

ED 026 001

HE 000 263

By-McConnell, T. R.

The Attainment of Individuality.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Pub Date Mar 66

Note-22p.; Seminar given at the University of Minnesota to mark the 25th anniversary of the Coffman Memorial Union, March 1966.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.20

Descriptors-Academic Freedom, *Higher Education, *Individual Characteristics, *Individual Development, Institutional Environment, *Intellectual Development, *Personal Values, Student Attitudes, Student Behavior, Student Development

A commonly held assumption is that students should enter college with values and attitudes shared by their parents and, following 4 years of preparation, leave as adults with identical values and attitudes. It is becoming evident that today's students have chosen to depart from these expectations, since growing numbers of them are entering college with an already high degree of intellectual independence and social autonomy. The usually traumatic process of breaking away from paternalism and developing a personal identity would be smoother if college experiences had greater impact on students' personality characteristics and room for their interests and values. Students should be accorded an increasing degree of freedom and responsibility, accompanied by gradually decreasing supervisory guidance, in order to intelligently evaluate their values, develop self-reliance, and learn to make responsible decisions. The individuality of a student will slowly emerge when he tests his values against those of a wide variety of other individuals and groups. The university has the dual role of preparing its students scholastically and making knowledge relevant to personal development and social progress. It should provide environments which stimulate creative expression by students who determine their own standards of community behavior and deal with infractions of these standards in the classroom and on the rest of the campus. (WM)

EDU 26001

THE ATTAINMENT OF INDIVIDUALITY

(One of four seminars on "The Social Psychology of the Future State Urban Campus" given at the University of Minnesota to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Coffman Memorial Union)

T. R. McConnell

**Chairman, Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education**

University of California, Berkeley

March 1966

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION**

**THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.**

022 000 222



THE ATTAINMENT OF INDIVIDUALITY

Speaking informally some time ago to a group of college and university presidents about the underlying issues in last year's student disturbances at Berkeley, I said that I had concluded that colleges could no longer stand in loco parentis. I went on to say that, although there are many exceptions, today's students are far more mature in many ways than the students of my generation and that colleges would have to treat them more as adults than as adolescents. That means dealing with them less paternalistically, according them a much greater degree of independence than in the past, and giving them a far greater voice in determining the standards of individual behavior and communal life.

One of the university presidents interrupted to say that although some of us might assume that it was no longer one of our principal functions to stand in the place of parents, parents would continue to hold us responsible. No doubt he is correct. Parents not only expect us to supervise their sons and daughters, but also to exercise greater control over them than the parents themselves had been able to exert. This has always been true, and it is unlikely to change soon.

Basically, parents do not want their children to change. They resent having the college tamper with the values and attitudes students take to college with them. They want the values which the family and the society have inculcated in young people to be confirmed, not criticized. There are also many colleges, I might add, which do not want students to change fundamentally. Some time ago a group of faculty members in one department of a California state college -- a group which, I am sure, did not represent the faculty as a

whole -- signed a letter which said in part:

"We do not see . . . college as an island of irresponsible but articulate critics in a desert of barbarism. We believe that we must take students able to meet our admission standards and enhance their professional and occupational goals with as much of science, the humanities, and the social sciences as they economically can afford and intellectually can accommodate . . ."

These faculty members seem to agree with parents that, except for having acquired a little more knowledge of history and literature and fairly substantial occupational training, the students should leave essentially as they come.

The academic community was shocked several years ago when Jacob declared that if colleges had any impact on students, it was "to bring about general acceptance of a body of standards and attitudes characteristic of college-bred men and women in the American community. . . . No break seems to occur in the continuity of the main patterns of value 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."^{1/}

In other words, what happens to a student in college fails to touch significantly the deep and pervasive elements of his character and personality. Jacob's critics found many deficiencies in the studies he used to support his thesis and in his analysis of the data. But in the end, few could say that he had badly overstated the case. In any event, the Jacob bombshell stimulated

^{1/} Jacob, P. E., Changing Values in College. New Haven: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1956, p. 6.

several intensive investigations of the impact of college experiences on students' personality and intellectual functioning. The Research and Development Center in Higher Education at Berkeley has been conducting such studies, and by and large these investigations have confirmed Jacob's conclusions. Nevertheless, the Center has found significant exceptions to the general lack of college impact on students' interests, values, and personality characteristics, and I shall discuss some of these exceptions later.

