation. It is this adjustment which seems instrumental, in large measure, to determining the extent of influence successfully exerted.

3. Given a different perception of what goal is appropriate for higher education, the influence of higher education varies in different substantive areas. Thus, the self concept of vocationally oriented students attending a highly vocational school, tends not to change. Their attitudes toward education, on the other hand, was much more likely to change. The academic intellectual group in comparison tended to change both their self concept and their attitude toward education. Further, the directional tendency of such changes was different for the subcultures identified. Being in the academic intellectual subculture, for example, apparently increases the probability of changing one's attitude toward authority and in a less respectful

direction. Vocational membership, on the other hand, apparently lessens the probability of change, but when it does occur it tends to be in the direction of more respect.

These phenomena are more impressive when it is remembered that these students shared the same college community, ostensibly exposed to the same college experiences. We conclude from this that one's "definition of the situation" in terms of his goal orientation not only contributes to his susceptibility to influence, but the consequence of that influence, given a change resulting from it.

4. An allegation frequently made about large state universities is their lack of ability to influence student attitudes and values. This is often attributed to their extreme "vocational orientation" which trains but does not educate. The description is frequently used in contrasting such schools to the "high quality" academic institutions in the East or far West. The allegation does, it would seem from our data, have more than a grain of truth to it. Like most simplified views, however, it glosses over the complexity of the situation. At least for the population studied, education, as evidenced by changes in attitudes and values does occur for a significant proportion of the subjects studied. While unfortunately, our data do not indicate how these subjects varied in their attitudes and opinions prior to college attendance, it does indicate that changes do occur once college is attained for a significant number. It is concluded, therefore, that significant changes in attitudes and values do occur for a substantial number of students in a large, vocationally oriented university.

The general conclusion reached for our study, then, is that higher education does significantly influence student attitudes and values. Concluding this, however, does not permit us to exclude the qualifications which, of necessity, must be recognized. Specifically, higher education influences students differently, dependent upon their perception

of, and adjustment to the perceived academic climate in which they exist. Further, it does not influence attitudes and values uniformly in all areas. The nature of the particular formal system and the diverse social origins of the students contributes to a relative influence being exerted--strong in some areas and on some students, weak or non-existent in other areas and on other students. The final conclusion is, therefore, that the influence of higher education upon attitudes and values is real, but shaped in terms of the particular institution and segment of the student body considered.

Implications for Future Research

In the final analysis one of the most significant contributions of this study, we believe, rests in its implications for future research. While the limitations of the study preclude generalizations to a larger population, the findings are indeed suggestive for future research in this area. Some of the more cogent implications are as follows.

1. As a first attempt to develop and operationalize an explanatory model in this area, we believe this study has made a significant contribution. It remains, however, a first attempt. Both in terms of its theoretical framework and methodologically, the model needs development. Methodologically, the descriptive statements used can only be considered a crude device to distinguish the various student types. While promising, more intensive development is needed. Factor analytic methods seem most promising in this regard. Theoretically, such variables as the effect of differences in intelligence, personality characteristics, and particular aptitudes have not been considered, nor has the influence of the student's major in college. Particularly in this latter instance we anticipate that significant consequences would ensue. While, unfortunately, data on the subject's college major was not available, it is reasonable to expect

that such an element determines to some extent the perception of higher education by the student. Thus, the comparatively narrow training received by engineering students would tend to support or engender a vocational emphasis not similarly supported by the nature of the requirements for an English literature major. The extent of such pressure, acting as a catalyst or suppressor to attitude and value change, is unknown.

2. The differences in the proportion of students evidencing change in the academic intellectual and vocational subcultures, both of which contain a sizable segment of lower status and rural students, suggests that insufficient information is known about the effects of social origin upon the student's performance in higher education. While it is generally assumed that lower status and rural individuals attend college strictly for vocational rewards, our data suggests that this is not necessarily true for a sizable percentage of them. And, further, while the effects of higher education appear to be minimized when these students do emphasize the vocational goal, an emphasis on the academic goal by students from the same origins leads to significant shifts in attitude and value. The importance of a study on the influence of such factors becomes even more meaningful with current forecasts of up to 47 per cent of future male high school graduates and 34 per cent of female high school graduates attending college.[2] The observation that social origins not only influence the perception of higher educations goal, but the manner in which a student adjusts to the institution itself is a problem not yet considered in the current literature.

3. The influence of the student's self-concept upon his performance is suggested by the manner in which the various subcultures varied

---

[2]Robert J. Havighurst, American Higher Education in the 1960's (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1960), pp. 62-64.

in their G.P.A. As an indirect indication of how students perceived themselves as students, the statements described earlier offer a reasonable suggestion of the nature of this relationship. If a student views the academic environment as an end in itself, he will tend to view himself as one who fills the expectations of that environment, in terms of his perception of himself as sharing the values, attitudes, and behaviors deemed appropriate. If, on the other hand, his view of higher education is more instrumental, his self-concept in the student role emerges as one in which attitudes and behavior relative to his goal attainment within the academic situation are much more narrow in scope. Once established, such a self-concept legitimatizes behavior consistent with it and influences his academic performance accordingly.

While such a relationship seems tenable, based upon the results of this study, research is needed to verify it. It is apparent that the greater percentage of students change their self-concept in the course of four years. The specific factors contributing to this change are unknown.

4. While the findings can be considered only suggestive, their implications for research dealing with college student admittance and drop outs is significant. For they suggest that it is as much the type of student admitted as the nature of the school itself which determine the extent of higher education's influence. What is suggested is not simply that the academically "brighter" type of student is more likely to benefit. This idea has formed the basis of most contemporary scholarship programs. But rather by "type" is meant that students may be identified on the basis of their perception of the purpose of higher education, which in turn is instrumental in their subsequent response to it. Motivation is frequently considered a primary factor for success in college. Our data suggest this consideration should be modified to include motivation for what--vocational, academic or social factors?

It is possible, given the differential emphasis upon one of the three primary goals discussed, that a student's success, or lack of it at a given college or university is due more to his compatibility or incompatibility of goal orientation than his aptitude (or lack of it). What is needed, by way of future research, are studies of both admittance and dropouts at several institutions, identified in advance as emphasizing one or the other of the educational goals. By determining, initially, the student's perception of the goals of higher education, and subsequently, their adjustment or lack of adjustment to it, a measure of its effect upon student success could be obtained.

5. Related to the above, but from the perspective of the organization, is the effect of the size and complexity of the particular school in influencing student attitudes and opinions. While the explanatory model, as developed, seems reasonably appropriate for large scale universities or colleges, would it be so for smaller schools, or for schools catering to a more homogeneous student body, socially or academically? It is possible that the reputed success of the smaller school in influencing changes in attitudes and values is a function of its selectivity. Or it may be simply a function of size and heavy emphasis upon one goal. Our findings suggest that while both contribute, the latter consideration could be the more important. The academic goal, if emphasized primarily, would enhance the probability of bringing about changes not only among the academic intellectual group at that school, but among the conformists as well. Newcomb's study of Bennington College, where such an emphasis was presented by the formal system, lends support to this interpretation.[3] No research following up Newcomb's findings relative to this point has been accomplished, however, These findings suggest, strongly, the necessity for it.

