R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 076 JC 670 535

TOWARD AN EMPIRICAL TYPOLOGY OF JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT SUBCULTURES.

BY- MAUSS, ARMAND L.

PUB DATE 31 MAR 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.28 32P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS, *CONCEPTUAL SCHEMES, STUDENT ATTITUDES, STUDENT EVALUATION, STUDENT GROUPING, *CULTURAL BACKGROUND, CULTURAL TRAITS, CULTURAL FACTORS, ATTITUDE TESTS, MATURITY TESTS, *TYPOLOGY, STUDENT SUBCULTURES,

ADAPTATION OF THE FOURFOLD TYPOLOGY DEVELOPED BY CLARK AND TROW TO THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT PERMITS DISCUSSION OF THE ROLE OF SOCIOLOGICAL FACTORS IN EDUCATIONAL PERFORMANCE. STUDENTS OF THE FOUR TYPES DIFFER PRIMARILY IN THEIR VALUE COMMITMENTS TO (1) THE VALUES OF THE ADULT WORLD AND (2) THE PURSUIT OF INTELLECTUAL IDEAS. THE SUBCULTURE TYPOLOGY CONSISTS OF THE "ACADEMIC" TYPE CHARACTERIZED BY (1) AND (2), THE "VOCATIONAL" TYPE (1), THE "INCIPIENT REBEL" (2), AND THE "PERPETUAL TEENAGER" WHO IS IDENTIFIED WITH NEITHER (1) NOR (2). TO SEE IF DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ABOUT SUCH VALUES COULD BE OBTAINED FROM A JUNIOR COLLEGE POPULATION, A QUESTIONNAIRE WAS ADMINISTERED TO 500 STUDENTS ON A SUBURBAN CALIFORNIA CAMPUS. INCLUDED WERE SEVERAL ITEMS TO PROVIDE BACKGROUND INFORMATION, ITEMS TO PERMIT ANALYSIS OF VALUE COMMITMENTS, AND MEASURES OF STUDENT RESPONSE TO THE MOST COMMON TEACHING DEVICES. DATA INDICATE THAT THE FOUR SUBCULTURES DO EXIST, WITH DIFFERENTIAL CONSEQUENCES FOR ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR. STUDENTS CREATE AN "ENVIRONMENTAL PRESS" AND THE VALUES THEY BRING TO COLLEGE ARE CRITICAL DETERMINANTS OF EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES. (IMPLICATIONS FOR ACADEMIC POLICY ARE DISCUSSED, AND TABULATIONS OF THE RESPONSES ARE PRESENTED.) (AL)

TOWARD AN EMPIRICAL TYPOLOGY OF JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT SUBCULTURES

Armand L. Mauss
Social Science Department
Diablo Valley College
Pleasant Hill, California

Paper read at the annual
meeting of the Pacific
Sociological Association
Long Beach, California
March 31, 1967

TOWARD AN EMPIRICAL TYPOLOGY OF JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT SUBCULTURES

Armand L. Mauss
Diablo Valley College
Concord, California

In the study of educational performance, the sociological approach has generally differed from the psychological in its greater concern with the "non-cognitive" or "non-intellective" determinants, such as family, ethnic and religious subcultures, social structure, peer influences, and the like. A considerable body of data on such determinants has begun to accumulate, although relatively little empirical work has been done at the college level.[1] The lack is especially great at the junior college level, owing, no doubt, to the relatively recent advent of junior colleges in any large number. In view of the fact, however, that junior college students are now the most numerous kind of college students in California (a development increasingly true of several other states also), the junior college setting would seem to warrant more attention from educational sociologists.[2]

Among the non-cognitive determinants of educational performance which have received some study at the college level (as well as at the high school level) is that of "student culture", a rather imprecise concept referring apparently to different constellations or syndromes of values and attitudes which are believed to exist among college students, and which may or may not be derived from cultural influences outside the campus. Among the most recent works in this general field is College Peer Groups, a very interesting and informative collection of essays edited by Newcomb and Wilson.[3] In addition,

several of the essays in Sanford's The American College deal with "student culture" as in some sense a determinant of performance, as do a few of the articles discussed in Lavin's bibliographical work, The Prediction of Academic Performance.[4] However, these studies are almost all limited to some variation of the notion of "peer culture" or "adolescent culture", and few of them are empirically based.

One effort toward a more systematic and comprehensive analysis of college subcultures is the four-fold typology developed by Burton Clark and Martin Trow, which, although fairly well-known, has only recently been published in its completeness.[5] Derived from a simultaneous application of two dimensions, the typology yields the following four types of student cultures: the academic, which strongly identifies with the college (through the faculty) and is involved with ideas; the collegiate which also identifies with the college (through the fraternities or athletic teams, etc.) but is not involved with ideas; the non-conformist, which is involved with ideas but does not identify with the college, and the vocational, which neither identifies with the college nor is involved with ideas.