Our general reluctance to induce change is an expression of the all too common view that college experience should provide continuity between the student's previous development and his life as an adult after college. I think it is reasonable to assume that college experience should prepare students for adult life. The question is, what kind of life? Should it be a life compatible with the values which the individual's family, his social status, and his culture have inculcated? Should it be a life which conforms to the dominant values and beliefs of society as he finds them? Should it be a life in which his personal standards are determined by his occupation and by the social groups in which he moves; or should it be a life in which he deliberately chooses his values, establishes his own standards, and chooses whether to conform to social norms or to depart from dominant social expectations?

In spite of parental pressures and popular constraints, the college experience should be basically unsettling and it should stimulate change. This is not to say that an educational institution should set out deliberately to fracture the bond between the student and his parents without helping him to find new means of security, or to demolish his value system without helping him to replace it with a better one. It is to say that college should assist the student to break his dependence on parents, to develop self-reliance, and

to earn personal freedom. The college cannot give this assistance by acting as a parental surrogate or by handing the student a ready-made community. It can offer help by giving students a very large part of the responsibility for organizing their own affairs, for setting the standards of community behavior and dealing with infractions of these standards, and by encouraging students to be intellectually independent in the classroom and on the campus. In according students an increasing degree of freedom and responsibility, a college or university will almost certainly incur popular criticism and perhaps parental censure. But the only way to enable students to attain responsible independence is, after all efforts at positive guidance have failed, to permit them to make mistakes. I spent a good deal of time as a university president saying to mothers' clubs, church groups, service clubs, and other organizations that students who enjoyed the freedoms of the University of Buffalo would from time to time almost certainly embarrass their parents and the University and draw the fire of prominent individuals or groups in the community. But I pointed out that this was the price we would all have to pay for giving students the opportunity to learn to make responsible decisions and to learn to take the consequences of unwise acts. I can assure you that an institution which believes that the individual should become increasingly autonomous has to live with no small amount of internal turmoil and external criticism.

The problem, of course, is that maturity does not come suddenly and that, in most cases, individuals and groups, in spite of their impulsive demand for full freedom now, should be given progressively greater responsibility for their own affairs with a correspondingly gradual removal of supervisory support. Let me give you an example.

As a freshman, the daughter of a friend of mine objected strenuously to a regulation requiring students to be in their residences at a certain hour on week nights. Her father asked, "Well, where do you want to go?" She replied, "I have no particular desire to go anywhere, but I simply will not be told when I am to get in." At the end of her freshman year she notified her parents that she was going to transfer to Antioch, where some of her friends had gone previously. At Antioch she lived in a residence which did not have adult supervision and in which rules were minimal. Furthermore, at Antioch rules were established and their observance controlled either by students who lived together or by the larger student community. The result was a degree of freedom well beyond that enjoyed in most colleges. The young woman in question found this environment much more congenial. She admitted, however, that many students were not mature enough to accept this freedom without abusing it, and consequently that too many quickly fell by the wayside because of academic failure or reprehensible conduct. Antioch is one of the colleges which has been studied intensively at the Berkeley Center. Our investigations of the characteristics of entering students, their adjustment and persistence, and changes in their behavior over time, have led us to conclude that without curtailing the ultimate degree of responsibility given to students for their own behavior, Antioch should provide stronger initial support for students who experience an abrupt change from parental authority to self-regulation. Sanford has emphasized the same point as follows:

"Developmental change takes place when there is a challenge -- of such a kind or intensity that the individual cannot manage by behaving just as he did before but must evolve new ways of responding. The challenge must not, however, be too severe -- beyond the adaptive capacities of the individual --

for in that case there will be a falling back upon primitive modes of adaptation.^{1/}

The effort to attain a personal identity, one of the most significant aspects of which is to sever parental controls, is often a traumatic experience for the individual student -- and, I might say, for the college or university. It may be even a more traumatic experience for the parents. It is not surprising that students, while suffering their own growing pains, often fail to realize that parents who think they are being dispossessed may be going through an even more painful experience than their offspring. College students could be generous enough to be more sympathetic with their parents. This does not mean that they should not snip the apron strings or that they should not assert their individuality. It does mean that they might do it quietly rather than histrionically. One of the immature ways of attaining maturity is to rub one's deviance, like salt, into a parent's wounds. Psychological weaning is difficult for both the elders and the young, and there is no point in unnecessarily lowering the pain threshold.

