

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 625

CG 006 012

AUTHOR Berdie, Ralph; And Others  
TITLE Urbanization and the College Student. Social Psychology of the Future State Metropolitan Campus.  
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis.  
PUB DATE Sep 66  
NOTE 79p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$4.05  
DESCRIPTORS \*College Environment, \*College Students, Program Development, \*Relevance (Education), Research Needs, Self Actualization, Student Adjustment, \*Student Characteristics, Student Interests, Student Needs, Student Participation, University Administration, Urban Environment, \*Urban Universities

ABSTRACT

It is assumed that a greater understanding of the complex interrelationship between the individual student and his environment will result in more intelligent and effective use of institutional resources in total educational programing. The first of four articles calls for increased research on students because it is felt that the adequacy of institutional programs depends on the extent they conform to students' abilities, achievements, socioeconomic backgrounds, cultural and vocational interests, values, and expectations. The second article discusses the growing pluralism in American universities and suggests that an understanding of the developmental processes of students will provide a basis for the development within the institution of a multiplicity of educational environments which will enable students to find educational conditions best suited to their potential and intellectual aspirations. The third article is concerned with the student's attainment of a personal identity and proposes that colleges should assist the student in breaking his dependency on parents, developing self reliance, and gaining personal freedom and individuality. The last paper focuses on students' strong reaction to bureaucratic universities and suggests ways to make college more personal. (RSM)

EDO 39625

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.



In Commemoration of the 25th Anniversary of Coffman Memorial Union

# Urbanization and the College Student

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF THE FUTURE STATE METROPOLITAN CAMPUS

SPRING 1966

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Minneapolis, Minnesota

CG 006012

## BOARD OF REGENTS

Honorable Daniel C. Gainey	Honorable Lester A. Malkerson
Honorable Bjarne E. Grotum	Honorable Charles W. Mayo, M.D.
Honorable Albert V. Hartl	Honorable William K. Montague
Honorable Robert E. Hess	Honorable George W. Rauenhorst
Honorable Marjorie J. Howard	Honorable Otto A. Silha
Honorable Fred J. Hughes	Honorable Herman F. Skyberg

## ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

*President—O. Meredith Wilson*

*Vice President of Academic Administration—William G. Shepherd*

*Vice President of Business Administration—Lawrence R. Lunden*

*Vice President for Educational Relationships and Development—  
Stanley J. Wenberg*

## 1966 UNION BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Robbie Engelmann	Charlotte Weber
Sheldon Gulinson	Robert Weinhagen
Irene Hadley	Bruce Wilson
Eric Hucke	Mr. N. L. Bentson
Penny Kelly	Dr. Mary Corcoran
Bob Kofski	Dr. James Holte
Ilse Vinson	Mr. Tracy Page
Vince Wagner	Mr. Gordon Starr
Mary Watson	Dr. Donald Zander

ED0 39625

**URBANIZATION AND THE COLLEGE STUDENT**  
The Social Psychology of the Future State  
Metropolitan Campus

A Series of Four Seminars Presented at the  
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, in com-  
memoration of the 25th Anniversary of Coff-  
man Memorial Union.

Spring, 1966

## PREFACE

For the 18,574 students entering or returning to the University of Minnesota in the fall quarter of 1942, the spacious corridors, comfortable lounges, handy committee rooms, and inviting recreational areas of the newly opened Coffman Memorial Union offered untold promise. Planning for its use was keyed to the social-cultural-recreational needs of the campus. Its role included program initiation, coordination with the activities of some 300 other student organizations, and service as a physical setting for a major proportion of student activities outside the classroom.

Twenty-five years later, in a vastly altered environment, with much of the sheen of its original appointments removed by the press and flow of ever larger student generations, the Coffman Union Board of Governors moved to celebrate its first quarter century of service.

"In-house" activities looked back over time, and a year-long program of reminiscence capped by programs giving recognition and appreciation for services rendered was capably organized and presented under the direction of the then-current membership of the Union Board.

But what of the future? The committee charged with developing an appropriate anniversary celebration felt the need to reexamine the assumptions upon which student service programs are based, in the light of major enrollment increases and a much more mobile, more sophisticated student population.

The program committee, chaired by Dean of Students E. G. Williamson, proposed a seminar series focused on the student in the urban university setting. The committee moved beyond the more specific questions relating to the use of the Student Union in the campus of the future, and sought to introduce discussion relating to the individual student and his environment, assuming that out of greater understanding of this complex interrelationship would come more intelligent and effective use of institutional resources in total educational programming.

Four distinguished educators were asked to explore certain basic questions through comments followed by informal discussion with audiences of student leaders and interested members of the faculty and administration. The sessions, held in the late afternoon hours and continuing through dinner and after-dinner discussion in the St. Paul Campus Student Center, were vital and alive. Participants

saw the need for greater understanding as a necessary first step in program projection. The sharing of responsibilities and concerns have contributed to a spirit of cooperative effort in looking to the University's future.

The Coffman Memorial Union Board of Governors provided financial support to this undertaking. The remarks of the seminar leaders, so directly concerned with the social psychology of the future state metropolitan campus, follow. In initial presentation they sparked excellent discussion and led to further inquiry among the seminar participants. Their comments deserve wider distribution, and the committee is appreciative of the Union Board's interest in making this possible.

Keith McFarland

University of Minnesota  
September 1966



## CONTENTS

- Characteristics of Students Today**..... 1  
Dr. Ralph Berdie – University of Minnesota,  
Minneapolis.
- The Patterning of Students in Their Group Relationships** ..... 19  
Dr. Donald R. Brown, – University of Michigan,  
Ann Arbor.
- The Attainment of Individuality: Impact of College on Students** ..... 35  
Dr. T.R. McConnell – University of California,  
Berkeley.
- The University can be a Personal Place** ..... 51  
Dr. Earl A. Koile – University of Texas,  
Austin.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS TODAY\*

Ralph F. Berdie  
Director, Studies of Student Life  
Office of the Dean of Students,  
University of Minnesota

The following statements about University students are accepted by many persons as facts:

Students today are not as carefully selected intellectually as were students in past decades.

Students today are better prepared for college than were students yesterday.

Students today have a good idea of why they are in college.

Students today have no values.

Most college students at some time or another in their academic careers are involved in cheating.

Most college students essentially are honest.

A few years after college most students have forgotten a large part of the information they acquired, but they have retained the broad principles and generalizations learned in college.

College experiences change the attitudes and values of students.

College has little impact on students.

Students' academic success can be predicted accurately.

Moral values of students today are different from those of yesterday's students.

All students who are strongly motivated and who possess a high order of general intellectual ability or academic aptitude can master the fundamentals in communications, English and foreign languages, mathematics, humanities, and the social, behavioral, and natural sciences.

---

\*Presented at a Series of Seminars on the Social Psychology of the Future State Urban Campus, The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, February 10, 1966.



Employment of students on outside jobs is not detrimental if the number of hours of employment is limited.

Lectures and textbooks provide the most effective vehicles of instruction in college.