		Involved with Ideas +	Involved with Ideas -
Identify with the College	+	Academic	Collegiate
	-	Nonconformist	Vocational

As described by Clark and Trow, those in the academic culture may be recruited from any socio-economic background, but can be expected to come disproportionately from upper-middle class homes, where the parents themselves are well-educated and value books, etc.; will have strong college loyalty through identification with the faculty and its intellectual concerns; will

look forward to graduate training (and will only then become "vocational" students); and have as their symbols the library and the laboratory. The collegiate students will be recruited especially from the upper SES homes; will develop strong college loyalty through identification with fraternities and sororities; will become devoted alumni; will thrive only on residential campuses; and will have as symbols the star athlete and the homecoming queen. The non-conformists, or at least the main variety of them, will be characterized by an "aggressive non-conformism" highly critical of the "establishment"; will be hostile to the administration; detached from the college as a whole; concerned with ideas in the classroom, but more concerned with issues in the wider society; will be recruited from all SES levels; and will seek personal identity through the adoption of distinctive styles of dress, speech, etc. Finally, the vocational student, whose symbols are the slide-rule and the placement office, will come disproportionately from the lower-middle and working classes; will appear mainly at the "parking lot" campuses; will have no strong college loyalty but be part of an "atomized aggregation"; will face many off-campus demands such as a family to support and a job; and will take a pragmatic no-nonsense approach to education, resisting intellectual demands beyond the bare minimum, and seeking units, a diploma, and a job as fast as these can be acquired.[6]

The Clark-Trow typology has a strong prima facie plausibility to anyone acquainted with college campus life in America, and it was no doubt based on the extensive observation and experience of its creators, but it has been subjected to few systematic empirical tests, and it was not intended to apply to junior colleges which are almost never residential campuses. As a general conceptual scheme, however, this typology, or some variation of it, would seem to have considerable theoretical promise because of its relatively great concreteness and comprehensiveness.[7]

The study reported here deals with an attempt to (1) modify the Clark-Trow typology for application to junior college students; and (2) devise procedures to provide some additional empirical validation for such a typology. The chief difficulty with the C-T typology for junior college students lies with its "vertical" dimension, i.e. "Identification with the College". Junior colleges are virtually always "commuter" campuses rather than residential ones. The students live either at home with their families or with small groups of friends in apartments in the surrounding communities. Furthermore, the junior colleges are only two-year colleges, which means that those students who have any plans at all for the future tend to anticipate their socialization either (1) into a particular vocation for which they are following a terminal program, or (2) into a "real" college to which they expect to transfer as soon as possible. Under these circumstances, it is understandably difficult for a student to develop any commitment to, or identification with, his junior college.[8] What, then, is the equivalent, for the junior college student, of "Identification with the College"? I suggest that if, in the process of attending junior college, a student comes to identify with any community at all, other than the adolescent one of which he was a part in high school, it will be with that community in which he is being socialized off campus - namely, the "normal" adult community in which he has his home, his job, his draft board, his church, and probably an increasing number of adult friends and acquaintances. Unlike the student who has gone to live in a totally new community on the residential campus, our commuting student will merely experience perhaps new modes of socialization in the old community: he may find some new expectations and demands made of him by his parents and others, or he may find himself carrying the new responsibilities that come with the freedom and independence of living

in a bachelor apartment instead of with parents; and he will probably have the new experience of negotiating by himself with school registration personnel, prospective employers, draft boards, and other bureaucracies of the adult world which surrounds his junior college. It may be assumed that some of the students will respond to these new socializing experiences in accordance with the models provided by "significant adult others" and will accept (at least gradually) the new adult roles urged upon them; or, in other words, they will come to "identify with the adult community" in which they are immersed off campus. As Clark and Trow observe, "The working, commuting student ..... has no time for interest in campus matters, social or political, especially if he is supporting a family as well."[9] At the same time, it may be assumed that other students will not so readily accept adult roles, but will cling, in so far as possible, to adolescent roles, patterns of behavior, and high school friendships, because of differences in maturation, parental expectations, or prior socializing experiences.[10]

It is proposed, then, that for junior college students, we should substitute "Identification with the Adult Community" for "Identification with the College" as the "vertical" dimension of our typology. This will yield four theoretical subcultural types, which will correspond in some ways with the Clark-Trow types but will be different in some important respects: first is the Academic type, which identifies with the adult community and is involved with ideas; then the Vocational type, which also identifies with the adult community, but is not involved with ideas; third is the Incipient Rebel, who is involved with ideas but who does not identify with the adult community (although his rebellion may not take grossly overt forms); and, finally, the Perpetual Teenager, who neither identifies with the adult community nor is

involved with ideas, even though he may not be any younger in chronological age than the other types.