There was many a poignant human experience in the Berkeley disturbances last year, apart from the sentencing of hundreds of students by the civil court. One of these intense dramas was the subject of an interesting article in the Ladies Home Journal. The story was about a brilliant young woman, a graduate student at Berkeley, who, said the caption to the story, comes from a fine home and used to be a Young Republican, but who now has a jail record and "lives in protest against the morals and ethics of her parents and professors. A very personal story of a student's search for identity." This

^{1/} Sanford, Nevitt, "Implications for Education and for Adjustment of Curricula to Individual Students". In E. J. McGrath (Editor), Universal Higher Education: A Plan for a New Educational Pattern. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966, pp. 40-64.

is a rather pathetic account of estrangement between upper-middle-class parents and a young woman who has repudiated many of the values of her family and social class. On the one hand, the parents cannot understand how their daughter can repudiate their way of life, with its emphasis on material rewards and social status, and at the same time maintain a high personal moral integrity and a strong social idealism. On the other hand, the student apparently fails to realize how her behavior has shaken the very roots of her parents' existence, how her actions and her values have ridiculed the goals for which her parents have striven throughout their lives. I have sympathy for both the young woman and her parents. While elders may have little patience with rebellious youth, the latter might have a greater capacity for understanding than parents who have come to the age when they find it almost impossible to rebuild their lives. Youth, after all, must go its own way, but I think it can do so with forbearance and kindness.

I said that college experience should be unsettling and should lead to change. I said also, however, that the college should not set out deliberately to demolish a student's values without helping him to find new ones to replace the old. Neither do I think that faculty members, individually or collectively, should attempt to inculcate a ready-made set of values. College teachers are too prone to want to reproduce themselves. It was Professor Paton of Oxford, I think, who said that college teachers should recognize that they are not the only model for generous and intelligent youth. The only values we should take as given, the ones the college should inculcate, it seems to me, are those of the free mind and the free society. I take it, however, that the values of the free society need careful definition and that the means of attaining freedom are in considerable part still to be devised or applied.

What, then, are we to do about values? First of all, we should become aware of them. Too few of us realize that when we choose among significant personal or social behavioral alternatives, we are in fact choosing among values. We need a great deal of practice in consciously identifying the ends which our behavior serves or to which it leads. This is the first step in applying intelligence to our personal lives and our social relationships.

Having become aware of the focal considerations around which our thoughts, decisions, and actions turn, we should submit them to critical evaluation. We should test them against experience -- not only our own, but that of our associates; not only the experience of our generation, but also that of previous times; not only the experience of our class, but of other classes in society; not only the experience of our culture, but of other cultures. We should also test our values against evidence when it exists or when it can be obtained. We should test our values by their consequences to the individual and society. This does not mean that we should assume that all the values we have acquired, for the most part unconsciously, will be found wanting. I would be surprised if all middle-class values should turn out to be unworthy, or that all the characteristics of western civilization, even of capitalist societies, should prove to be humanly untenable. Where personal or social values are found wanting, we should spare no effort to replace them with those which are more human and humane, more conducive to self-actualization, more beneficial to all mankind. This constant search for what is better is necessary for stability during change.

Sanford has said that although the first task of the college is "to shake up the blind loyalties that have been generated earlier, it has to bear in mind that intellectual analysis by itself is not enough; other loyalties -- of a more flexible and differentiated sort, we may hope -- must take the place

of those that are to be given up." He went on to say: "Indeed, a college cannot effectively challenge values that are supported by family, group, or community loyalties unless it can set in opposition to them loyalty to itself and its purposes. More than this, critical analysis of society, leading to the discovery that our most imposing institutions have faults and that highly placed individuals have weaknesses, can easily lead to cynicism, rebellion, or alienation from society. To keep these tendencies within bounds the college must embody within itself some worthy social purposes, and include among its faculty and administration some suitable models of mature social responsibility."^{1/}

In dealing with personal and social values, intellectuality is not enough, but it is imperative. Let me quote Sanford again:

"Far from being unintellectual or unscientific, these problems make the greatest demand on the intellect and on any science that attempts to understand human behavior as it is found in nature. If one approaches a human or social problem with a view to doing something about it he will soon discover that this problem exists in a context of processes, that to understand it he has to become familiar with multiple complex determinants, and that to take action affecting it he has to consider a range of possible consequences."^{2/}

One of the underlying issues in the Berkeley disturbances was over the place of social action in a university. Students in the so-called Free Speech Movement condemned the University for its irrelevance, either to the individual and his concerns; to the disadvantaged groups in their struggle for a better life; or to a society which still denies full freedom, which still uses force to bend others to its will, and which administers justice unevenly. It was

1/ Sanford, Nevitt. Ibid.

2/ Sanford, Nevitt. Ibid.

the more conservative Associated Students of the University of California that resolved in October 1964 as follows:

"Properly, a central goal of this institution should be to prepare students for emergence into our society as active citizens -- people with something to contribute to the perpetual effort to perfect our way of life. It is our conviction that the University can only mold this kind of citizen by providing for him the opportunity to act upon his convictions, to apply his classroom thought to the laboratory of political activity. To do less, to content itself with armchair analysis of political movements and social problems, the University fails in fulfilling its educational responsibility."^{1/}

There is a strongly negative aspect of today's student rebellion against social values and social institutions. In spite of the fact that many students have committed themselves to the cause of civil rights and have courageously participated in protests against injustice to Negroes in the South, taught in freedom schools, and helped Negroes register, they have often failed to realize that the problem of extending full citizenship and self-realization to Negroes is an extremely complicated one. One of the graduate research assistants at the Center, a highly committed member of the Free Speech Movement, taught last summer at a southern Negro college where he learned a great deal at first hand about the limitations which discrimination and injustice had visited on the present generation of Negroes. The student returned with a new realization of the educational and cultural obstacles to greater social and economic opportunities for this disadvantaged group. Whatever their limitations, however, the Negro people will demand a greater

^{1/} Quoted in Lunsford, T. F., The "Free Speech" Crises at Berkeley, 1964-65: Some Issues for Social and Legal Research. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1966, p. 94 (mimeographed).

share in society's material benefits. To devise means of overcoming educational and cultural deprivation to the fullest possible degree, but at the same time to lead the present Negro generation to adjust its expectations to a reasonable level of realization, will challenge the scholarship of educators, economists, sociologists, psychologists, and anthropologists. This is a case in which social action must be informed and guided by intellectual analysis. It is this intellectual analysis which universities are peculiarly equipped and responsible to provide.

The primary function of a university is intellectual. If it becomes preoccupied with social action, it is almost certain to compromise or, for all practical purposes, to abandon its primary responsibility. The university, of course, has a dual obligation. It has a responsibility for advancing and systematizing knowledge. Its business is to develop scholarly disciplines in the natural sciences, the social sciences, the humanities, and the arts. But it also has a responsibility for bringing the knowledge and methods of investigation of these disciplines to bear on human and social problems. In the last analysis, learning must be relevant to personal development and social progress. For this reason scholarship cannot be abstracted from values. The furtherance of scholarly disciplines is itself based upon values, and the application of intelligence to human life invariably raises questions of worth and significance.

The problem we face is to subject emotion to reason and to couple intellectual solutions with emotion and commitment. We should break down the intellectual wall between the university and the market place, between the university and the community, between the discipline and the man, between the curricular and the extracurricular, between the classroom and the remainder of students' life in the institution.

Reconciling intellect and emotion, reason and feeling, is one means by which an individual determines his identity. In coming to understand himself and to locate himself in relation to other persons, to a wide variety of groups, and to the major social currents of his time, the individual should attain a higher degree of autonomy and a fuller measure of individuality. Individuality is the product of wide social experience. Identifying one's self with a single group such as a sorority or a fraternity, or associating almost always with people who possess common interests and a well-protected body of ideas and beliefs, is conducive to conformity rather than autonomy and to socialization rather than individuality. Anastasi has explained how individuality is the product of wide social experience. She wrote:

"The key to this problem seems to lie in the multiplicity of overlapping groups with which the individual may be behaviorally identified. The number of such groups is so great that the specific combination is unique for each individual. Not only does this furnish a stimulative basis for the existence of wide individual differences, but it also suggests a mechanism whereby the individual may 'rise above' his group. There are many examples of individuals who have broken away from the customs and the traditional ways of acting of their group. Through such situations, modifications of the group itself may also be effected.