My purpose in listing these presumed facts is obvious. We simply do not know whether or not these statements are true. For the most part, generalizations about college students are based on opinion or folklore, and occasionally on observations of small and selected groups of students, usually at one or a few institutions during a restricted period of time. We have some reason to believe that the attitudes of students at Vassar a few years ago were changed while they attended college (Sanford, 1962), and we have some evidence that suggests that the attitudes of University of Minnesota students a few decades ago were not changed while attending college (Pace, 1941). One review of available research concludes that college has very little impact on students' personality (Jacob, 1957), and another review provides a somewhat contradictory conclusion (Eddy, 1959). The most comprehensive effort to describe American colleges, the volume edited by Sanford (1962), contains as much information about the college student as can be found in the literature, but even in this volume the little information about students that is presented is exceeded by far by the number of hypotheses and speculations about students.

#### HOW HAVE STUDENTS CHANGED?

Let us look for a minute at some of the ideas about college students that have received attention recently. Only a decade ago much discussion was devoted to the apathy of American college students. Stories were current that graduates, when seeking employment, were concerned mainly with security and such things as retirement plans, vacation schedules, and guaranteed incomes. Incidentally, the study of high school seniors in 1961 provided evidence strongly supporting the conclusion that high school graduates of that time in Minnesota were not security ridden. (Berdie & Hood, 1965) The stereotype of the apathetic student has been replaced during the past couple of years by the stereotype of the committed or involved student. Books have been written, mainly stimulated by the Berkeley incident, describing the unrest and agitation among college students today. Much of the evidence concerning these stereotypes, whether they involve the apathetic or the rebellious student, is based on impressions such as are reported in the recently published book, Ferment on Campus (Mallery, 1966). A number of students, they may be a few or they may be many, do and say certain things that create impressions, often in the minds of

journalists and other writers, and these impressions tend to be regarded as reality, regardless of the number or proportion of students involved.

A decade ago, were students apathetic, or were they not very much interested in many things that student leaders or faculty members thought ought to interest students? Today, are students rebellious or are there a few students who have discovered ways of obtaining much attention and arousing certain group reactions that lead to the impression of rebellion?

Perhaps instead of interviews with selected students we need data from representative samples of different populations and generations of students to tell us something about their attitudes and expectations in terms of their reactions to the status quo.

Similarly, discussion has been devoted to the morality of college students, particularly as it concerns cheating and sex behavior. Almost without question we accept the statement that morality on the campus has changed. We have little evidence concerning the changes that might have occurred in student behavior, even verbal behavior. Some students can be found who speak differently today than did students a few decades ago but we have some reason to be skeptical about even this extreme statement.

We assume that students are under more pressure and strain today than they were decades ago. We call it stress now. We simply do not know. Members of the staff of the Student Counseling Bureau hope to compare the personality inventory scores of students currently entering the University with scores of those who entered a decade ago and this information will tell us something.

What I am trying to say here is that we frequently speak as if we knew much about students but usually this information is based on rather casual experiences with selected individuals or groups of students and more often, on reports from other persons who speak quite authoritatively on the basis of experiences perhaps no more valid than our own. There are many things we do not know.

#### THE NEED FOR MORE INFORMATION

With almost six million students in about 2,000 colleges in the United States, why do we have so little valid information about either the person or the process in higher education? The literature, and the supporting evidence, regarding administrative organization, building planning and needs,

enrollment prediction, and financial administration are vast when compared to the body of knowledge concerning the student, his experiences, and his curricula. No paucity of literature exists here, merely a lack of evidence, data, and information.

Who should be in college? Who are college students? What are their goals? Where do they come from? What are colleges attempting to do with these students? How effectively are these goals being accomplished? What determines the differential reactions of students to college experiences? How can the efforts of both students and colleges be better planned to achieve the desired objectives?

Obviously, we need much information about college students. The major problems we face are to identify the significant questions and to use research as a strategy in making decisions. Our ability to develop methods for answering questions has been well demonstrated. Our ability to identify and define the crucial questions, however, is still undetermined.

In Minnesota, many individuals and groups constantly are making decisions about higher education. The public at large has questions about higher education. The state legislature devotes much time and money to problems of education and constantly this group faces questions. The governing boards of colleges and universities, our Board of Regents, week-by-week are making policies in answer to questions about students. The University administration, the faculty, and the students themselves must make decisions concerning policy, procedures, and specific actions that depend on assumptions and information about students.

Decisions in the University of Minnesota, like decisions in all other colleges, touch on the purposes of the institution, the selection and admission of students, the classification of students admitted, the development of curriculums, the instructional program, and all of the extra-classroom instructional programs involved in counseling, advising, activities, religious programs, student government, student unions, and student centers. In addition, decisions constantly are made about student services including housing, financial aid, recreation, and student health.

The University of Minnesota has been fortunate in having more information available about its students than do most other institutions. One realizes, however, the importance and relevance of our limited information when one considers the significant decisions that have been made in this University within the past decade. Let us look at those that come



to mind first.

The decision was made to expand the University by developing the west bank of the Mississippi River, a new campus at Duluth, a new campus at Morris, and most recently, a new campus at Crookston. A new library is being developed on the west river bank and new kinds of facilities and services planned for that library. The admissions requirements in the University have been altered, and only last year the minimum requirement for admission in the Arts College was raised. The liberal arts requirements in the total University are being reviewed and certain decisions already have been made concerning the educational background expected of all graduates. Decisions have been made regarding language requirements in the Arts College and mathematics requirements in several colleges. A decision recently was announced to abolish the undergraduate minor in the Arts College. Tuition increases were effected several times during the past decade. Dormitory expansion has proceeded and further expansion is planned with new types of buildings. A program of developing parking facilities has been adopted. The regulations pertaining to the hours of women students have been changed and the requirements that older students live in University approved housing have been relaxed. The University has actively participated in the NDEA Loan Program, the Work-Study Program, and the American College Testing Program. The Arts College has been reorganized, new colleges have been established, and departments have been transferred from one college to another.

All of these decisions and changes provide evidence that the University of Minnesota is a viable, growing, and developing institution. These decisions show acuity on the part of the board, the administration, and the faculty regarding developments and problems in the University. The University is not a static place and many changes have been made.

Some of these decisions were made by the state legislature, strongly influenced by various segments of the public, some were made by the Board of Regents, some by the administration, some by the faculty, and perhaps some by the students. Prior to each decision, relevant questions were identified and discussed and available information reviewed. In some cases, studies were undertaken to gather information and various arguments and alternatives carefully considered.

In many instances, the quality of the decision must depend on the information available and all too often in higher education, such evidence simply is not at hand. Let us consider just for a minute some of the questions that, at the

time of a decision, were difficult or perhaps even impossible to answer, where the answers might have improved the quality of the decision.

For example, how do changes in the occupational choices of students over recent years relate to the colleges and departments in which students will be registered in coming years and how will this influence the traffic pattern on campus? Where do students study and how many hours a week do they study in various places? What are the preferences of students for places to study and what are the characteristics of effective study locales? Do students more easily come to and more effectively utilize small, localized, and specialized library units or more comprehensive and larger units?