Before proceeding to the discussion of the data in this study, perhaps a few qualifications and caveats are in order: Clark and Trow themselves have warned us that typologies of this kind are intended only as "heuristic device(s) for getting at the processes by which social structures shape student styles of life in different kinds of colleges."[11] Of necessity there is a certain danger here of an oversimplified "pigeonholing", when in fact we know that in real life there are probably some mixtures of these subcultural types. And let us be clear that we are not talking here about anything so concrete as structured peer groups, but only about the different normative settings within which peer groups are presumed to form. We are calling these "subcultures". Riesman calls them "constituencies" and "climates within which peer groups are formed".[12] Rossi's use of "interpersonal environment", and the term "environmental press" used by Pace and Baird, would both seem to be conceptually similar to what we mean by "student subcultures".[13]

DATA AND METHOD

Having made a theoretical case for the junior college revision which I propose to the Clark-Trow typology, there remains the question of empirical validation. Implicit in the typology is the contention that students of the four types differ primarily in their value commitments, i.e., in whether or not they feel some commitment to the values of the adult world (or, for Clark and Trow, the college community), and/or whether or not they have some commitment to the pursuit of ideas and of things intellectual. In an effort to see if differential responses to such questions about values could be obtained

from a junior college population, a questionnaire was administered to a sample of about 500 students on a suburban junior college campus in the East San Francisco Bay Area. The sample was made up of several sections (or classes) of general social science courses of the kind taken by virtually all students of whatever majors. Although this did not constitute a random sample in the usual sense, the courses in which the students were surveyed are so generally taken that they probably provide a fairly good cross-section of the student body. Furthermore, a comparison of this sample with the registrar's figures for the total student body of the same semester showed few if any differences between this sample and its presumed "universe" in distribution by age, sex, socio-economic status, marital status, transfer plans, or other important social variables.

In addition to several items on social background, plans, grades, habits, religion, etc., the questionnaire contained two main sections: (1) on value commitments, to make possible classification in the typology; and (2) on student evaluation of standard teaching devices (lectures, textbooks, term papers, etc.). The items on value commitments had been tried out on various small groups of students in previous semesters, and twelve items were finally selected, of which six were intended to relate to identification with the adult community, and six to involvement with ideas. As it turned out, three of the six "adult" questions were given "adult" answers so generally, that they were discarded as not having much discriminatory power; consequently, only the three which were the <u>least</u> likely to receive "adult" responses <u>as a general rule</u> were used in making up the dimension (or "scale") of "Identification with the Adult Community" (See Appendix One). Similarly, of the six questions relating to involvement with ideas, three were chosen which were the <u>least</u> likely to receive

"idea-oriented" answers as a general rule, and these were used to make up a "scale" of "Involvement with Ideas" (See Appendix Two). The methodological reasoning behind this practice of discarding the "commonly accepted" items on the two dimensions is that it probably does not take much of an "identification with adults" or much of an "involvement with ideas" to respond to a given question in about the same way that most other youngsters do. It seems likely that these (discarded) questions were perceived by most of the respondents as cultural shibboleths, to which they simply responded in the "expected" way. In any case, the distribution of the respondents on the two dimensions, and the resulting typology itself, are shown in the drawings in Appendix Three.[14]

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

The various sections of Table 1 show how the four subcultural types are distributed according to certain social background variables. Section A of Table 1 indicates that the academic subculture is about twice as likely as any of the others to contain students over 21 years of age. On the other hand, since the Vocationals, who were also high on my "Adult Scale", have a distribution very similar to the Teenagers', it is not likely that the typology is merely a function of age. The sex difference, however, seems to matter. While about 55% of the total sample (and entire population) are male, 3/4 of the Academic subculture are girls, an over-representation which might be common to junior colleges as a reflection of a greater parental willingness to send academically talented <u>boys</u> away from home for the freshman year. The two sections on religion (C and D) are interesting in a couple of respects: First, the two subcultures which are "idea-oriented" (Academic and Rebel) are strikingly less likely to be Roman Catholic than are the other two, which is reminiscent of Lenski's findings about the differential intellectual autonomy between

Catholics and Protestants.[15] Secondly, the religion tables provide an interesting validation of my Incipient Rebel category, which, as we would expect, is the least likely of all to contain conservative Protestants, the most likely of all to have students of no formal religious affiliation, and the most likely of all to include those who never attend church services. The section on marital status is not particularly interesting, except for a somewhat greater tendency for the Teenagers to be going steady or engaged, which is probably a carry-over from high school days.