---

[3]Newcomb, Social Change and Personality, op. cit.

6. Within the context of this study, the role of the faculty in influencing student attitudes and values has not been distinguished from that of the college community as a whole. While earlier research has suggested that such an influence is minimal,[4] our findings suggest that it may be true only for a segment of the total student body. This would be so particularly at schools where the vocational or social goals are strongly emphasized. For those students having membership in the academic intellectual subculture, the influence of the faculty may be consistently significant. It is necessary to note, however, that faculty like students vary. One dimension of such variance is reported by Gouldner.[5] Lazarsfeld and Theilen's study indicates that many faculty members tend to be more conservative politically than their fellow faculty members.[6] Such differences may well relate to the nature of faculty influence in any given area. Indeed, Gouldner's "locals" could be more influential on what we have identified as the "academic conformists," than, as we would suspect, the "cosmopolitan" faculty members are on the academic intellectual students. Such relationships tend to be ignored in research dealing with the faculties influence on attitudes and values. In pointing, as we have done, to significant differences within a given student population on attitudes, values, behavior, and change, we have implicitly raised the question as to whether similar differences exist within the faculty.

7. The significance of what we have referred to as the "managerial ideology" as developed in our model upon student behavior in higher

---

[4]Jacob, op. cit.

[5]Gouldner, op. cit.

[6]Paul F. Lazarsfeld and W. Theilens, Jr., The Academic Mind: Social Scientists in a Time of Crises (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958).

education is suggestive of the need for future research in this area. Related to the value placed on "the individual" in American Society, and the social goal ascribed to higher education, we would speculate that, contrary to Clark's conclusion,[7] this view of higher education is not being submerged by the vocational, but rather is becoming more clearly defined. Such a view of the goal of higher education is, of course, as blatantly instrumental as the vocational view. It differs, however, in perceiving "people" and their control, as opposed to specific knowledge about one area and its usage, as instrumental to subsequent success in life. It is, in a sense, a natural outgrowth of the ethos referred to by Whyte in "The Organization Man."[8] Admittedly, but one facet of a more complex ideology, it is an important one in terms of its significance in modifying the influence of higher education upon those students who subscribe to it. Its impact has been virtually ignored in research on college students, however.

The preceding seven points do not exhaust the potential suggestiveness of this study, but they do point out, given the tentativeness of the conclusions, the significant implications inherent in our findings. In the final analysis, their pursual rests upon the development and refinement of an adequate theoretical framework, and more thorough and sophisticated analysis and methodology than set forth in this study. It has been the intent of this study, however, to establish a groundwork in both areas, which may serve as a basis for such future developments. It is the writer's belief that such a goal has been achieved and, therefore, a significant contribution has been made to a better understanding of the role of higher education in the socialization process.

---

[7]Clark, op. cit.

[8]William H. Whyte, Jr. The Organization Man, Doubleday Anchor Books (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1956), pp. 83-86.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Adorno, T, W., et al. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Becker, Howard S., et al. Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bendix, Reinhardt. Work and Authority in Industry. Torchbook Edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Brookover, Wilbur, and David Gottlieb. A Sociology of Education. Second Edition. New York: American Book Co., 1964.

Caplow, T., and R. J. McGee. The Academic Market Place. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Clark, Burton R. Educating the Expert Society. San Francisco, Calif.: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.

Coleman, James A. The Adolescent Society. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1961.

Davis, James A., and Norman Bradburn. "Great Aspirations": College Career Plans of America's June 1961 College Graduates. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Durkheim, Emile. Suicide. John Spaulding and George Simpson, Translators. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951.

Festinger, Leon. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1957.

Fromm, Erich. Escape from Freedom. New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1941.

Ginzberg, Sol. W., et al. Occupational Choice: An Approach to A General Theory. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

Goldsen, Ruth K., et al. What College Students Think. Princeton, N. J.,: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1960.

Gottlieb, David, and Jon Reeves. Adolescent Behavior in Urban Areas: A Bibliographic Review and Discussion of the Literature. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1954.

Herberg, Will. Protestant, Catholic, Jew. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1955.

Hughes, Everett C. Men and Their Work. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.

Havighurst, Robert J. American Higher Education in the 1960's. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1960.

Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of College Teaching. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Knapp, Robert H., and H. B. Goodrich. Origins of American Scientists. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Knapp, Robert H., and Joseph J. Greenbaum. The Younger American Scholar: His Collegiate Origins. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Krech, David, Richard S. Crutchfield, and Egerton L. Ballachey. Individual in Society: A Textbook of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1962.

Lazarsfeld, P. F., and W. Theilens, Jr. The Academic Mind: Social Scientists in a Time of Crises. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.

Lecky, Prescott. Self-Consistency: A Theory of Personality. Boston: The Shoestring Press, Inc., 1961.

Lehmann, Irving J., and Paul L. Dressel. Critical Thinking, Attitudes, Values in Higher Education. East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University Press, 1962.

Lenski, Gerhardt. The Religious Factor. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1961.

Lindquist, E. F. Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1953.

McClelland, David C., et al., editors. Talent and Society. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1958.

McConnell, T. R. A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962.

Merton, Robert K., George Reader, and Patricia Kendall, Editors. Introductory Studies in the Sociology of Medical Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Miller, D. R., and Swanson, G. E. The Changing American Parent. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.

Murray, H. A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Newcomb, Theodore M. The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

_____. Personality and Social Change. New York: The Dryden Press, 1943.

Parsons, Talcott, and Robert F. Bales. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.

Reisman, David. Constraint and Variety in American Education. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1956.

_____. The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character. Anchor Book, Abridged Edition. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1953.

Reiss, Albert J., Jr. Occupations and Social Status. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

Rosenberg, Morris. Occupations and Values. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.

Sanford, Nevitt. Editor. The American College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Sears, Robert J., Eleanor E. Maccoby, and Harry Levin. Patterns in Child Rearing. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Co., 1957.

Selltiz, Clair, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. Revised one volume edition. New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1959.

Simpson, George. Translator. Emile Durkheim on the Division of Labor. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933.

Smith, Ernest. American Youth Culture. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1962.

Stern, George G., Morris I. Stein, and Benjamin S. Bloom. Methods in Personality Assessment. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956.

Veblen, Thorsten. The Higher Learning in America. Stanford, Calif.: Academic Reprints, 1954.

Walker, Edward L., and Roger W. Heyns. An Anotomy For Conformity. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.

Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Talcott Parsons, Translator. New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons., 1958.

Wedge, B. M. The Psychological Problems of College Men. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1958.

Whiting, John W. M. Becoming A Kwoma. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1953.

Whiting, John W. M., and Irving L. Child. Child Training and Personality. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1954.

Whyte, Jr., William H. The Organization Man. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1957.