To what extent do required liberal arts courses actually influence students? Are students who have completed the credit requirements in specified courses, particularly liberal arts courses, better educated than students who have not, in terms of their later reading habits, cultural appreciations, store of information, and intellectual and community activities?

To what extent is there a relationship between the amount of time or number of credits completed in a foreign language and language fluency, taking into account the verbal facility of the student prior to instruction? What determines the persistence of foreign language skills after a student has completed formal instruction?

The same types of questions can be directed toward mathematics or other specific courses. Related relevant questions include, How is student learning and persistence of learning related to incentive? Do students learn faster and retain longer as a result of taking courses they have selected as opposed to courses required by the college? What are the subsequent post-college careers of students who have completed course work distributed over many departments and students who have restricted course work to a few? How do students obtain funds for their college expenses? To what extent do activities related to the obtaining of funds, particularly employment, interfere with the attainment of the primary objectives of the University?

What conditions in a student residence unit influence effective study methods? What are the effects in student residence units of roommate patterns? To what extent do study rooms in student residences contribute to effective learning? What are the influences of residence counselors competent in the special areas in which students are studying? What are relationships between instructors' attitudes

toward students, the college, the curriculum, and their own specialties, and student attitude, progress, and success?

All of these questions fall under the most general question of, "What are the changes that occur in students while they are in college and what influences these changes?"

I have made this rather lengthy introduction on the assumption that all of us agree that more information about students is needed and my purpose has been to focus on why we need this information and to suggest some of the questions we wish to answer.

#### RECENT RESEARCH

Comprehensive and well-designed and conducted studies of college students have been rare. Back in the 1930's Learned and Wood (1938), using standardized ability and achievement tests, provided some of the early striking evidence regarding the diversity of college students within a single state. They reported, for example, that one-fourth of their college seniors made scores that were below those of the average college sophomore and that ten per cent of college seniors had scores below those of the average high school senior. Large differences were demonstrated both within and between colleges and in every instance when group comparisons revealed mean differences, at the same time extensive overlapping was present.

Newcomb's (1943) well known study of Bennington students, although it did not provide much of a basis for generalization, did provide a model for such research and demonstrated that the college student was a possible laboratory specimen. Later than Newcomb, Sanford and his colleagues (1962) demonstrated at Vassar that systematic changes could be identified in cohorts of students and that these observed changes provided greater understanding of both student development and the educational process.

Both Darley (1962) and Iffert (1957) reported information on broader samplings of University students and provided needed information concerning student characteristics. Iffert's study provided a comprehensive picture of student persistence in the United States and raised the possibility of the colleges revising their thinking so that the finished product was not only a student who completed the four years required for a baccalaureate but that the large number of students attending college for one, two, or three years also were products of higher education and should not be regarded necessarily by the colleges as waste or academic casualties.



Darley's report provided additional evidence concerning the diversity within American higher education and at the same time provided descriptions of the flow of students within and between institutions. Although his data do not support the conclusion that for every type of student there is a college, certainly they do reveal that for many, many types of students there are many, many colleges.

The work of Holland and Astin (1961), at first at the National Merit Scholarship Foundation, and the later work of Holland (1964) and his colleagues at the American College Testing Program, provide additional information regarding large segments of the American college population. The National Merit Foundation research for the most part was directed toward extremely high ability students planning to attend or actually attending college. The ACT research has dealt with what is a more representative sample of college students. Again, this research reveals the diversity among college students, and this diversity extends from ability and academic achievement to all kinds of personal and social characteristics.

Pace, Stern, and others (1958), in their development of instruments to appraise college and student characteristics, have provided considerable information concerning students and institutions. Mainly these studies have demonstrated differences in student perceptions and expectations and revealed that these differences can be viewed systematically and make considerable sense.

Before looking at a more intensive picture of students at the University of Minnesota, what does all of this available research reveal to us about the American college student. Here are some generalizations that we can accept as based on at least fairly good evidence:

1. Most American college students begin their college careers within the year following high school graduation.
2. Slightly over one-half of college freshmen eventually graduate from college.
3. The typical college graduate requires more than four years to obtain his degree.
4. Colleges differ widely in terms of their average students, considering ability, academic achievement, socio-economic background, and personality and interest factors.

5. Even for colleges which have widely different averages, considerable overlap usually is found and in most colleges having low averages, some students will be found who are considerably higher than the average student in other colleges.
6. Fewer than one-half of college freshmen who graduate remain in and graduate from the curriculum or vocational specialty they selected upon entrance.
7. Observable changes in values and attitudes resulting from college experiences are not great for a large proportion of college students.

These generalizations are most significant because of how few they are and how little they actually tell us about the American college student.

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA STUDENTS

Rather than attempting to catalog the known information about University of Minnesota students, I would prefer to select a few of the dimensions open to us and discuss the relevance of these, the implications these have for the University and decisions pertaining to higher education. A few years ago, at our Little Falls Conference, a more comprehensive description was assembled of Minnesota students and only a month ago, in the Student Counseling Bureau Newsletter, a summary description was reported of many aspects of the entering freshman class (Berdie, 1966). Much of the information we do have about students reminds one of the game in which one first identifies an answer and then searches for a question appropriate for that answer. We know much about our Minnesota students, but sometimes we are embarrassed in our attempts to determine in what way our knowledge makes any difference in operating the University. This afternoon I will attempt to direct myself to this latter question.

#### DIVERSITY AMONG STUDENTS

The first systematic studies of University of Minnesota students, those done by Dean Johnston about the time of the First World War, revealed what has continued to be the most obvious and significant datum about our student population. Students differ from one another in many ways and these differences are large and have educational relevance. Some students have much more scholastic aptitude than do others; some have better study habits; some work harder than do

others; and some work more effectively than do others. Individual differences among students are found physically, mentally, socially, economically, and emotionally. Students come to the University with different vocational objectives, expectations, perceptions, problems, and needs.

These differences are so extensive and involve so many dimensions that students cannot be easily classified, categorized, or fit into relatively homogeneous groups. If students with a given scholastic aptitude test score are placed within a group, these students will differ widely in terms of their academic achievement, socio-economic backgrounds, and personalities. If students with similar abilities, academic achievement, and socio-economic backgrounds are identified, among this group will be found students with widely varying attitudes and expectations. Each student is an individual unlike any other student and must be so considered.

The educational relevance of this fact is obvious, as are the problems it presents to the University. No single program is likely to meet the needs of all, or perhaps even a large proportion of students. When some students will learn fast, and others slowly, the same instructional program seems hardly inadequate. When some students enter the University with a fairly good knowledge of advanced mathematics, and others are mathematically illiterate, the same courses are not appropriate for all students. Students whose intellectual curiosities already have been developed require different experiences than do students whose curiosities still are latent.

This University, like most other institutions, to some extent recognizes the relevance of this phenomenon. Students enter different colleges within the University on the basis of their vocational goals and their demonstrated abilities and achievements. Within each college students initiate their collegiate work at different levels, depending on their achieved backgrounds in English, mathematics, languages, and sciences. Apparently we assume that all students entering college have quite the same backgrounds in and skill related to the social sciences insofar as we tend to start the students at the same levels. Provisions are made for students who have deficient backgrounds and they can take preparatory courses, usually not carrying college credit. Provisions also are made, although not with much enthusiasm, for students with particularly good backgrounds and advanced standing opportunities are available to these.