Sections F, G, and H of Table 1 show the distributions according to the three usual indicators of socio-economic status (occupation, education, and income). The studentbody of this particular junior college has always been quite homogeneous in socio-economic background, with a distribution that is skewed upward, as each of these tables indicates. Although this distribution does not vary to speak of among the four subcultural types, there is a somewhat greater tendency for the Teenagers to come from upper-status homes, according to the tables on education and income (a point that could be made also about the Rebels here). This finding parallels the Clark-Trow expectation for the Collegiate subculture, which is the counterpart of what is here called Perpetual Teenager.[16] The strong expectation for the Clark-Trow Academics to come from higher status homes, however, is not born out for these junior college Academics, again owing probably to the likelihood that most of the affluent Academics in a junior college community have been "siphoned off" to more "distinguished" institutions.[17]

Some of the findings in the various sections of Table 2 are also quite interesting as partial validations of my four types. According to Sections B and C, the Academics seem to be "doing it less but enjoying it more", i.e.

though they seem to be enjoying higher grades on the whole, they are the least likely of all to be carrying a full semester load of 12 units or more. The coincidence of these two findings might be a reflection of greater "grade-consciousness" on the part of the Academics. In Sections C and D, we see the Teenagers are the least likely to earn high grades (as we might expect) but the most likely to hold that their grades under-represent their true ability, i.e. that they could do better if they tried. This might indicate only a tendency to rationalize, but I suggest rather that it parallels the characteristic of the Clark-Trow Collegiates to try to get by with as little work as possible! Sections E and F of Table 2 indicate that the two "idea-oriented" subcultures are the most likely to contain students aspiring beyond the bachelor's degree, as we might expect; and, in striking confirmation of Berkeley's appeal to non-conformists, we find our Incipient Rebels much more likely than the other groups to express a transfer preference for the University of California (!).

Table 3, on the uses of time, turns out about as we would expect in several instances and thus adds to our confidence in the validity of our typology. The Academics are disinclined to spend much time just talking to friends, watching television, or dating; their time is more likely to be taken up in studying, free reading, or perhaps going to museums and concerts. The Vocationals appear to be conscientious in their <u>required</u> studies but disinclined to do much <u>free</u> reading, thinking, or going to museums, etc; they are the most likely of all, apparently, to seek their diversion in watching television. The Rebels are the least likely of all to watch television but are the most likely of all to spend a lot of time talking with friends, doing free reading, going to museums and concerts, and just thinking. The Teenagers, again as we might expect, seem disinclined to do much free reading, concert-going, or studying; they are the most likely of all to spend their time dating.

Table 4 shows us some attitudinal differences among the four types, in addition to those used as the basis for the typology. In general, the differences shown are not great, but here and there they are interesting. Even though most students of all four types accept such culturally-approved clichés as those in items 1 and 5 of Section A, the Rebels are clearly the least likely to go along with such notions; they are by far the most likely, however, to object to the status barriers separating them from their instructors (item 2). In the self-concept items (Section B), the two types which were high on my "Adult Scale" (i.e. the Academics and the Vocationals) tend generally to indicate stronger self-concepts than do the other two types.[18] They seem considerably less likely than the Rebels or the Teenagers to wonder who they are or where they are going in life and somewhat more likely to have clear college and career goals. The figures for the Rebels here remind us of the corresponding Non-conformist subculture described by Clark and Trow as "pursu(ing) an identity", "not as a by-product, but as the primary and often self-conscious aim, of their education."[19] (Italics added).

Section D of Table 4 reveals something which we might have expected from the earlier responses (in Section A) on status barriers: the Rebels are the only type of whom a majority prefer close and informal relations with instructors. Among the other three types, only about a third prefer such relations. This finding might suggest that the much publicized "alienation" among modern college students is limited to those of a particular, non-conforming student subculture.[20]

The aspect of this study which has the clearest pedagogical significance is the relation between the typology and student reactions to the various devices commonly employed in college teaching. Table 5 shows that the typology

has rather strong discriminating power in this regard, especially as between the responses of the Academics and the Teenagers. Since "success" in college is probably a function of a student's rating on both of the dimensions or "scales" which defined this typology, then we would expect those who are high on both dimensions (i.e. Academics) to have the most favorable general responses to the standard teaching devices, and those who are low on both (i.e. Teenagers) to have the least favorable general responses. This expectation is borne out here: On almost all of the items on Table 5, the Academics are the most likely, and the Teenagers are the least likely, to give the "very helpful" response, while just the reverse is true for the "not very helpful" response. The percentage-point differences, furthermore, are generally quite large.

The middle two categories in the typology also show certain expected and predictable tendencies on some of the items. The "give-it-to-me-straight-and-get-it-over-with" orientation which we associate with the Vocationals is somewhat borne out by their greater tendency here to find instructors "not very helpful" (probably because they seldom seek instructor help), their apparent disinclination to enjoy "supplementary" readings, their relatively low appreciation for "special research projects" and "essay tests", and their relatively high tolerance for "multiple choice" tests. The Rebels, who are (like the Academics) intellectually oriented, but tend to "buck the system", are not very enthused, it appears, by the instructor-imposed textbooks, supplementary readings, or multiple-choice tests (which they reject at almost a 50% rate!), but they tend to respond quite favorably to special research projects and essay tests.