"In these cases the individual is not reacting contrary to his past experience, as might at first appear. . . . His behavior is the result of psychological membership in various conflicting groups. Many group memberships can exist side by side in a composite behavioral adjustment. But in certain cases two or more groups may foster different ways of reacting to the same situation. This enables the individual to become aware of the arbitrariness

of the restrictions and traditions of each group, to evaluate them critically, and to regard them more 'objectively'. Membership in many diverse groups frees the individual from the intellectual and other limitations of each group and makes possible the fullest development of 'individuality'.^{1/}

The attainment of autonomy and individuality also requires a degree of detachment, or at any rate the ability to disengage oneself if he chooses from a particular group or set of associates. This detachment enables a person to test his values against those of other individuals and groups, and to test their values against a wider social horizon and a broader social experience. A degree of detachment enables an individual to choose to commit himself to certain group values and goals instead of being drawn in unknowingly and accepting the group's ideas, values, and acts uncritically. I was glad to find that one of the most committed members of the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley was well aware of the charisma of one of its principal leaders and the organizational skill of another. Speaking of the latter, he said, "No one in the movement is so capable of maintaining order in a meeting attended by a large number of articulate and vocal rebels and of organizing their responses toward a clearly held purpose." Then he added, "And he was so successful in organizing us that he used us to his ends when we should have been using him to ours." This perception was the beginning of social wisdom.

The ability to stand back, so to speak, and to look at oneself and the social world around him "objectively" is an example of what Maslow meant when he wrote, "Self-actualizing people . . . get along with the culture in various ways, but of all of them it may be said that in a certain profound and

^{1/} Anastasi, Anne, Differential Psychology. New York: Macmillan, 1958, pp. 6-8.

meaningful sense they resist enculturation and maintain a certain inner detachment from the culture in which they are immersed."^{1/}

Individuality need not lead to excessive individualism, social indifference, or social alienation. As Maslow also said:

"A paradox seems to be created at first sight by the fact that self-actualizing people maintain a degree of individuality, of detachment, and autonomy, that seems at first glance to be incompatible with the kind of identification and love that I have been describing above. But this is only an apparent paradox. As we have seen, the tendencies to detachment and to need identification and the profound interrelationships with another person can coexist in healthy people. The fact is that self-actualizing people are simultaneously the most individualistic and the most altruistic and social and loving of all human beings."^{2/}

The development of autonomy is one of the characteristics of personality in which the Berkeley Center has been especially interested. We have found that some students have acquired a high degree of intellectual independence and social autonomy by the time they enter college. These people are much more disposed to flexibility and change, much more interested in the world of ideas and abstractions, and more theoretically and esthetically oriented than the great body of college freshmen. The great mass of students is less open to change, less serious, less independent, less flexible, less tolerant of ambiguity or lack of certainty, less committed intellectually, than the other group. What is true of differences within a single institution may be true, also, among particular institutions or groups of institutions.

^{1/} Maslow, A. H., Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper, 1954, p. 224.

^{2/} Maslow, A. H. Ibid. p. 256.

One of my associates, himself a Catholic, has been interested in why American Catholic colleges successfully produce business men, nurses, teachers, engineers, physicians, and lawyers, but have not turned out their share of scholars and intellectuals. First of all, he compared the intellectual dispositions of students who attended five Catholic colleges, which he did not claim to be representative of the nation's Catholic institutions, with students who entered a large state college and with those who attended some of the well-known independent and Protestant colleges. He summarized the comparison as follows:

"With the exception of the state college Catholics . . . the Catholic college students appeared the least intellectual in attitude regardless of the comparison group. That is to say, they show the least interest in ideas, in critical and scientific thinking, in intellectual inquiry, and in esthetic matters. They indicate the most dogmatism, intolerance, and general authoritarianism. Catholics at the public university score higher on these scales (i.e., in the direction of non-authoritarianism) than Catholic college students, but generally not as high as their non-Catholic classmates. Moreover . . . the Catholic college students show the least interest in cultural, intellectual, and creative activities as manifested by their reading and other leisure activities. The comparative lack of intellectual attitudes . . . by these seniors who by self-report may be considered potential graduate students, matched against other beginning graduate students, may be suggestive of the reason why even those Catholic college graduates who have obtained higher degrees have been found to be underrepresented in the community of scholarship . . . ^{1/} I am certain that these findings could also be duplicated in certain other denominational colleges.