The University has made two outstanding adjustments in consideration of the differences among students, the University College and the Interdepartmental Major within the Arts

College. The University College provides to a few students each year an opportunity to tailor make a program most appropriate for the student in terms of his needs and abilities, and calling on all of the resources within the University. The Interdepartmental Major in the Arts College provides somewhat the same opportunity for students within that one division. The faculty and administration of the University recognized, decades ago, that regardless of the number of separate programs established for groups and subgroups of students, always there would be individuals who could benefit by unique programs not established formally within the University.

Perhaps the greatest opportunity for individualization of curriculum planning and instruction, and greatest recognition of the relevance of individual differences within the University, is found in the graduate school. Some divisions within the graduate school have thoroughly prescribed curricula and students complete the courses and requirements established by the department, regardless of differences among students. In many departments, however, the procedure of program planning for graduate students consists of the student and his advisor selecting the courses and experiences most appropriate for the student after a discussion of the student's educational-vocational goals, his previous background, and his own particular interests. This individualized program, arrived at by the student and his advisor, frequently is subjected to departmental review and always to group committee review in the graduate school to see that the professional, scientific, and academic objectives of the graduate program have been considered. The procedure requires much time and effort on the part of both the graduate student and his advisor but the benefits of tailor making an education should be great.

Perhaps the relevance for the University of this fact of individual differences can be stated simply in this way. The University must have a great variety of programs, services, and courses available to students who have different needs and abilities, and attempts to categorize and classify students and curricula for purposes of convenience and efficiency can be carried only so far before many students will have placed before them a diet quite unsuitable.

#### DIVERSITY WITHIN STUDENTS

A second fact, not quite so often recognized, but equally important, pertains to the intraindividual differences found within students. In general, students who are best able to do well in foreign languages are best able to do well in the social studies, and there is some evidence that a "general factor" helps explain academic success. In spite of this, however,



there are broad differences within each student, and many students are found who can do relatively well in one type of activity and quite poorly in another. Some students can achieve more effectively in mathematics than they can in social studies, and for each of these students, are some who can do better in social studies than they can in mathematics. We are not concerned here so much with the sources of these differences, whether they result from earlier experiences of the students or from more built-in conditions, but rather with the existence of these differences.

The two studies at Minnesota done recently by Johnson (1961) and Lester (1963) provide some evidence concerning the extent of these differences within individuals. Every student entering the University is given a series of four achievement tests, ACT tests in English, mathematics, social studies, and natural sciences. If students were consistent in their behaviors, four tests would not be necessary. One could tell whether a student was good in mathematics or English simply by giving him a single test. In general, the four tests scores are positively correlated and these correlations are not low, but any counselor or admissions officer after working with a few dozen of these students realizes that some students have much higher scores on some tests than they do on others. The work of Lester indicated that the tests do have differential prediction ability and that students with certain patterns of test scores do better in some subjects than they do in others.

The consideration now being given in the University to the establishment of a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in light of this fact is most encouraging. Some students with outstanding artistic or musical ability lack other aptitudes, just as many students quite proficient in mathematics or foreign language have little or no musical or artistic ability.

My own values lead me to believe that students who have certain superior aptitudes should not be deprived of the opportunity for developing these because they lack other aptitudes and when the University has resources that provide for the development of aptitudes that are present, it should not refuse a student access to these resources because he cannot effectively exploit the resources demanding skills he does not possess. You see here how the relevance of what I have been calling fact depends in large part on the educational philosophy of the person making the interpretation of relevance.

#### DIVERSITY IN STUDENT BACKGROUND

Students come from different families and have different backgrounds and these differences result in varying

experiences which influence the needs and capacities of students. Where do Minnesota students come from and what are their backgrounds? How are these characteristics to be viewed in light of what the University does?

A majority of University students are "first generation students;" that is, most of them have parents who have graduated from high school but not attended college. Approximately two-thirds of the students come from homes where neither parent has had much, if any, college experience. Almost one-fifth of the men entering the University have fathers with no more than eighth grade educations. A high proportion of the students come from homes where the parents are in skilled trades, semi-skilled trades, unskilled occupations, or industrial and production jobs.

Many of them come from homes having no more than 25 or 50 books and the typical magazines to which the family subscribes are Reader's Digest and Life. Relatively few students come from homes where magazines such as Harper's, Atlantic Monthly, or the Saturday Review are found and very rare is the student who has in his home magazines such as the Antioch Review, the Foreign Affairs Quarterly, the American Scholar, or magazines primarily devoted to the arts or to more intensive analyses of social problems.

What are the implications of this economic, social, and cultural background for a University? English instructors always have been well aware of the problem of teaching writing to students coming from "dese and dose" families. Placement officers have been aware of problems of helping students with deviate table manners obtain much wanted jobs. College counselors long have been aware of students frustrated in their social goals because of deviate habits pertaining to clothing and manners.

For many students college is a means for upward mobility and many students are willing but unable to conform to upper middle class expectations. Certainly the goal of a college is not to have everybody dress and behave as Amy Vanderbilt dictates, but should it not provide opportunities for students to change certain behavior?

Many University students come from homes where quantitative approaches to a problem and measurement incorporated into the thought processes are almost unknown. Many have had restricted contact with persons from other cultures. I remember my own surprise several years ago when I talked with a college freshman who told me that she never had talked with a negro or as far as she knew, seen or talked with a Jew. This knowledge about our students provides



supporting evidence for our maintaining on our campuses numbers of students from other countries and programs for "mixing" students from all races, religions, and nationalities.

Certainly this information has implications for our orientation programs, for our advising and counseling programs, and for our curriculum planning.

#### RESIDENT-COMMUTER DIFFERENCES

A majority of our undergraduates live at home. The problems of a commuter campus in many ways are quite different from those of a residential college, and the problems of a college that is part commuter, part residential, are even greater.

Thirty-five per cent of commuting students in 1949 belonged to not a single student organization, as compared to about 12 per cent of those who lived on campus. (Williamson, Layton, and Snoke.) A large number of these students could describe no activity in which they engage on the University campus other than attending class. Many of these students are not members of the University community at all and maintain their interpersonal relationships with persons in their home neighborhood, from their former high school, or in non-campus church or other organizations. These off-campus activities may have much to contribute to the educational development of the student and students may, in fact, derive more from these than they do from more carefully structured ones within the University. Before such a comparison can be made, however, opportunities have to be planned for campus activities so that commuting students can and will participate.

The Student Union and libraries presumably serve as campus centers for commuting students. A few students focus on fraternities, sororities, and religious foundations but we do not really know much about this. We do know that of a sample of University freshmen questioned at the end of their freshman year last year, 53 per cent reported they used student union facilities often or sometimes. Exactly the same proportion reported that during the freshman year they had been spectators at University sports events and slightly more than that reported they had visited displays on the campus. The survey revealed that only a small proportion of all students took advantage of any one University facility or service.