A concluding generalization, which, it seems to me, ought to be made about Table 5, is that most of the commonly used teaching devices seem to be really appreciated only by the Academics, who presumably make up less than 10% of the student body. With the exception of Item 4 (lectures), the Academics are the only ones of whom a majority ever give the response of "very helpful" (which they do on half of the items). Furthermore, for the response of "not very helpful", the Academics (unlike any of the other three types) never exceed a rate of about 25%, and, in fact, with two exceptions, do not exceed 15%. For the Teenagers, who represent nearly half of the sample, virtually the reverse is true, and it might fairly be said that the other two types resemble the Teenagers in their responses more than they resemble the Academics.

CONCLUSION

The study here reported has strongly indicated, I think, that the four subcultures postulated at the beginning do exist in real life, with differential consequences for student attitudes and behavior. The sampling and indicators used in the study have been gross, and the data have been presented without multivariate analysis or statistical tests. However, since the principal purposes at this time were to "break ground" and to stimulate further research, perhaps the scope of this presentation has been appropriate to the intended task.

In large part the study was a response to the kind of observation made by Newcomb and Wilson in their Preface: "The literature of social science is replete with general propositions relevant to the effects of students' membership in peer groups, but very few of them have been tested in the concrete context of the college."[21] What this observation says about peer groups could as well be said about the underlying subcultures within which peer groups are

formed. Since these subcultures presumably define clusters of values which, for the most part, students bring with them to college, they comprise an important part of what Wilson calls the "input variables" that are such critical determinants of educational outcomes.[22] Furthermore, to the extent that one or another of these subcultures predominates in a student body, through "selective recruitment" to a given institution, the main "environmental press" of that institution will be determined, with certain predictable consequences for all students, as well as for faculty and administration. Riesman uses this line of reasoning to explain what he calls "the most startling single bit of knowledge I (he) came across" in the Newcomb & Wilson collection: namely that students at one college learned as much and as well, no matter how they were taught -- or even if they were not taught at all![23]

It is probable that the "environmental press" at most junior colleges is dominated by what we have here called the Vocational and the Perpetual Teenager subcultures. The Teenagers alone comprise nearly half of the sample. The policy significance of all this is especially great because of the state and local laws under which junior colleges must operate -- at least in California. They must enroll virtually all applicants of college age and generally maintain rather permissive standards for dismissal (although there is some variation among college districts on this). The "cooling out" process described by Burton Clark[24] is long and inefficient and is, moreover, probably contrary to the philosophical inclinations of many junior college boards, administrators, and faculties. In view of the findings here reported, especially in Table 5 (on student reactions to teaching methods), it would seem that junior colleges are caught between

a largely anti-intellectual and adolescent "environmental press", on the one hand, and, on the other, a legislative mandate to hold all kinds of students as long as possible. This "institutional role strain" can be resolved in either or both of two ways: (1) the system can be modified to make it "reach" the 90% or so of its students who are not part of the Academic subculture, probably through radical and expensive changes in teaching technology and methodology; or (2) the students can be modified so that they can "reach" the system. The latter is probably the more practical of the two approaches, and it might be accomplished by instituting, at least for the Perpetual Teenagers, on "ungraded pre-college orientation year" on the junior college campus. Under this arrangement, students whose attitudes (via registration questionnaires) indicate that they are not "ready for the system," as it were, could be persuaded by counselors to enroll in programs designed largely to build skills and change attitudes. They would receive little or no college credit for these courses, but neither would they be under threat of dismissal or probation as long as they were so enrolled. As it is now, many such students with considerable potential are "cooled out" after a very wasteful and frustrating first year. Under the arrangement I am suggesting here, they might instead be "warmed in"!

FOOTNOTES

1. See, for example, the works discussed in Sarane S. Boocock, "Toward a Sociology of Learning: A Selective Review of Existing Research," Sociology of Education 39:1 (Winter, 1966), especially pp. 26-31; also, A. H. Halsey, Jean Floud, and C. A. Anderson (eds.), Education, Economy, and Society, New York: Free Press, 1961, Part IV; David E Lavin, The Prediction of Academic Performance, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965, especially Chapters 6 and 7; and Nevitt Sanford (ed.), The American College, New York: Wiley & Sons, 1962, especially Sections 3, 5, 6, and 7. Among them these citations give a fairly good overview of the research which has been done in recent years on the "non-cognitive" or "non-intellective" factors in educational performance, but only the last cited item deals to any extent with college students.

2. One of the extremely few, and probably the most penetrating, of the books on junior colleges is Burton R. Clark, The Open Door College: A Case Study, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960. Pages 3-5 deal with the rapid growth of junior colleges. See also Leland L. Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect, same publisher, 1960.

3. Theodore M Newcomb and Everett K. Wilson (eds.), College Peer Groups, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.