Williams, Jr., Robin M. American Society: A Sociological Interpretation. Second Edition. New York: Alfred A. Knoph, Inc., 1960.

Wilson, Logan. The Academic Man. New York: Oxford University Press, 1943.

Wolfle, Dael L. America's Resources of Specialized Talent. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

B. PERIODICALS

Aberle, David F., and Kasper D. Naegele, "'Middle-class Fathers': Occupational Role and Attitudes Toward Children," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 22:366-378, 1952.

Bealer, Robert C., and Fern K. Willits. "Rural Youth: A Case Study in the Rebelliousness of Adolescents," The Annals, 338:63-69, November, 1961.

Brown, D. R., and Denise Bystryn. "College Environment and Social Ideology of Three Ethnic Groups," Journal of Social Psychology, 44:279-288, 1956.

Chapanis, Alphonse. "Men, Machines and Models," American Psychologist, 16:113-131, March, 1961.

Davies, James. "Social Class Factors and School Attendance," Harvard Educational Review, 33:175-185, Summer, 1953.

Davis, Allison, and Robert J. Havighurst. "Social Class and Color Differences in Child Rearing," American Sociological Review, 11:698-710, 1946.

Davis, James A. "Intellectual Climates In 135 American Colleges and Universities: A Study in Social Psychophysics," Sociology of Education, 37:110-128, Winter, 1963.

Farnsworth, Dana M. "Some Non-Academic Causes of Success and Failure of College Students," College Entrance Examination Board, 2:72-78, 1955.

Frederikson, Norman O. "The Evaluation of Personal and Social Qualities," College Entrance Examination Board, 1:93-105, 1954.

Gottlieb, David, and Benjamin J. Hodgkins. "College Student Subcultures: Their Structure and Characteristics in Relation to Student Attitude Change," The School Review, 71:266-289, Fall, 1963.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward An Analysis I and II," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2:281-306, 444-480, December, and March, 1958.

Haller, Archibald O., and Carol E. Wolff. "Personality Orientation of Farm, Village and Urban Boys," Rural Sociology, 24:331-346, 1959.

Hartshorne, E. Y. "Undergraduate Society and the College Culture," American Sociological Review, 8:321-332, June, 1943.

Hathaway, S. R., E. P. Monachesi and L. A. Young. "Rural-Urban Adolescent Personality," Rural Sociology, 24:331-346, December, 1959.

Hofstadter, Richard. "American Higher Education," College Entrance Examination Board, 3:15-24, 1956.

Holland, J. L. "Undergraduate Origins of American Scientists," Science, 126:433-437, 1957.

Kahl, Joseph. "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys," Harvard Educational Review, 33:186-203, Summer, 1953.

Kohn, Melvin F. "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, 64:337-351, 1959.

Lortie, Dan. "Laymen to Lawmen: Law School Careers and Professional Socialization," Harvard Educational Review, 29:352-369, Fall, 1959.

McArthur, Charles. "Subculture and Personality During the College Years," Journal of Educational Sociology, 33:260-268, February 1960.

Munson, B. E. "Personality Differentials Among Urban, Suburban, Town and Rural Children," Rural Sociology, 24:257-264, 1959.

Pace, C. R., and George G. Stern. "An Approach to the Measurement of Psychological Characteristics of College Environments," Journal of Educational Psychology, 49:269-277, 1958.

Peterson, Osler. "An Analytical Study of North Carolina General Practice, 1953-54," Journal of Medical Education, 31: part 2, December, 1956.

Plant, W. T. "Changes in Ethnocentrism Associated with a Four Year College Education," Journal of Educational Psychology, 49:162-165, 1958.

Ramsey, R. R. "A Subcultural Approach to Academic Behavior," Journal of Educational Sociology, 35:355-376, April, 1962.

Reisman, David. "The 'Jacob' Report," American Sociological Review, 23:732-735, 1958.

Rose, Peter I. "The Myth of Unamity: Student Opinions on Critical Issues," Sociology of Education, 37:129-149, Winter, 1963.

Rosen, Bernard. "The Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, 21:203-211, 1956.

Sanford, Nevitt (ed.), "Personality Development During the College Years," Journal of Social Issues, 12:3-72, 1956.

Schwarzweller, H. K. "Value Orientations in Educational and Occupational Choices," Rural Sociology, 24:257-264, 1959.

Sewell, William. "Community of Residence and College Plans," American Sociological Review, 29:24-38, February, 1964.

Stern, George G. "The Intellectual Climate of College Environments," Harvard Educational Review, 43:5-41, Winter, 1963.

_____. "Congruence and Dissonnance in the Ecology of College Students," Student Medicine, 8:304-339, 1960.

_____. "Assessing Theological Student Personality Structure," Journal of Pastoral Care, 18:76-83, 1954.

Stern, George G. "Pediatric Lions and Gynecological Lambs," Journal of Medical Education, 33:12-18, 1955.

Stouffer, Samual A. "Social Forces that Produce the 'Great Sorting,'" College Entrance Examination Board, 2:1-7, 1955.

Thistlewaite, Donald. "College Press and Student Achievement," Journal of Educational Psychology, 50:183-191, 1959.

Washburne, A. F. "Socio-Economic Status, Urbanism and Academic Performance," Journal of Educational Research, 53:130-137, December, 1959.

Webster, H. "Changes in Attitudes During College Years," Journal of Educational Psychology, 49:109-117, 1958.

Yinger, Milton. "Contraculture and Subculture," American Sociological Review, 35:625-635, October, 1960.

C. ESSAYS, ARTICLES, GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS, AND UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Ash, Solomen E. "Issues in the Study of Social Influences on Judgment," Conformity and Deviation, Irvin A. Berg and Bernard M. Bass, editors. New York: Harper and Bros., 1961. Pp. 143-158.

Campbell, Stewart. "The Place of Higher Education in a Changing Society," The American College, Nevitt Sanford, editor. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962. Pp. 894-939.

Child, Irving L. "Socialization," Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. II. Gardner Lindzey, editor. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954. Pp. 655-692.

Clark, B. and M. Trow. "Determinates of College Student Subculture," The Study of College Peer Groups: Problems and Prospects for Research. (Mimeographed.)

Douvan, Elizabeth and Carol Kaye. "Motivational Factors in College Entrance," The American College, Nevitt Sanford, editor. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962. Pp. 193-224.

Fox, Renee C. "Training for Uncertainty," The Student Physician, Robert K. Merton, et al., editors. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957. Pp. 207-244.

Goldsen, Rose K. "Recent Research on the American College Student: 2," Orientation to College Learning: A Reappraisal, Nicholas C. Brown, editor. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1961. Pp. 26-32.

Gottlieb, David. "Youth Subculture: Variations on a General Theme," Paper delivered at 5th Social Psychology Symposium, the University of Oklahoma, May 6, 1964.

Greenblum, Joseph and Leonard I. Pearlin. "Vertical Mobility and Prejudice: A Socio-Psychological Analysis," Class, Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification, R. Bendix and S. M. Lipsit, editors. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953. Pp. 480-491.