The University has paid most attention to the commuter student regarding the problem of parking his car. Food

services are available to him but in almost every other instance, the assumption is made that those services and resources of the University available to all students are available to the commuting student and he should make use of them.

The problem of providing adequate study space presents an interesting illustration. We simply do not know where or how many hours a week students study. We do know that many students report they are unable to find satisfactory study conditions at home, because of the presence of small children who make noise, parents who keep the TV too loud, ringing telephones, and other distractions. Some students live with families in homes or apartments where there simply is not room for study. Currently the University is attempting to expand its studying facilities by making available room on the University campus and in the new library on the West Bank. An interesting hypothesis is that students would make more effective use of University study areas not located on the campus but located throughout the city where more space is available, access is more convenient to students, and time spent in transportation could be spent on studies. Could a large room be obtained in a suburb which sends perhaps thousands of students to the University and in this room a minimum reference library maintained, adequate desks or tables with seating provided for studying, and perhaps a person to supervise the study room?

#### ATTITUDINAL AND INTEREST DIFFERENCES

We have considerable information regarding the differences among University students in their attitudes and interests as they approach the University.

Since the University can categorize administratively its students and assign them to relatively homogeneous groups, our task of understanding the characteristics of University students becomes somewhat easier. Within a complex University the obvious category is based on college or division and the evidence available indicates that this is a psychologically meaningful category as well as an administratively convenient one. The scholastic comparison studies done by the Student Counseling Bureau during the past 30 years demonstrate the ability and academic differences among University colleges. The volume by Darley and Hagenah (1955) shows the extent of differences between colleges on the distribution of Strong Vocational Interest Blank scores. The recent work done on the College and University Environment Scales shows that significant differences are found among colleges on all five of the scales. Similar dif-

ferences among colleges can be noted on such variables as parental occupation and education and student residence.

However, these same data show an astonishing diversity within colleges and although the differences among colleges are large and statistically significant when one considers the averages, the amount of overlapping among colleges on any one of these variables is more impressive than the differences among means. Regardless of the variable, in every college are found students who exceed the mean in every other college; no college has a monopoly on bright, dull, wealthy, impoverished, ambitious, crazy, adjusted, or disturbed students.

Students can be assigned to categories on the basis of a vocational goal or objective. This category system quite well corresponds to that we have when we use colleges and again we find somewhat the same differences between means and the same extent of overlapping.

#### RELEVANCE OF RESEARCH TO DECISION MAKING

Research on students constitutes an important strategy in the decision making process of higher education. The development and selection of alternatives pertinent to curriculum, instruction, physical plant, student personnel services, and every other aspect of college and university planning can be improved if they are based on knowledge about students.

Many dimensions of the student body are open to investigation, and each of these is relevant to the institution. The adequacy of institutional programs depends on the extent they conform to students' academic abilities and achievements, socio-economic backgrounds, cultural and vocational interests and readiness, and attitudes, values, and expectations. Only after considering these aspects of students can the staff of a college decide what the college now is, what it should be, and how it might become that.

The strategy of research is not an easy one because it is founded on the assumption of our ignorance about that which concerns us most deeply. The most difficult part of this research orientation is the question asking, not the answer finding. To pose meaningful questions relevant to impending decisions requires a more deliberate, logical, and self-divesting approach to problem solving than that with which most of us are familiar. When faced by a dilemma, we must ask ourselves, "In order to make a good decision here, what must I know about students that I now do not know?" Once we have the imagination to ask these questions well, then we will have the skill to find their answers.

## References

- Abe, Clifford, & Holland, J. L. A Description of College Freshmen. Iowa City: American College Testing Program Research reports, May, 1965, No. 3, June, 1965, No. 4.
- Astin, A. W. & Holland, J. L. "The environmental assessment technique. a way to measure college environments." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1961, 52, 308-316.
- Berdie, R. F. "A picture of new university freshmen." Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Student Counseling Bureau Newsletter. Vol. 18, January, 1966, 1-6.
- Berdie, R. F. & Hood, A. B. Decisions for Tomorrow. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1965.
- Darley, J. G. Promise and Performance. Berkeley: University of California Center for the Study of Higher Education. 1962.
- Darley, J. G. & Hagenah, Theda. Vocational Interest Measurement: Theory and Practice. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1955.
- Eddy, E. E. The College Influence on Student Character. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education. 1959.
- Holland, J. L. & Mehals, R. C. "Production of academic and extra-curricular achievement in college." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1964, 55, 55-65.
- Iffert, R. E. Retention and Withdrawal of College Students. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1957.
- Jacob, P. E. Changing Values in College. New York: Harper and Row. 1957.
- Johnson, R. W. The Relationship Between Measured Interests and Differential Academic Achievement. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota doctoral dissertation. 1961.
- Johnston, J. B. The Liberal College in Changing Society. New York: Century, 1930.



References (continued)

Learned, W. S. & Wood, B. D. The Student and His Knowledge. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1938.

Lester, R. A. The Relationship of SVIB and ACT Scores to Differential Academic Achievement. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota doctoral dissertation. 1963.

Mallery, David. Ferment on the Campus. New York: Harper and Row. 1966.

Newcomb, T. M. Personality and Social Change. New York: Dryden Press. 1943.

Pace, C. R. College and University Environment Scales. Princeton: Educational Testing Service. 1963.

Pace, C. R. They Went to College. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1941.

Pace, C. R. & Stern, G. G. "An approach to the measurement of psychological characteristics of college environments." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 49, 269-277.

Sanford, N. "Developmental Status of the Entering Freshman" in The American College, edited by N. Sanford. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1962.

Sanford, Nevitt (Editor). The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1962.

Williamson, E. G., Layton, W. L., & Snoke, M. L. A Study of Participation in College Activities. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1954.

## THE PATTERNING OF STUDENTS IN THEIR GROUP RELATIONSHIPS \*

Donald R. Brown  
Center for Research on Learning and Teaching  
University of Michigan

It is with well advised humility that I venture to speak to you about the urban university of the future in general, and about groups, in particular. The reason for this humility is that I come to you unbiased and practically untarnished by relevant experience in urban universities and as one who puts more emphasis on individual development and determination than on group phenomena. In fact, the more I pondered the image of myself pontificating about groups in the locale of an urban university, the more my own experience as an undergraduate at a semi-urban, private university, as a graduate at a semi-urban, state university, and my 13 years as a faculty member in the cloistered atmosphere of a small Quaker women's college along with 10 years as a research consultant to the Mellon Foundation studies at Vassar, the more I felt drawn to the phrase "the social psychology" in the title of your 25th anniversary series. Having organized and participated in a symposium at the American Psychological Association meetings in San Francisco over a decade ago with the title of "The Social Psychology of Higher Education," which ultimately resulted in the publication of the volume edited by Nevitt Sanford called, The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of Higher Education, I feel at least comfortable in discussing some of the implications of this approach to the future of higher education, whether it be in the setting of a state urban-university or a quite different locale.