4. Sanford, op.cit. and Lavin, op.cit.

5. Burton R. Clark and Martin Trow, "The Organizational Context," in Newcomb and Wilson, op.cit., pp. 17-70.

6. Ibid., pp. 19-26. See also condensation in L. Broom and P. Selznick, Sociology (3rd edition), N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1963, pp. 453-456. Some typologies which seem to resemble that of Clark and Trow in some respects will be found in C Robert Pace and Leonard Baird, "Attainment Patterns in the Environmental Press of College Subcultures," and in James S. Coleman, "Peer Cultures and Education in Modern Society." Both of these essays are in Newcomb and Wilson, op.cit.

7. Among the attempts which have been made at empirical applications of the Clark-Trow typology are: Richard E. Peterson, "On a Typology of College Students," ETS Research Bulletin No. 65-9, Princeton, N. J., March, 1965 (mimeo.); and D. Gottlieb and B. Hodgkins, "College Student Subcultures," School Review, 1963, 71 (Autumn), pp. 266-290. Though both of these attempts seem quite successful, they arrive at somewhat contrasting results.

8. Many scholars who have studied the group substructures of campus life have emphasized the importance of on-campus residence and isolation from extra-campus influences in the development of identification with an institution. See, for example, Clark and Trow, op.cit., pp. 52-60, and Robert A. LeVine, "American College Experience as a Socializing Process", pp. 116-121, in Newcomb and Wilson, op.cit. LeVine points especially to the importance (at Bennington College) of the influences of upperclassmen as "attitudinal role models" for the lowerclassmen, an influence totally lacking, of course, in the junior college.

9. Clark and Trow in Newcomb and Wilson, op.cit., P. 53.

10. Newcomb, in "The General Nature of Peer Group Influence" (in Newcomb and Wilson, op.cit., pp. 7-10), points out that pre-college acquaintances and residential propinquity are important factors in the foundation of friendships even at residential campuses. I am suggesting that these same influences operate strongly off-campus among the commuting students, resulting instead in off-campus "identification".

11. Clark and Trow, op.cit., p. 20.

12. David Riesman, "Comment" in Newcomb and Wilson, op.cit., p.272.

13. Peter H. Rossi, "Research Strategies in Measuring Peer Group Influence", pp. 200-203; and C. R. Pace & L. Baird, "Attainment Patterns of College Subcultures", pp. 216-217 and 233-238. Both essays are in Newcomb and Wilson, op.cit.

14. It might be of interest to observe here that my "inductive" method of deriving the four subcultural types is in contrast to the more "deductive" method of Richard Peterson (op.cit.), who classifies his student respondents on the basis of their expressed identification with a brief description of one or the other of the Clark-Trow hypothetical subcultures.

15. Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1961, pp. 199-204 and 270-273.

16. Clark and Trow, op.cit., pp. 20-21.

17. Ibid. pp. 22-23.

18. These indicators of the strength of self-concept were taken from the study by R. J. Adamek and W. J. Goudy, "Identification, Sex, and Change in College Major", Sociology of Education, 39:2 (Spring, 1966), p. 188.

19. Clark and Trow, op.cit., p. 24.

20. See the debate on this and related issues in Section V of S. M. Lipset and S. S. Wolin, The Berkeley Student Revolt, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books (paperback), 1965, pp. 285 ff.

Footnotes continued.

21. Newcomb and Wilson, op.cit., viii.

22. Everett K. Wilson, "The Entering Student: Attributes and Agents of Change", pp. 72 ff., and Theodore Newcomb, "The General Nature of Peer Group Influence", p. 7; both essays are in Newcomb and Wilson, op.cit.

23. Riesman, loc.cit;; he was referring to one of the findings in Wilson, op.cit., from a study of Antioch College students.

24. Burton R. Clark, The Open Door College, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1960, Chapter V.

DIAGRAMS AND TABLES

FOR

"Toward an Empirical Typology of Junior College Student Subcultures"

Armand L. Mauss

Diablo Valley College

December, 1966

APPENDIX ONE

DISTRIBUTION OF ALL RESPONDENTS ON QUESTIONS ABOUT "ADULT" ATTITUDES

		% Giving "adult" answers (either "strongly" or "somewhat") to each statement
1.	A person should sacrifice some pleasures while he is young so that he can make something of himself in later life. . . . . (agree)	85%
2.	By and large, the things that parents and teachers expect of us are reasonable and desirable . . . . . (agree)	74%
3.	I really would rather not be in college this semester, but I was expected to enroll, so I did. . . . . (disagree).	82%
*4.	Adult society, as I experience it, is mostly insincerity and "phoniness". . . . . (disagree).	45%
*5.	College students and other young people in our society are not given enough freedom to find themselves; they are too often required to conform to what the adult community thinks is proper . . . . . (disagree).	26%
*6.	Examinations, grades, transcripts, etc., probably do more harm than good; they are artificial and should be abolished. . . . . (disagree).	40%

*Indicates those items selected for use in making up the "A-Scale", because of the relatively small likelihood of their being given an "adult" response "normally." Students giving "adult" answers on 2 or 3 of these three items were classified as "high" on the A-Scale, and those giving 0 or 1 "adult" answers were classified as "not high."