Huntington, Mary Jean. "The Development of a Professional Self-Image," The Student Physician, Robert K. Merton, et al., editors. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957. Pp. 179-188.

James, William. "Democracy and the College-Bred," The Intellectuals: A Controversial Portrait, George B. de Huszar, editor. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1960. Pp. 285-289.

Kendall, Patricia and Hanan C. Selvin. "Tendencies Toward Specialization in Medical Training," The Student Physician, Robert K. Merton, et al., editors. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957. Pp. 153-176.

Koch, Sigmund. "Appendix: Suggested Discussion Topics for Contributors of Systematic Analyses," Psychology: A Study of a Science, Vol. 3, Sigmund Koch, editor. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959. Pp. 713-723.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "Introduction," College Education: A Methodological Examination of Changing Values in College, A. H. Barton, author. New Haven: Hazen Foundation, 1959.

Martin, William. "Preferences for Types of Patients," The Student Physician, Robert K. Merton, et al., editors. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957. Pp. 189-206.

Parsons, Talcott. "An Outline of the Social System," Theories of Society: Foundations of Modern Sociological Theory, Vol. I, Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils, editors. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

Parsons, Talcott and Edward A. Shils. "Values, Motives, and Systems of Action," Toward A General Theory of Action, Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils, editors. New York: Harper and Row, Torch Book Edition, 1962. Pp. 47-278.

Reisman, David. "The Spread of Collegiate Values," The Intellectuals: A Controversial Portrait, G. B. de Huszar, editor. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960. Pp. 505-509.

Reisman, David and Christopher Jencks. "The Viability of the American College," The American College, Nevitt Sanford, editor. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962. Pp. 74-192.

Rogoff, Natalie. "The Decision to Study Medicine," The Student Physician. Robert K. Merton, et al., editors. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957. Pp. 109-130.

Sanford, Nevitt. "Epilogue," The American College, Nevitt Sanford, editor. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962. Pp. 1007-1034.

Selznick, Philip. "Institutional Vulnerability in Mass Society," America as a Mass Society, Philip Selznick, editor. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1963. Pp. 13-29.

Stern, George G. "Environments for Learning," The American College, Nevitt Sanford, editor. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962. Pp. 690-730.

_____. "Continuity and Contrast in the Transition from High School to College," Orientation to College Learning: A Re-appraisal, Nicholas C. Brown, editor. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1961. Pp. 33-58.

_____. "Student Values and Their Relationship to the College Environment," Research on College Students, H. T. Sprague, editor. Boulder, Colorado: Western Inter State Commission for Higher Education, 1960.

Strodtbeck, Fred. "Family Interaction, Values and Achievement," Talent and Society, David C. McClelland, et al., editors, New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1958. Pp. 135-194.

Thielens, Wagner Jr. "Some Comparisons of Entrants to Medical and Law School," The Student Physician, Robert K. Merton, et al., editors. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957. Pp. 131-152.

United States Department of Commerce. Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1960.

Webster, Harold, Mervin B. Freedman, and Paul Heist. "Personality Changes in College Students," The American College, Nevitt Sanford, editor. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962. Pp. 811-846.

West, Patricia S. "Social Mobility Among College Graduates," Class, Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification, Reinhardt, Bendix, and Seymour Lipset, editors. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953. Pp. 465-479.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA SHEET

This year, a study will be made of college freshmen: their attitudes and views toward a variety of topics, their behavior, and their background. In order that the research staff learn more about the nature of the student population, we would appreciate receiving certain information from you. It will be appreciated if you will be as accurate as possible in providing this information. While it is necessary to ask your name, your replies will be held in strict confidence and will be read only by the research staff.

Before beginning work, please fill in your NAME, AGE, SCHOOL, NAME OF TEST, and DATE in the spaces provided on this answer sheet. Indicate your MAJOR (or write "No Preference" if you do not have a major) in the blank after CLASS. Indicate your STUDENT NUMBER in the blank after CITY. For the other answer sheets only your name, student number, and name of test will be needed. Please make no marks on this or any other sheets. Record all your answers on the IBM sheets with your special pencil.

1. Sex: 1. Male 2. Female
2. Age at last birthday:
   1. Under 18 2. 18
   3. 19 4. 20 or over
3. Marital status:
   1. Single 2. Married
   3. Divorced 4. Widowed
4. How often do you attend the church of your faith?
   1. Regularly 2. Frequently
   3. Rarely 4. Never
5. Nativity of parents:
   1. Mother native-born and father foreign-born
   2. Father native-born and mother foreign-born
   3. Both foreign-born
   4. Both native-born

6. As you see your situation at the present time, how much education would you like to have?

    1. A year of college
    2. Two years of college
    3. Three years of college
    4. Four years of college (Bachelor's Degree)
    5. Graduate or professional school

7. As you see your situation at the present time, how much education do you really expect to get?

    1. A year of college
    2. Two years of college
    3. Three years of college
    4. Four years of college (Bachelor's Degree)
    5. Graduate or professional school

8. Before coming to college, in what kind of a community did you live most of your life?

    1. Farm
    2. Village, 250-2,499 population
    3. Town, 2,500-24,999 population
    4. City, 25,000-99,999 population
    5. City, over 100,000 population

9. Type of secondary school attended (for most of your high school years):

    1. Public
    2. Parochial
    3. Private (non-parochial)

10. Size of high school graduating class:

    1. Under 25
    2. 25-99
    3. 100-199
    4. 200-399
    5. 400-999
    6. Over 1000

11. In which third of your high school graduation class did you stand with respect to grades?

    1. Lower third
    2. Middle third
    3. Upper third

12. How actively did you participate in high school activities?

    1. Very active
    2. Moderately active
    3. Not active

13. About how far did your father go in school? Blacken only one of the following spaces:

    1. If attended grade school (grades 1 to 8) but did not finish
    2. If completed grade school through grade 8
    3. If attended high school (grades 9 to 12) but did not graduate
    4. If graduated from high school
    5. If attended college but did not graduate
    6. If graduated from college
    7. If attended graduate school or professional school but did not attain a graduate or professional degree
    8. If attained a graduate or professional degree

14. About how far did your mother go in school?
    (Follow same directions as for Question 13)

15. If I have a problem, I prefer to discuss it with:
    1. Parents
    2. Minister
    3. Doctor
    4. Teacher
    5. Friend
    6. Husband or wife

16. Over all I get along with my parents:
    1. Excellent
    2. Good
    3. Average
    4. Fair
    5. Poor

17. What is your principal source of support while at college?
    1. Parents
    2. Job
    3. Athletic scholarship
    4. Loans
    5. G. I. Bill
    6. Academic scholarship

18. Where do you live now while attending college?
    1. Dormitory
    2. Off-campus apartment
    3. Off-campus rooming house
    4. Fraternity or sorority house
    5. With my family

19. Do you now have, or plan to get, a job during the academic year?
    1. Yes 2. No

20. Which of the following explains your reasons for coming to college? (Check one or more.)

    1. To get a broad education
    2. To prepare for a vocation
    3. For the prestige of a college education
    4. To be with old friends
    5. To help get a job
    6. To please parents and/or friends
    7. It was "the thing to do"
    8. Foregone conclusion. I never questioned why
    9. Will enable me to make more money
    10. For the social enjoyment of "college life"
    11. It is a family tradition
    12. None of these

21. Religious preference:

    1. Catholic
    2. Jewish
    3. Protestant
    4. None
    5. Other (write your religion in the space provided).

IF PROTESTANT (answer item 22)

22. Denomination:

    1. Angelican
    2. Baptist
    3. Church of Christ
    4. Congregational
    5. Dutch Reformed
    6. Episcopal
    7. Lutheran
    8. Methodist
    9. Presbyterian
    10. Other (write in denomination in the space provided).