### SOCIAL CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT OF A UNIVERSITY

All of this is not to say that the social cultural environment of the university does not play a very important role in the structuring of student life, but rather to point out that regardless of the power of the group in influencing and directing the behavior of the individual--whether in a university or any other area of life--in the final analysis, the group operates as a subculture which provides, for the individual, characteristic ranges of stimulation, goals and

---

\*Presented at a Series of Seminars on the Social Psychology of the Future State Urban Campus, The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, February 24, 1966.



rewards. For these stimuli, goals and rewards to be effective, they must be perceived, internalized and appreciated by the individual. In the last analysis it is through the individual that all group effects are mediated.

#### ETON - 1860's

The reason for this disclaimer is to permit me, if you will, to direct your attention to an approach to the understanding of the groupings of students in institutions of higher education through a model which starts with a developmental theory of the individual in a complex social environment such as a university. I would argue that, if an individual is thwarted in this developmental sequence, he will often be forced to turn to readily available groups for his goals and rewards. This anchoring in a theory of individual development has many advantages when we are forced to operate, as we are, in a highly pluralistic educational society such as ours. Perhaps I can make this point more clearly by referring to descriptions of students and their approach to education in different historical eras. It is always helpful before one views with alarm the present situation to look back and try to understand the alarming situations of the past. Let me start by reference to a statement, called to my attention by Professor George Stern, written by one of the great Eton masters in the 1860's--a period when education of any sort, higher or otherwise, was reserved for a social-cultural elite. "You go to school at the age of 12 or 13; and for the next 4 or 5 years you are not engaged so much in acquiring knowledge as in making mental efforts under criticism. A certain amount of knowledge you can indeed with average faculties acquire so as to retain; nor need you regret the hours that you have spent on much that is forgotten, for the shadow of lost knowledge at least protects you from any illusions. But you go to a great school, not for knowledge as much as for arts and habits; for the habit of attention, for the art of expression, for the art of assuming at a moment's notice a new intellectual posture, for the art of entering quickly into another person's thoughts, for the habit of submitting to censure and refutation, for the art of indicating assent or dissent in graduated terms, for the habits of regarding minute points of accuracy, for the habit of working out what is possible in a given time, for taste, for discrimination, for mental courage and mental soberness. Above all, you go to a great school for self knowledge."\*

---

\*Quoted by Geoffrey Madan in "William Cory," The Cornhill Magazine, July to December 1938, p. 208, from an 1861 tract on "Eton Reform" by William Cory.

As one ponders on Cory's statement, one cannot help but be reminded of Philip Franck's warning that the metaphysics of yesterday is the common sense of today and the nonsense of tomorrow. That is to say, that while what Cory describes as the goals of a liberal arts education still hold today as they did in the 1860's in upper-class England, nonetheless the sociological derivations of our students in the urban university of the 1960's differs considerably, and 25 years from now will differ even more. For many years our students came from much the same social class as those that Cory was describing. But sometime shortly after World War I the proportion of Americans attending high school increased astronomically and this desire for education burst into the college scene about the time of World War II and has been increasing ever since so that today we find it necessary to think at least 25 years ahead in order to be prepared for the ever-increasing onslaught of students. This is bound to have far-reaching consequences on the nature of education and the needs that students bring to our institutions of higher learning. How has this manifested itself since World War II?

## POST WORLD WAR II

Consider the bulging enrollments immediately following the war, when the veterans were flocking to our campuses. These were young men and women of above average college age who had been brought up during the great depression and then tempered in the fiery inferno of World War II. Their values and goals were clear. They knew who the great enemies were. First there were the problems of economic inequity and irresponsibility which could be defeated by the "new economics" and later there were the evils of totalitarianism and fascism over which they had waged a long and bitter physical struggle ending in total victory, or so it seemed. Now they retreated to the nurturing security of alma mater with the help of a benevolent G. I. bill to prepare themselves for the fruits of the better life for which they had made so many sacrifices. This of course is my generation. We knew what we were doing in college and our devotion to our studies and our pragmatic approach to the curriculum had profound effects on the university. Practically overnight the Hollywood rah-rah culture of the campuses was dealt its death blow and ultimately finished off by the rise of the meritocracy following the launching of Sputnik. Immediately following this group on the campus, there came the children of the new affluent society now coming to college in much larger numbers than ever before and consequently from much more diverse educational and cultural backgrounds. Our attention was called quite forcibly to their appearance and to the disparity from the good old days at

"City College," when no one but first class intellectuals populated the campuses with real commitment and social concern manifested on every side. Philip Jacob, in his study on value change in college students, summarizes the orientation of this new group as 1) an absorbing self-interestedness, directed essentially toward satisfying desires for material well being, privacy within one's own male-oriented family domain, and relief from boredom; 2) group dependence, which causes students to bring personal conduct and standards into line with the expectations of groups to whom they turn for a sense of belongingness; or look upon as vehicles to self advancement; 3) social and political indifference and irresponsibility; and 4) an instrumental approach to reason and morality which pulls both reason and moral code into the service of preset personal goals rather than acknowledges them as guides of verity and controlling rules of conduct.

#### MICHIGAN NOW

Jacob was of course describing what we all came to think of as the age of student apathy--in many ways a most comforting age during which to be a member of the establishment. Contrast this description with a quote from an article which appeared last Sunday in the Michigan Daily: "The American Student is Breaking Out of His Cocoon" is the lead.

"The eruption started in the late 50's when students (whose older brothers and sisters had thought the smooth move was to mind one's own business) were stirred by the Civil Rights movement and began to emerge from their study carrels and fraternity houses to make their dent on the world.

They were a new generation bred in prosperity. These students did not know the depression, they did not remember the war. To seek material reward--the house in Scarsdale, the pretty wife, and the steady job--was not enough because it was so attainable. To be satisfied with a return to normalcy was not enough because normalcy was already the way of life.

They took their tactics from Ghandi, their idealism from philosophy class, their money from Daddy. They worked hand in hand with civil rights groups such as CORE, NAACP, SNCC, and SCLC.

The results of the movement were civil rights acts, the voting rights bill, and the emergence of the American student.

Realizing they had the power to influence events, students broadened their involvement so that it ranged from criticizing foreign policy to organizing the poor.