^{1/} Trent, J. W., "Dimensions of Intellectual Productivity Among Sectarian and Non-Sectarian College Students". Unpublished paper presented at the annual convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, March 26, 1964.

Dr. Paul Heist of the Center has shown that there are striking differences on measures of intellectuality and autonomy among freshmen in three academically selected colleges. The measure of intellectuality was based on scales measuring an interest in abstract ideas and in ideas for their own sake, and another measuring esthetic interest and orientation. He found that 76 percent of the freshmen in college B, but only 35 and 37 percent of those in colleges A and C, were above the average of freshmen scores in a large number of diverse institutions. He also found that 96 percent of the students in college B were above the norm on the autonomy scale, in contrast to 59 percent and 16 percent in colleges A and C respectively.

More important than their status at entrance, perhaps, is the extent to which students change over the college years in intellectuality and autonomy. Trent compared changes between freshman and senior years on the part of students in five Catholic colleges and more than 1500 students attending a number of public, private, and church-related colleges. On a scale presumably measuring a general readiness to express impulses, a propensity for active imagination, a tendency to value sensual reactions and to seek gratification either in conscious thought or in overt action, he found that in all colleges the seniors scored higher on this scale than they did as freshmen, with the sole exception of the Catholic college students, who scored lower than they did as freshmen. That is to say, the Catholic students changed in the direction of greater acquiescence and more restricted and uncreative behavior; in a word, toward greater docility.

Heist has coordinated an intensive investigation of student change and institutional impact in eight diverse educational institutions. Today I can give you only a few of the results of this study.

First, students as groups changed significantly in certain attitudes, values, interests, and other personality characteristics in some of the colleges. Some groups changed in spite of the fact that they had high scores as freshmen on measures of intellectuality and autonomy. However, group change may disguise a vast amount of information on what happens to individuals. Individual changes were by no means all in the same direction. Some students were more theoretically and esthetically oriented as seniors than they were as freshmen. Others exhibited no change. A minority changed in the direction of less interest in ideas or in esthetic matters.

Second, the proportion of students who changed differed significantly among the three small independent, highly selective, academically distinguished liberal arts colleges. A greater proportion of students changed in one of these colleges than in any of the other seven institutions in the study. This college is perhaps the most distinctive in character and program among the eight institutions. It has a work-study program in which students alternate periods of formal study on campus with periods of employment, for the most part in other communities scattered across the United States. It is a college which is committed to community government, involving students, faculty, and administrative officers. Students are given a very large degree of responsibility for managing their own affairs and for setting standards of individual and group conduct. They participate with faculty members and administrative officers in recommending faculty appointments and promotions, and in making the college budget. The entire college community has a strong bias toward social action. The president of this college has taken the position that the intellectual investigation of social issues is insufficient to vitalize students' educational experiences, and that the college as an institution should play an

active role in the application of intelligence to social institutions and human relationships. This college president seems to take the position that intellectual activity is sterile unless it is carried over into the life of man. But do not conclude that this college neglects the intellect. It has set increasingly rigorous standards of scholarship and it puts a premium on ideas. The evidence from our study is that it leaves its mark on many of its students.

At some of the institutions our staff has identified a fascinating group of intellectual nonconformists. Heist has pointed out that these students are strongly inclined toward autonomy in their thinking, independent in their relationships to other individuals and to social institutions, unusually curious intellectually, and often critically oriented toward their environment. Sometimes their striving for autonomy is coupled with rebellion and aggression. Some of them may be unable to discipline their impulses or to channel their behavior toward constructive purposes. Those who do attain self-discipline, however, have the potentiality for unusual intellectual accomplishment. Not a few of these students have the earmarks of creativity as well as the stamp of intellectuality. Unfortunately, many of the nonconformists, especially the potentially creative ones, tend not to complete four years in the selective colleges which they first enter. The majority of those who drop out drift on to other institutions, frequently the large universities, in an attempt to find a more hospitable environment. But many of those who leave or transfer never complete four years of college. Heist has pointed out that some who never earn a degree are already learners for life, and a diploma may be an unessential goal for them. He has also concluded that the colleges usually do little to encourage creative expression and the full use of intellectual talent on the part of those who do finish four years. Apparently none of the eight institutions we have been studying intensively really succeeds either in

understanding the promising nonconforming, potentially creative individuals, or in providing an environment in which their gifts will flower. This is most apparent in the arts, but it is also true in science. Heist has found that both the very selective liberal arts colleges and some of the most distinguished scientific institutions lose more creative youth than they educate.