23. What does your father do for a living? (Describe in a line or two in the space provided.)

_____

_____

24. What does your mother do for a living? (Describe in a line or two in the space provided.)

_____

_____

25. Does either parent have a secondary or part-time job? (Describe in the space provided.)

_____

_____

Senior-Year Experience Inventory

Institutions of higher learning feel that they can be of greater service if they attempt to ascertain the opinions and observations of students and former students in regard to those aspects of the university experiences which are felt to be of importance.

This inventory consists of a number of sections containing items about your reactions to your college experience. It is hoped that you will feel free to give frank and sincere responses. Your cooperation in this endeavor will insure that MSU will have a more accurate perspective regarding its programs and their effectiveness. All information will be treated as confidential and will be used for research purposes only.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

General Directions: Each of the questions on this inventory can be responded to by means of a coded key. For each question, write the code number of the answer appropriate to you in the code column blank at the right. Please read each question carefully and make sure that you are using the appropriate code. Answer all items.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Part I: Items 1 - 5

Compare how you thought you would spend your time at MSU with how you actually did according to the following code:

	Code
More than I thought	1
Same as I thought	2
Less than I thought	3

	Code	IBM No.
1. Time spent on studies.	____	(7)
2. Contact with faculty	____	(8)
3. Participation in school activities	____	(9)
4. Dating	____	(10)
5. Prejudice because of social or religious background	____	(11)

* * * * * * * * * *

Part II: Items 6 - 11

Below are a number of statements. Please rate each of them in terms of your own experiences at MSU using the following code:

	Code
Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Disagree	3
Strongly disagree	4

	Code	IBM No.
6. Generally, I found my classes pretty interesting.	____	(12)
7. Most of my instructors were enthusiastic about their teaching.	____	(13)
8. College is not as tough as I thought it would be.	____	(14)
9. Generally, I spent less time on my studies than I thought I would.	____	(15)
10. Getting good grades does not seem as important now as it once did.	____	(16)
11. MSU is the kind of school a person should go to if he really wants a good education.	____	(17)

* * * * * * * * *

Part III: Items 12 - 29

The following questions refer to some general reactions that you might have about a variety of issues. Please react to each question using the following code and mark your answer in Code Column A.

	Code
Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Disagree	3
Strongly disagree	4
No opinion	5

	Code A	IBM No.	Code B	IBM No.
12. Red China should be admitted to the U.N.	____	(18)	____	(36)
13. College professors should be allowed to subscribe to any ideological or political belief they wish	____	(19)	____	(37)
14. College professors should be required to take a loyalty oath.	____	(20)	____	(38)
15. My friends have had more impact on my views and beliefs than have courses or instructors.	____	(21)	____	(39)
16. A student should report another student cheating on an examination.	____	(22)	____	(40)
17. College teachers, on the average, tend to be conservative	____	(23)	____	(41)
18. College tends to liberalize one's views	____	(24)	____	(42)
19. I am satisfied with my grades	____	(25)	____	(43)
20. I know exactly what I will be doing in the immediate future	____	(26)	____	(44)
21. The United States should prevent known communists from entering or visiting this country	____	(27)	____	(45)
22. Communists should not be permitted to speak on our campus	____	(28)	____	(46)
23. Medical care for the aged should be provided by the Federal government	____	(29)	____	(47)
24. The United States should continue nuclear testing in the atmosphere	____	(30)	____	(48)
25. Petting and deep-kissing are appropriate sex outlets for unmarried college students.	____	(31)	____	(49)
26. All college students should be required to take a series of general education courses	____	(32)	____	(50)
27. I wouldn't hesitate to take a towel as a souvenir from a hotel in which I stayed	____	(33)	____	(51)
28. A college education should place equal emphasis on academic and social development	____	(34)	____	(52)
29. A person in a skilled trade is worth as much to society as one in a profession	____	(35)	____	(53)

We would also like to know how you would have reacted to each of the above statements (12-29) if we were to have asked these questions when you were a freshman. Please reread the questions and try to answer them this time, reacting as a freshman. Use the same code, but place your responses in Code Column B.

* *

Part IV: Items 30 - 38

People engage in a number of activities as adults. We would like to know how active a role you eventually will play in each of the following. Please rate each of the activities using the following code:

	Code
Very active	1
Active	2
Not very active	3
None	4
No idea	5

	Code	IBM No		Code	IBM No
30. Local politics	____	(54)	34. Chamber of Commerce	____	(58)
31. Church activities	____	(55)	35. Men's or Women's clubs	____	(59)
32. PTA	____	(56)	36. Charitable civic groups	____	(60)
33. Scouting	____	(57)	37. Country club	____	(61)
			38. Cultural groups (Art, Music, etc.)	____	(62)

Part V : Items 39 - 54

These sixteen questions refer to your conception of a good college teacher.

The characteristics of a good college teacher are many and varied. Listed below are a number of characteristics which others have considered important to a good teacher. Indicate how you feel about each statement. Please rate each statement according to the following code:

Code: 1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

A good college teacher	Code	IBM No.
39. is active in civic affairs. (1)	_____	(63)
40. is active in campus activities. (2)	_____	(64)
41. is willing to discuss a student's career plans. (3)	_____	(65)
42. is willing to discuss a student's personal problems. (4)	_____	(66)
43. is a person who can teach in an entertaining manner. (5)	_____	(67)
44. is someone who sticks to teaching and does not act as a "buddy" to students. (6)	_____	(68)
45. is active in religious affairs. (7)	_____	(69)
46. is someone who really knows his field. (8)	_____	(70)
47. does not give out a lot of reading assignments. (9)	_____	(71)
48. is willing to help students decide on how they should stand on things like politics and religion. (10)	_____	(72)
49. is someone who judges a student on his work and not on how he dresses or looks. (11)	_____	(73)
50. is someone who really makes students produce. (12)	_____	(74)
51. is someone who is willing to give the student a break when the student doesn't do his work. (13)	_____	(75)
52. permits students to take part in deciding the course objectives. (14)	_____	(76)
53. does not attempt to indoctrinate his students in a particular political, religious, or ideological belief. (15)	_____	(77)
54. Of the 15 characteristics listed above, which one do you feel is the most important characteristic for a good college teacher.	_____	(78) (79)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Part VI: Items 54a - 54c

This section requires some writing. Do not spend too much time on any one item but be as specific as possible.