Thus, the idealism of the civil rights movement led to an alienation from the multi-university and the hope for an idyllic "community of scholars" as the wave of the future. The democratic nature of the movement led students to hope they could have a meaningful voice in governing their own affairs at their universities; and the success of the movement made students realize that they could implement their goals. \*\*

#### VALUE AND POPULATION CHANGES

One is aware, naturally, that any attempt to describe all students at all institutions is a task fraught with folly. These descriptions that I have given as applicable to historical periods over the last 100 years refer not even to the modal situation but rather to the salient situation. They tend to represent the highly visible peaks of student behavior in the mass rather than individual students on the one hand or the majority of students on the other. These are the dominant images that characterized the periods, not necessarily the dominant behavior. Even if we take a frankly sociological view of the matter and attempt to understand these seeming changes in the value orientation of university students as reflections of the population from which they are recruited, from this view we know that college going has not only increased numerically but has increasingly attracted segments of our population with different "life expectancies" from those to which the more traditional liberal arts curriculum was originally attuned. We are dealing here with a population change rather than value change. For example, the increasing numbers of veterans attending college on the G. I. bill and its various revisions since World War II, working class children attending on government loans or state scholarship programs, the meritorious attending on National Merit Scholarships and similar competitive awards for students with outstanding high school attainment, Negro youth attending on the various new grants directed toward their recruitment, children of immigrants located by nationwide talent searches--all of these groups bring new value constellations to our colleges, and the realities of their postcollege lives will undoubtedly be different from those of the classical liberal arts college student who could postpone his vocational plans until graduate school and even sometimes forever. It's interesting to speculate on the

---

\* The Michigan Daily, February 20, 1966



differences in the atmosphere of universities which follows from the obvious fact that not only have the sources of students changed, as the well established universities have increasingly culled off the cream of admissions and thereby gotten a much broader geographic representation in their student bodies and the large state universities have dipped much further down to sample the real sources of intellectual quality in their states, while at the same time, the recruitment of faculty has been very much influenced by these previous population shifts in college attendance. It is not idle speculation to propose that a large per cent of faculty just now entering into senior positions come from the G. I. bill crop which flooded graduate schools with the sorts of Ph. D. material that rarely aspired to such educational heights before. As I look back on my own college experience, I am struck by how much more similar in socioeconomic background current faculties are to their students than my faculty, which tended to represent a kind of upper-class traditional scholarly gentlemen with considerable family wealth. All of this is bound to make for changes in the groupings of students in the urban university a quarter of a century from now.

### THREE COLLEGE IMAGES - INTELLECTUAL, VOCATIONAL, AND SOCIAL

The above merely indicates to me the striking pluralism of American society and the consequent pluralism that we can expect in our urban universities in the future. Let us now try to analyze this diverse population and present some theoretical assumptions about the nature of development in students which would allow me to talk about the significance of the groupings of students that we might find on our urban campuses 25 years from today. For the sake of argument I will maintain that at the moment students come to us holding to varying degrees one of the following often mutually exclusive stereotypes of the purposes of higher education. The first relates to the development of the intellect and the growth of the personality. Here the emphasis is on the broadening of the intellectual horizons of the students along with the consequent maturing and stabilizing of the personality. The liberal arts curriculum as classically defined is accepted as the golden road to these goals and the product is hopefully "cultured." The stress in this type of education is on being. The image is best represented by the statement which I quoted from the Eton schoolmaster, Cory. The image today is still represented by some of the prestigious colleges--particularly some of the smaller members of the seven women's colleges conference, which are prestigious not so much because of their lofty educational aims but because these aims are generally supported by the upper classes, and in particular for women. It is the desire to

identify with these classes that accounts for the current elevation in the desirability of attending one of these institutions. Secondly, there is the much more widely held image of college as a place to acquire occupational training. As a society becomes both affluent and technologically advanced, the demand for highly trained personnel increases. The colleges rush in to fill the demands of the market, albeit sometimes with reluctance. The urban state university experiences great pressure to fulfill this type of demand arising from its constituents. This, at the same time, increases the demand for the college degree and cheapens it as a symbol of professionalization. The degree comes to cover a multitude of sins committed in the name of education. All sorts of occupational groups join in and demand college programs in their fields. The emphasis is on doing and on being able to do rather than on being. The third dominant image relates to the collegiate fun culture which is the one most often portrayed in the mass media image of college, particularly before the rise of the meritocracy. However, the idea of college as a never-ending series of increasingly romantic social events leading to blissful union to be punctuated by glorious homecomings is still a real image for adolescent girls in particular. Here the emphasis is on learning the sex role as popularly conceived. Perhaps this image never did exist in any large extent in the streetcar type of urban university.

The students, coming as they do from the larger society, bring with them one or another of these three views of higher education. Therefore they start their college experience with views that are to varying degrees incongruent with the generally held values of the faculty. The latter see themselves as seekers of knowledge in specialized areas and critics of the culture. Indeed, they demand special privileges of tenure and academic freedom in order to permit the unhampered pursuit of these goals. In recent years because of the nature of the market, they have indeed demanded almost total freedom even from teaching. At the same time they are asked to educate a semi-captive audience who hold values often widely discrepant from their own views and very often widely variant within any given classroom. Here are certainly the seeds of conflict.

#### STUDENT PEER CULTURE

The students are not without resources of their own for avoiding the issues of this conflict and the educational benefits which follow from its rational resolution. They create a "peer culture" which largely perpetuates the general societal values held outside the college and turn to this new subculture for their goals and their rewards. The



challenge for the urban state university, as for any university, is to become aware of the groupings or subcultures that exist amongst its students so that they can rationally plan to enlist the forces which are often very powerful inherent in these groups to influence the openness of their members and your students to new experiences. At this point we see the mediation between the individual view and the social groups approach.

As we have seen the society and, indeed, often the university are not completely clear about the goals of higher education. Therefore, it is not surprising that the students, unable to face the multiplicity of challenges to their self image, find themselves forced to seek clarity in group identifications which reinforce the old and familiar. In the case of male students, with their ever-increasing commitments to an occupational role, the ability to fuse the contrasting value orientations is often rather painless and usually with considerable social support in the service of occupational preparation. This situation is not so painless for women, and, indeed, with the increasing intolerance for idiosyncratic roles such as that of feminism, this situation is becoming even more confusing rather than less.

#### UNDERSTANDING LATE ADOLESCENCE

Having described the general value conflict of society in higher education, let me now turn to the entering freshman. If we think of the stage of late adolescent development that precedes young adulthood, we can assume that the entering college student is somewhere in this stage on his way to goals of higher integration and more precise differentiation of personality. The striking fact of this stage is the ascendancy of the cognitive and rational controlling mechanisms over the impulses which previously dominated the determinants of behavior. These controls are not yet mature; they tend to be rigid, overdetermined, and impulse seems capable of bursting through at any point. This is true to some extent of all of our students regardless of whether they are living in residence with the college in locus parentis or whether they are townies. Sanford, in The American College, has put it well when he describes the freshman as follows: "The freshman tends to be like a convert to adulthood, an enthusiastic supporter and imitator of adult ways who knows what it is to backslide--which he sometimes does. The achievement of flexible control, an arrangement in which there is genuine freedom of impulses because there is little danger of their getting out of hand lies ahead; nevertheless impulses are now inhibited or contained with sufficient effectiveness so that the young person can turn his attention to other matters. He is not ready to concentrate upon his relations with the external world--to