APPENDIX TWO

DISTRIBUTION OF ALL RESPONDENTS ON QUESTIONS ABOUT COMMITMENT TO IDEAS (OR "INTELLECTUALITY")

		% Giving "idea-oriented" or "intellectual" answers (either "strongly" or "somewhat") to each statement
1.	Getting an education takes more time than it should; the curriculum should be streamlined, so that serious students can get out of college and make a living. . . .	(disagree) 57%
2.	For a student majoring in engineering, it is just as worthwhile for him to have courses in history and philosophy as in math and science.	(agree) 68%
3.	Learning for its own sake is very important, even if a person can't find much practical use for some of the things he learns.	(agree) 82%
*4.	I admire my instructors more than I do most other people	(agree) 43%
*5.	The main reason for going to college is to prepare for a career that will make you a useful and successful member of the community	(disagree) 28%
*6.	I often think I would like to spend the rest of my life just reading books and learning new things	(agree) 42%

*Indicates those items selected for use in making up the "I-Scale", because of the relatively small likelihood of their being given an "intellectual" response "normally." Students giving "intellectual" or "idea-oriented" answers on 2 or 3 of these three items were classified as "high" on the I-Scale", and those giving 0 or 1 "intellectual" answers were classified as "not-high."

APPENDIX THREE

DIAGRAMS OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE TYPOLOGY

Diagram 1: A-Scale Distribution

' ot High (n=309)	High (n=153)
Zero or One "adult" response asterisked items in Appendix One.	2 or 3 "adult" responses on the three asterisked items.

Diagram 2: I-Scale Distribution

Not High (n=312)	High (n=150)
Zero or One "intellectual" response on the three asterisked items in Appendix Two.	2 or 3 "intellectual" responses on the three asterisked items.

Diagram 3: The Typology

I-Scale (Involvement with Ideas)

A-Scale (Identification with the Adult Community)		High	Not High
	High	"Academics" n=44 (9.5%)	"Vocationals" n=109 (24%)
	Not High	"Incipient Rebels" n=106 (23%)	"Perpetual Teenagers" n=203 (44%)

N=462
100%

TABLE 1: SOCIAL BACKGROUND VARIABLES

(Percentaging is downward in all cases)

	Acad. (44)	Voc. (109)	Reb. (106)	Teen (203)
N's:				
A. AGE				
18 years or less	44%	54%	44%	54%
19, 20, or 21 years	39	37	47	45
over 21 years	17	9	9	1
B. SEX				
Male	27%	53%	56%	58%
Female	73	47	44	42
C. RELIGION				
Roman Catholic	18%	31%	19%	36%
Liberal and Moderate Protestant	29	31	29	31
Conservative and Fundamentalist Protestant	25	15	9	13
Other	3	3	4	3
No formal religious affiliation	25	20	39	17
D. MONTHLY ATTENDANCE AT CHURCH SERVICES				
3 or more times	51%	46%	32%	47%
1 or 2 times	12	16	20	17
None	37	38	48	36
E. MARITAL STATUS				
Single and uninvolved	52%	51%	56%	52%
Going steady or engaged	27	36	37	43
Married	18	12	5	3
Widowed, divorced, separated	3	1	2	2
F. OCCUPATION OF FATHER				
Lower blue-collar	19%	16%	11%	13%
Upper blue-collar	27	25	22	24
Lower white-collar	11	20	15	17
Upper white-collar	43	40	39	40

TABLE 1: SOCIAL BACKGROUND VARIABLES (continued)

N's:	Acad. (44)	Voc. (109)	Reb. (106)	Teen (203)
G. EDUCATION OF FATHER				
Less than high school graduate	25%	28%	22%	19%
High school graduate	34	30	29	27
More than high school graduate	41	42	49	55
H. ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME				
$7,000 or less	25%	25%	25%	27%
Between $7,000 and $10,000	44	36	27	28
Over $10,000	32	38	47	46

TABLE II: GENERAL COLLEGE INFORMATION

(Percentaging is downward in all cases)