54(a) The most important (or significant) thing that I learned at MSU was

_____

_____

_____

54(b) The experience or activity which has been most profitable to me at MSU was (what and why)

_____

_____

_____

54(c) The experience that has had the greatest impact on me was (what and how)

_____

_____

_____

Part VII: Items 55 - 60

Listed below are six religious concepts. Please indicate your definition for each of the major concepts. Read the seven statements under each concept and select the statement that most nearly agrees with your attitude regarding that concept. Record the number of the statement in the code blank at the right of the major concept.

55. The Bible. . . . . Code _____ IBM No. (7)

1. The Bible is inconsistent, contradictory and exaggerated in value.
2. The Bible is a collection of myths.
3. The Bible is a great literary work expressing religious philosophy.
4. The Bible is valuable because of its inspirational effect.
5. The Bible is an account of man's experiences with God.
6. The Bible is God's revelation written by inspired men.
7. The Bible was dictated by God through the hand of man and is infallible.

56. Prayer. . . . . Code _____ IBM No. (8)

1. Prayer is a direct approach to God which will always bring results if there is enough faith.
2. Prayer is communication with God.
3. Prayer is a means of bringing man into a proper relationship with God.
4. Prayer may be communion with God but how it is effected is not understood.
5. Prayer is a means of relieving anxiety.
6. Prayer can be equated with strong wishes or desires.
7. Prayer is only a superstitious practice.

57. Man. . . . . Code _____ IBM No. (9)

1. Man represents no more than the highest order of evolution.
2. Man is a biological organism with distinctive powers of memory and rational thought.
3. Man is a psychological organism with spiritual needs.
4. The nature and significance of man are not determinable.
5. Man has both a body and a soul with the soul being the more essential.
6. Man is the created object of God's love.
7. Man is a descendant of Adam who was created from the dust of the earth.

58. God . . . . . Code _____ IBM No. (10)

1. God is our creator and judge who observes everything that we do.
2. God exists as a divine being.
3. God exists as a supernatural power beyond man's comprehension.
4. God probably exists but no one knows what he is like.
5. The concept of God is a means of explaining the unknown.
6. God is a projection of man's unconscious mind.
7. There is no supernatural being.

59. Sin . . . . . _____ (11)

1. Sin is a religious concept used to create guilt feelings in man.
2. Sin consists of behavior which is not culturally approved.
3. Sin consists of a violation of the rights of others.
4. Sin is a violation of one's conscience.
5. Sin is a denial of our best nature.
6. Sin consists of any thought, word or deed that interferes with a proper relationship to God.
7. Sin consists of a wilful participation in worldly acts that transgress Divine Law.

60. Eternity . . . . . _____ (12)

1. After physical death there will be a judgment in which each man is sent to heaven or hell.
2. All men will some day be responsible for their relationship to God.
3. Heaven and hell are symbols of our relationship to God after physical death.
4. Probably man does not have a separate identity after death, yet he participates in a kind of immortality.
5. Man's immortality consists in the influence that he leaves behind him at death.
6. The concept of eternity is a manifestation of man's fear of death.
7. Our present life constitutes the whole of our existence.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Part VIII: Items 61 - 86

Below is a list of objectives which may apply to various courses and experiences in college. You are to rate them as to their importance to you now. Use the following code and mark your answer in Code Column A.

Code A. 1. Very important (Essential that this be achieved)
2. Average importance (Desirable that this be achieved)
3. Little importance (Not important that this be achieved)

	Code A	IBM No.	Code B	IBM No.
61. To master a classification of knowledge in a field	____	(13)	____	(39)
62. To master certain techniques applicable to one's vocation or field of special interest	____	(14)	____	(40)
63. To acquire specific information and techniques in preparation for further study in a particular field	____	(15)	____	(41)
64. To acquire and use the skills and habits involved in critical and constructive thinking	____	(16)	____	(42)
65. To develop a code of behavior based on democratic and ethical principles	____	(17)	____	(43)
66. To express one's thoughts effectively	____	(18)	____	(44)
67. To recognize the fact of world interdependence	____	(19)	____	(45)
68. To learn to get along with people	____	(20)	____	(46)
69. To acquire a degree of expertness in a special field	____	(21)	____	(47)
70. To experience a realistic sampling of one's chosen vocation	____	(22)	____	(48)
71. To attain a satisfactory emotional and social adjustment	____	(23)	____	(49)
72. To understand other cultures and people	____	(24)	____	(50)
73. To know the major developments in a vocational field or field of special interest	____	(25)	____	(51)
74. To understand the ideas of others	____	(26)	____	(52)
75. To habitually apply scientific thought to the discovery of facts	____	(27)	____	(53)
76. To bring up to date one's knowledge in a special field of interest or a vocational field	____	(28)	____	(54)
77. To become proficient in one's chosen field of work	____	(29)	____	(55)
78. To understand and enjoy literature, art and music	____	(30)	____	(56)
79. To understand one's physical and social environment	____	(31)	____	(57)
80. To develop certain manual skills	____	(32)	____	(58)
81. To move smoothly from high school to adult independence	____	(33)	____	(59)
82. To develop a broad general outlook and familiarity with a variety of subjects	____	(34)	____	(60)
83. To develop knowledge and understanding making possible a more effective choice of one's life work	____	(35)	____	(61)
84. To acquire knowledge and attitudes basic to a satisfying family life	____	(36)	____	(62)
85. To develop the ability to do significant independent research	____	(37)	____	(63)
86. To maintain and improve one's own health	____	(38)	____	(64)

We are also interest in learning the degree to which each of the objectives listed above was realized. Please rate each of the objectives in Code Column B, using the following code:

Code B: 1. Very well achieved
2. Moderately achieved
3. Not achieved

Part IX: Questions 87-125

College affects or influences people in different ways; e.g., some people change in one way, others change in another way, and still others may not change at all. An experience which might have some effect on one person is ineffectual on another.

In this section, a number of behavior traits are presented. Although all of them may not apply to you, we are interested in learning those which you feel describe changes that have come about in you over the past four years. In other words, in what ways are you different now from what you were like when you entered MSU as a freshman?

Read each of the statements below and give your frank opinion. Since there are no right or wrong answers, do not spend too much time on any one of the statements. Do not skip any items. React to each statement according to the following code:

Code: 1. More (i.e., I tend to possess more of this quality.)
2. Less (i.e., I tend to possess less of this quality.)
3. Same (i.e., I am not conscious of any change.)