In contrast to the college in which a large number of students changed in the direction of greater immersion in the world of ideas, there were two colleges which seemed not to have significantly either touched students' intellectual interests, or liberalized their religious attitudes and values. There was a tendency for students in these colleges to become somewhat, but not strikingly, more autonomous. In other words, these are among the institutions which do not reach the wellsprings of human behavior, which neither intellectualize nor humanize their students nor make them freer and less constricted in their thinking and in their relationships to other people, nor much more autonomous and independent of external supports or social norms. Whatever knowledge or skill these students may have attained, their development as persons has been arrested and future growth in fullness of personality seems unlikely.

I referred earlier to Maslow's findings that there is no incompatibility between individuality or autonomy and social commitment. This conclusion seems to have been confirmed by a study of the characteristics of students who participated in the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley. Heist's study of the social and educational background, the personal characteristics, and the academic performance of these students led him to characterize them as a collection of unusual people who deviate from most college student norms and from the Berkeley student body in general. As a group the FSM students were unusual in their concern about social problems and political issues, their

intellectual awareness and need to be actively involved in academic matters,^{1/} and their exciting potential for scholarship and creative expression.

Coupled with their intellectuality was a high degree of autonomy, impulsivity, and religious liberalism. Their profile on the Omnibus Personality Inventory, a research instrument developed at the Center, indicates, in Heist's words, ". . . a higher level of cultural sophistication, a greater release from the institutional influences of the past, and a greater openness and readiness to explore the world of knowledge and ideas."^{2/}

How unfortunate it was that the faculty and administration had not recognized the intellectual and social potential of these students, and had not engaged them, long before the disturbances of 1964-65, in an intellectual discussion of social issues and movements, and in fruitful dialog about educational vitality at Berkeley. How unhappy, too, when the disturbances began, was the failure -- in which students, faculty, and administrative officers must share the blame -- to work together for a productive solution to the breakdown of the campus community. The students possessed the elements of greatness as young, perceptive adults -- a deep social commitment, intellectual interests, a propensity for theoretical analysis and for esthetic response, intellectual independence, courage to stand against tradition and social norms when they seemed insufficient or immoral. (These attributes, of course, do not guarantee that the students' motivations were always worthy, their actions wise, or their efforts constructive.) Could not these characteristics have been capitalized by a sensitive administration? There are, it is true, positive outcomes of the

^{1/} Heist, Paul, "Intellect and Commitment: The Faces of Discontent." Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1966 (mimeographed edited version of an article in Order and Freedom on the Campus, O. A. Knorr and W. J. Minter, editors, Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965.)

^{2/} Heist, Paul. Ibid.

student revolt: a faculty committee has proposed a modest program of educational reform; the decentralization of authority from Regents to president to chief campus administrative officers has been accelerated; a new cooperative body composed of students, faculty members, and administrative officers is considering campus rules; due process in student discipline is being established; and so on. But, without going into details, let me assert that the cost of this progress has been inordinately high. It is a cost much of which could have been avoided. I am a faculty member, and I ask myself what, with my colleagues, I might have done. Perhaps I have found the answer in a paragraph by the Dean of Antioch College:

"Teaching through responsibility-giving requires a great deal of emotional commitment and commitment of sheer time and faculty energies. It would be irresponsible of the faculty to bestow freedoms upon students and then wash their hands of matters. The faculty must deliberate with students about the use of their freedom. Student leaders who wish their freedom to continue and to grow will be obliged to interpret this situation at length to their peers: freedoms always have limits; in the long run the range of responsibilities, and thus of freedom, is expanded only if we observe limits and work effectively to fulfill responsibilities within them."^{1/}

^{1/} Keeton, M. T., "Crazy Like Parents". Antioch Notes, Vol. 42, No. 4, January 1965.