	Acad.	Voc.	Reb.	Teen
N's:	(44)	(109)	(106)	(203)
A. NUMBER OF COLLEGE UNITS COMPLETED				
0 - 15	55%	71%	49%	58%
16 - 29	16	6	17	13
30 or more	18	23	35	27
B. NUMBER OF UNITS CURRENTLY ATTEMPTED				
Less than 12	32%	20%	19%	15%
12 or more	68	80	81	85
C. SELF-ESTIMATES OF CURRENT COLLEGE GRADES				
Above Average (A's and B's)	77%	68%	71%	59%
Average (mostly C's)	14	15	21	22
Below Average	9	17	9	20
D. SELF-EVALUATIONS OF GRADES AS REPRESENTING ABILITY				
Grades under-represent my true ability	41%	54%	58%	70%
Grades more or less fairly represent my ability	54	45	39	29
Grades over-represent my ability	4	1	4	2
E. TRANSFER INTENTIONS				
To the University of California	14%	11%	23%	14%
To California State College	73	73	55	69
F. EVENTUAL EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS				
Less than Bachelor's Degree	8%	19%	17%	20%
Bachelor's Degree	36	36	29	43
More than Bachelor's Degree	56	45	54	37

TABLE III: USE OF TIME

(figures are percents spending 10 hours or more per week in each activity, except in the case of No. 4)

	Acad. (44)	Voc. (109)	Reb. (106)	Teen (203)
N's:				
1. Talking to friends	49%	61%	64%	59%
2. Watching television	21	51	19	24
3. Free reading	20	11	30	9
4. Going to museums, plays, concerts, etc. (4 hours per week or more)	12	7	21	9
5. Dating	14	22	29	32
6. Studying	58	59	55	44
7. Just thinking	46	32	59	41

TABLE IV: ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES

(figures are percents agreeing to statements at left, except in the case of A 3 and 4)

	N's:	Acad. (44)	Voc. (109)	Reb. (106)	Teen (203)
A.	**BELIEFS AND VALUES** (Not including items used in A-Scale or I-Scale)				
	1. A person should sacrifice some pleasures in life while young, so that he can make something of himself in later life.	84%	90%	69%	90%
	2. College experiences are more satisfying and educational when you can get to know instructors as ordinary human beings, without status barriers in the way.	50	47	73	47
	3. Getting an education takes more time than it should; the curriculum should be streamlined so that serious students can get out of college and make a living (%'s <u>dis</u>agreeing)	71	56	67	50
	4. I really would rather not be in college this semester, but I was expected to enroll, so I did. (%'s <u>dis</u>agreeing)	93	88	75	80
	5. By and large, the things that parents and teachers expect of us are reasonable and desirable.	90	81	59	75
B.	**SELF-CONCEPT ITEMS**				
	1. I often wonder where I am going in life.	64%	74%	86%	85%
	2. I often wonder who I am.	48	34	71	79
	3. I feel at ease in new situations <u>only</u> after long periods of time.	27	48	47	50
	4. I have a clear idea of my goals in college.	54	57	48	49
	5. I have definite career objectives in mind.	70	64	54	60

TABLE IV: ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES (continued)

	Acad. (44)	Voc. (109)	Reb. (106)	Teen (203)
N's:				
C. REASONS FOR COMING TO COLLEGE				
1. Pragmatic Reasons (e.g. vocational training, transfer preparation, etc.)	86%	72%	72%	71%
2. Escapist and Opportunist Reasons (e.g. to avoid military service or full-time work, to get away from home, to be with friends, etc.)	9	25	24	24
3. Unclassified reasons	5	3	4	5
D. PREFERRED RELATIONS WITH INSTRUCTORS				
1. Formal and distant	0%	4%	2%	3%
2. Informal and close	36	33	52	40
3. Formal but friendly	57	59	37	54
4. No preference	7	4	9	3

TABLE V: STUDENT EVALUATION OF VARIOUS TEACHING DEVICES

(downward percentaging totals less than 100 because of omission of "not sure" answers)

	Acad.	Voc.	Reb.	Teen
N's:	(44)	(109)	(106)	(203)
1. INSTRUCTOR				
Very helpful	64%	50%	51%	47%
Fairly helpful	29	34	33	35
Not very helpful	7	14	11	11
2. BASIC TEXTBOOK				
Very helpful	19%	18%	10%	10%
Fairly helpful	45	37	40	42
Not very helpful	27	39	42	42
3. SUPPLEMENTARY READINGS				
Very helpful	37%	13%	15%	14%
Fairly helpful	45	59	51	43
Not very helpful	13	24	27	28
4. LECTURES				
Very helpful	58%	55%	53%	46%
Fairly helpful	37	33	34	41
Not very helpful	5	7	11	12
5. SPECIAL RESEARCH PROJECTS				
Very helpful	67%	28%	45%	14%
Fairly helpful	15	36	28	29
Not very helpful	15	25	22	34
6. MULTIPLE-CHOICE TESTS				
Very helpful	27%	25%	8%	18%
Fairly helpful	45	49	39	42
Not very helpful	24	30	47	35
7. ESSAY TESTS				
Very helpful	48%	27%	38%	27%
Fairly helpful	38	46	46	46
Not very helpful	5	12	6	17
8. SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS				
Very helpful	57%	49%	48%	37%
Fairly helpful	30	23	33	42
Not very helpful	12	24	16	15