	Code	IBM No.
87. Tolerance of people differing in race, creed, color, or religion...	____	(65)
88. Respect for the views and opinion of other people.....	____	(66)
89. Respect for views and opinions opposite to mine.....	____	(67)
90. Tolerance of unconventional dress, behavior, and manners.....	____	(68)
91. Insight into the behavior of other people.....	____	(69)
92. Ability to get along with other people.....	____	(70)
93 Interest in political matters.....	____	(71)
94. Interest in social issues.....	____	(72)
95 Interest in intellectual and cultural matters.....	____	(73)
96. Interest in scientific developments	____	(74)
97. Interest in world affairs.....	____	(75)
98. Ability to adjust to conditions not to my liking.....	____	(76)
99 Ability to accept disappointment..	____	(77)
100 Ability to change my views in the presence of facts.....	____	(78)
101. Confidence in my ability to deal with new problems.....	____	(79)
102. Responsibility for my own behavior	____	(80)
103 Dependence on class attendance for learning.....	____	(7)
104. Feeling that the quality of one's education depends on the institution rather than the individual...	____	(8)
105. Dependence on my age group for behavior patterns.....	____	(9)
106. Acceptance of the Bible as a guide to modern living.....	____	(10)

	Code	IBM No.
107. Attachment to a religious sect or denomination that I can believe in and defend.....	____	(11)
108. Respect for law.....	____	(12)
109. Respect for rules and regulations..	____	(13)
110. Respect for persons in positions of authority.....	____	(14)
111. Feeling that money is of primary importance.....	____	(15)
112. Desire to accept a job for the satisfaction it has to offer rather than the salary it pays.....	____	(16)
113. Drive to get ahead as quickly as possible.....	____	(17)
114 Feeling that a major aim of college is to prepare one for a vocation or profession.....	____	(18)
115. Feeling that a college should also stress a liberal-arts type of education.....	____	(19)
116 Feeling that a college education is necessary to succeed in the world.....	____	(20)
117. Importance of grades as measures of achievement.....	____	(21)
118. Confusion as to what I want out of life.....	____	(22)
119. Optimistic outlook for my future...	____	(23)
120. Pessimistic outlook for my future..	____	(24)
121. Optimistic outlook for future of civilization.....	____	(25)
122. Pessimistic outlook for the future of civilization.....	____	(26)
123. Feeling of the necessity for religious faith for living in modern times.....	____	(27)
124. Commitment to a set of religious beliefs.....	____	(28)
125 Awareness of my goals in life.....	____	(29)

Part X: Items 126 - 175

Listed below are courses, personnel, activities, and organizations which probably have strengthened or reinforced, modified or altered the beliefs that you had when you came to MSU as a freshman. Which of these have influenced you the most?

Place a ✓ before those which you feel have served to strengthen or reinforce your attitudes, values, opinions, beliefs, and interests. Place a ✓✓ before the THREE you feel had the most reinforcing influence.

Place an X before those which you feel have modified or altered some of your attitudes, values, opinions, beliefs, and interests. Place an XX before the THREE you feel had the most influence.

____126. Communication Skills 111
____127. Communication Skills 112
____128. Communication Skills 113
____129. Natural Science 181
____130. Natural Science 182
____131. Natural Science 183
____132. Social Science 231
____133. Social Science 232
____134. Social Science 233
____135. Humanities 241
____136. Humanities 242
____137. Humanities 243
____138. A course in your major
____139. Any other course
____140. A Social Science instructor
____141. A Humanities instructor
____142. A Natural Science instructor
____143. A Communication Skills instructor
____144. An instructor in your major
____145. Any other instructor
____146. Social events
____147. Athletic events
____148. Lecture-Concert Series
____149. Extra-curricular clubs
____150. Participation in athletics
____151. Fraternity or sorority
____152. Close friend(s)
____153. Roommate
____154. Discussions or "bull-sessions"
____155. Counseling Center
____156. Library
____157. Mental Hygiene Clinic
____158. Improvement Services
____159. Living quarters
____160. Church
____161. Housemother
____162. R.A. or Head R.A.
____163. Employment
____164. A person I dated
____165. Family
____166. Conduct patterns of faculty
____167. Conduct patterns of students
____168. Academic adviser
____169. Campus regulations
____170. Being away from home
____171. ROTC
____172. Physical Education
____173. Honors College Membership
____174. Conforming to campus mores
____175. Honorary Societies

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Part XI: Items 176 - 182

In every college that we know of, some students seem to have a very high standing, and some seem to have a low standing. But the reasons seem different in the different colleges and universities.

Listed below are nine factors which might lead to high prestige. Which of these factors do you feel to be important to students, to faculty, and to both students and faculty?

1. Being original and creative
2. Having a pleasing personality
3. Demonstrating scholarly capacity
4. Being active in campus activities
5. Dedicating yourself to your studies
6. Not being too critical
7. Coming from the right social background
8. Being active in varsity athletics
9. Being a member of a fraternity or sorority

	Code	IBM No.
176. As a freshman, which of these factors did you feel gave a student prestige with the faculty? (you may choose more than one)	_____	(30)
177. Which of these factors do you now feel gives a student prestige with the faculty? (you may choose more than one)	_____	(31)
178. Which single factor do you now feel is the most important with the faculty?	____	(32)
179. Which single factor do you think should be most important to faculty?	____	(33)
180. Which factors do you now feel give a student prestige with his fellow students? (you may choose more than one)	_____	(34)
181. Which single factor do you now think is most important to students?	____	(35)
182. Which single factor do you now think should be most important to students?	____	(36)

Part XII: Items 176 - 180

In every college that we know of, there are different kinds of students who enjoy doing different kinds of things. Listed below are some comments or descriptions about the kinds of students you might find in any American college. Read each of these over and then answer the questions which follow as best as you can. We know that it is difficult to "peg" yourself in some slot but please make a choice for each of the five questions. Place the LETTER of the TYPE which most accurately describes you in the blank column at the right.

TYPE W: This kind of person is interested in education, but primarily to the point of preparation for his occupational future. He is not particularly interested in the social or purely intellectual phases of campus life, although he might participate in these activities on some limited basis. This person does his homework so that grades can be maintained, but otherwise restricts his reading to the light, general entertainment variety. For the most part, this person's primary reason for being in college is to obtain vocational or occupational training.

TYPE X: This person is interested in learning about life in general, but in a manner of his own choosing. He is very interested in the world of ideas and books, and eagerly seeks out these things. Outside of the classroom, this person would attend such activities as the lecture-concert series, Provost lectures, foreign films, etc. This person wants to go beyond the mere course requirements and will frequently do extra readings in order to obtain a more complete understanding of the world in which he lives. From a social point-of-view, this persons tends to reject fraternities, sororities, and the social events that are a part of campus life. When this person does join, it will usually be one of the political or more academic campus organizations. For the most part, this person would consider himself to be someone who is primarily motivated by intellectual curiosity.

TYPE Y: This person is in many respects like Type X noted above. He is concerned with books and the pursuit of knowledge, but is also the kind of person who does not cut himself off from the more social phases of campus life. He is interested in getting good grades and usually tries to maintain a fairly high grade-point-average. He is the kind of person who will work with student government, the campus U.N. and activities of this type. He is the kind of person who feels that the social side of college life is not the most important but is certainly significant for his general development.

TYPE Z: This is the kind of person who is very much concerned with the social phases of college life. He identifies closely with the college and tries to attend as many of the campus social and athletic events as possible. This person may be interested in intellectual kinds of things but will, for the most part, find greater satisfaction in parties, dances, football games, etc. He is concerned about his education, but feels that the development of his social skills is certainly important. His college years are centered about fraternity and sorority activities even though he might not be a member. This person attempts to "make grades" but will rarely go out of his way to do extra or non-assigned readings.

Now that you have read each of the four descriptions, answer the following questions:

	Code	IBM No.
176. Which of the above (W,X,Y,Z) comes closest to describing the kind of person you consider yourself to be now?	____	(37)
177. Which of the above is least descriptive of the kind of person you consider yourself to be now?	____	(38)
178. Which of the above comes closest to describing the kind of person you were when you first came to college?	____	(39)
179. Which of the above types comes closest to describing the kind of person you would like to be if you had a choice?	____	(40)
180. Which of the above types comes closest to describing the typical MSU student?. . . .	____	(41)

* * * * * * * * *

181. What type of job, position, vocation, or profession are you now in, or plan to engage in eventually? e.g. medical doctor, elementary school teacher, civil engineer, housewife, etc. _____

_____

If this is any different from the plans you had when you entered as a freshman, answer questions 182 and 183. If NO, skip to question 184.

182. What job or profession or type of work did you plan to engage in when you were a freshman?

_____

183. Why did you change your plans? _____

Part XIII: Items 184 - 187

A person's decision for choosing one job or career over another may rest on one or more of the following factors:

1. Making a lot of money
2. Opportunities to be original and creative
3. Opportunities to be helpful to others or useful to society
4. Avoiding a high pressure job which takes too much out of you
5. Living and working in a world of ideas
6. Freedom from supervision in my work
7. Opportunities for moderate but steady progress rather than the chance of extreme success or failure
8. Opportunities to exercise leadership
9. Remaining in the city or area in which I grew up
10. Opportunities to work with people rather than with things
11. Other(specify) _____

	Code	IBM No.
184. Which of these factors do you now feel is important in choosing a career or job? (You may choose more than one)	_____	(42)
185. Which of these factors did you feel to be important when you were a freshman? (You may choose more than one)	_____	(43)
186. Of the 11 factors listed above, which ONE do you now consider is the most important factor to be considered in picking a job or career?	____	(44)
187. Which single factor do you think is most important to the average college student? (Choose only ONE).	____	(45)

* * * * * * * * * * *

Part XIV: Items 188 - 190

	Code	IBM No.
188. To what extent have you financed your own college education?	____	(46)

1. Completely 2. Most of it (over 75%) 3. About one-half
4. Part of it (less than 25%) 5. None of it

189. Which of the following would you say best describes what has happened to your religious attitudes in the past four years?	____	(47)

1. I was never really a religious person and I feel the same way now.
2. I was a fairly religious person when I came to college and I feel the same way now.
3. I was much more religious when I came to college than I am now.
4. I am much more religious now than I was when I first came to college.

190. Which of the following would you say best describes what has happened to your political attitudes in the past four years?	____	(48)

1. I was pretty much a political conservative and I still am.
2. I was pretty much a political liberal and I still am.
3. I am much more a political liberal than I was when I first came to college.
4. I am much more political conservative than I was when I first came to college.

* * * * * * * * * *

Part XV: Items 192 - 199

Please rate each of the following factors in terms of their effect or impact on your career plans or decisions during college according to the following code:

	Code
Very important.....	1
Fairly important.....	2
Unimportant.....	3
Never received any.....	4

	Code	IBM No.
192. Vocational or psychological tests	____	(49)
193. Discussions with academic adviser.	____	(50)
194. Discussions with other faculty members.	____	(51)
195. Vocational/Guidance counselor		(52)
196. Advice from parents.	____	(53)
197. Advice from family other than parents.	____	(54)
198. Discussion with peers	____	(55)
199. Of the seven factors listed above (192-198) which ONE do you consider played the most important part in your career decisions during college?	____	(56)

Part XVI: Items 200 -202

200. If you had to register in the next election, how do you think you would register?. . . . . ____ (57)

1. Republican
2. Democrat
3. Socialist
4. Independent

201. The following activities cut across a number of specific jobs. Which ONE do you anticipate will be the most important part of your long-run career work? . . .____ (58)

1. Teaching
2. Research
3. Administration
4. Service to patients and clients
5. None of these

202. Did you change majors while at MSU? . . . . . ____ (59)

1. Entered as NO PREFERENCE and transferred to final major.
2. Entered as NO PREFERENCE and changed major twice or more.
3. Entered a major field and did not change
4. Entered a major field and changed major one or more times

Part XVII: Items 203 - 212

For some people, the choice of a community depends upon such factors as cultural activities, type of schools, proximity to church and shopping, etc. If you did not have an opportunity to have ready access to the activities or resources listed below, how dissatisfied would you be with the community? Rate the degree of your dissatisfaction according to the following code:

	Code
Extremely dissatisfied.....	1
Quite dissatisfied.....	2
Somewhat dissatisfied.....	3
Wouldn't bother me.....	4

	Code	IBM No.
203. Opportunities to hear live performances of serious music .	____	(60)
204. Opportunities to see serious drama	____	(61)
205. Opportunities to see professional or college athletic events. . .	____	(62)
206. A good local art museum	____	(63)
207. An excellent local bookstore. .	____	(64)
208. Opportunities to engage in serious discussion of the basic problems and issues which confront our country	____	(65)
209. A theatre which shows foreign and art films	____	(66)
210. Opportunities for an active social life	____	(67)
211. A good local library.	____	(68)
212. Excellent public schools. . . .	____	(69)

* * * * * * * *

Part XVIII: Items 213 - 216

213. Have you married since leaving MSU? . . . . . ____ (70)

1. Yes 2. No

Some of the factors which might influence an individuals views are as follows:

1. Lecture and/or assigned course readings
2. Friends
3. Personal contact with faculty members
4. Increased independent reading
5. Independence from parental ideas
6. Increased thinking

214. If your political views have changed since you were a freshman, which factor/s listed above have most influenced you? ____ (71)

215. If your religious views have changed since you were a freshman, which factor/s listed above have most influenced you? . . . ____ (72)

216. If your moral or ethical views have changed since you were a freshman, which factor/s have most influenced you?. . . . . ____ (73)

APPENDIX B

INDICES WITH FACTOR LOADINGS

CULTURE VALUES INDEX ITEMS WITH FACTOR LOADINGS

ITEM	FACTOR LOADING
Opportunity to see serious drama	.8121
Opportunity to hear live serious music	.7682
A good local art museum	.6890
A theater with foreign and art films	.6423
An excellent local book store	.4426

POLITICAL INSECURITY INDEX ITEMS
WITH FACTOR LOADINGS

ITEM	FACTOR LOADING
The United States should prevent known communists from entering or visiting this country.	.7013
Communists should not be allowed to speak on this campus.	.6988
College professors should be required to take a loyality oath.	.4861
College professors should be allowed to subscribe to any ideological or political belief they want.	-.4340*

*Because of the negative loading, the scoring was reversed on this item.