improve his understanding of that world and to find a place within it." This state of affairs offers both an opportunity and a danger to the development of a system of adult values. After all, one of the main functions of the university is to develop resources within the individual for that peculiarly human function--the ability to evaluate and act on the basis of one's evaluational decision. Turned as they are to the outside world, freshmen are sensitive to and capable of identifying with a whole new range of adult models and institutions on which can be based an often new and broader set of values. However, also as a consequence of increased awareness and greater cognitive sensitivity, the freshman becomes aware, often for the first time, of the corruption, hypocrisy, and cynicism to be found in many corners of a complex society such as ours. Also they are brought together in new groupings with new temptations for challenging and exciting activities and intellectual patterns. It could well be pointed out here that we have only recently seen some of the results of this awareness where it would appear that a significant minority of the students have suddenly taken the first image of higher education that I presented very seriously indeed only to discover that the institution or establishment as they refer to it was no longer as committed to this image as they had been led to believe. Indeed, a lot of the recent so-called conflict on the campuses centers about the students' discovery that the university is not devoted solely to their immediate and personal educational development. In many of them this seems like a betrayal but of course on more mature reflection they come to realize the multiplicity of the university as a mirror of the multiplicity of the society from whence they come. It remains then a challenge to higher education to guide the student through this crises toward the ability to evaluate and judge what is perceived in a way that permits change and development but does not lead to complete alienation from parents, community and society. What is desired is an internalized sense of values based on a strongly developed sense of dignity and pride in self. Upon arrival at college, even in the urban university, to some extent the immediate support of family and community are withdrawn or at least alienated, and as contact is made with new systems of value, the freshman seeks new sources of support. The easy choice is the readily available support of peers who minimize the threat by offering a subculture in which the student can more readily determine his own stake. If this total identification with the peer cultures which exist within and on the periphery of an institution persists for four years in an unaltered form, education will be a failure. It will fail because the student will either keep a value structure which developed before college and will remain untested against the broader horizons of the university or because, in his anxiety to avoid

rejection by the valued group, he will adopt a set of values by simple imitation. Values acquired in this manner, whether from faculty or through the influence of student culture, are not internalized but are merely borrowed for the occasion. For values to become internalized they must be reflected on and made the object of the individual's best efforts at judgment and decision making.

Closely related to the internalization of value is the development of self esteem, which also is at first very sensitive to the appraisal of peers and faculty. The development of self esteem will ultimately lead to a sense of identity and mastery but this goal may take all of college and longer to be reached. Therefore it is important for the institution to provide a readily open channel for its students to switch identities often during their college careers if both to avoid too narrow a range of choices and too early commitments which will hamstring the individual for life. For example, a young woman who flees into marriage in the sophomore year has chosen sides too soon to maximize her development.

### THREE DIMENSIONS OF STUDENT GROWTH

What can the college do to foster growth during these years? In general there are three main dimensions along which students can be expected to grow which are very much influenced by the curriculum and the social groupings which exist at the institution. They are 1) freeing the impulse through the opportunity to learn and to manipulate the symbols of human experience in imagination through literature, philosophy and the arts while not directly committing oneself. Let us not underestimate the value of empathy through imagination in the overall educational process.

2) enlightenment of conscience to the point where the individual believes in what he ought to do because he has arrived at a moral code by reasoned judgment and knowledge. Contact with diversity, training in disciplined analysis of thought, and a tolerant but committed faculty are invaluable here along with, of course, sound liberal arts coverage of content.

3) differentiation and integration of the ego such that the student increases his scope while becoming more of a unity. That is, perceptions and thought become more and more differentiated and personal responses more and more discriminating and interrelated. Thus a young woman, for example, could see herself as being both feminine and educated.



## BRINGING STUDENT GROUPS INTO THE SERVICE OF STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

Now the problem that faces the urban university of today and one which will increase in the future is how can an increasingly diverse source of students drawn more and more widely from all areas of the population as the economic wherewithall for education becomes more available be brought together in the common pursuit of these intellectual and personal goals which I have just alluded to. It seems obvious to me that in order to accomplish this challenging goal, the university must bring student groups into the service of student development. In order to do this we must operate on several levels at once. For example, it has long been assumed by the better residential colleges that students largely educate one another even in the most rigorous academic disciplines. But, unfortunately with the rapid expansion and increasing specialization of knowledge coupled with the increasing cafeteria-like offerings of our universities, it is rare that two students come together outside of class who have a common academic experience to share. Thus the university should consider new ways of grouping students both in the curriculum and in the scheduling such that larger numbers will have some common shared intellectual experience which will serve as a foundation for intellectual and social interaction. Very often we now force our students in their noncurriculum groupings into nonintellective areas of concern by denying them easily integrated experiences which stem from the academic content of their institutional endeavor.

### STUDENTS FROM DEPRIVED BACKGROUNDS

A further expectation for the future urban state university stems from the increasing proportion of students who will come from those segments of society which have been to some extent crippled by mistreatment and lack of opportunity in the past. It would be wrong to assume that these students already share the dominant values of the middle class which tend to be so well entrenched in all of us. Their aspirations have been thwarted too long for them to burst into full flower with just a little nourishment. This means that the university as it opens its doors--and the urban university really must--to these peoples must at the same time carefully evaluate the sort of socialization that these students must go through before they can really become a part of the academic race. If the university is not willing to face up to the requirements of this task they are surely allowing the race to be run against cripples. At the University of Michigan we have discovered a particularly poignant problem with those students from deprived backgrounds that have



been admitted under a special equal opportunity program in recent years. They have been so removed from the common experience of current college-going populations that they still have a quaint pre-meritocracy image of college life and therefore feel seriously deprived when life at the university turns out not to be as presented on television. It is difficult for them to see that their more fortunate classmates are living very much the same kind of work-oriented day to day life at the University. There are serious problems in the area of socialization to life at the University which must be solved before large numbers of our urban disadvantaged populations will be able to feel a part of academia. I am speaking here, of course, of those who clearly qualify on intellectual and academic criteria. Indeed, the most frequent cause for failure on the part of these people appears to be social failure and lack of a sense of belonging with the peculiarly devastating effects of that kind of alienation rather than lack of ability.

#### NEW MILITANCY OF STUDENTS

A further characteristic of the state urban university of the future will be the increasing militancy of the students toward a role in running the university. This is an area which is fraught with confusion of purpose and aim both on the part of students and on the part of the faculties and administrations. One could with President Perkins of Cornell argue that the students after all are at the university to learn, not to run it. And if one did not want to be so blunt, one could point out that students stay only for a generation of four years whereas the faculty and administration seemingly stay on forever, or at any rate so it seems when we find ourselves having to resolve the same issues year after year only with different groups of protesting students who want a voice in running things their way and who weren't in on the last round of discussions. I am afraid that we are going to have to resolve ourselves to even more of this fatiguing but necessary educational function. I warn you, however, that the students of today have been all too well trained in the meaning of democracy from that first grade election on up. They are terribly sophisticated and sensitive to fraud. They will have no part of student governments, committees, advisory panels and all the other paraphernalia that has developed on our campuses over the years unless these have functions which are real. Pseudo-responsibilities will be spurned and the students will increasingly turn from these false involvements to other concerns which stem from the multiplicity of groupings which will spontaneously arise on any campus of this size. Many of these other activities will not be those that we would find conducive to the orderly conduct of the university's business.

Of course, only a small minority of students will themselves want to participate actively in the affairs of the university but they will be in a position to mobilize their less involved and active peers if they are treated in a manner not becoming intelligent adults. The happy note here is the amazing responsibility and maturity which the recent generations of students have shown when given real responsibility and power. When taken into the inner sanctum and frankly apprised of the many elements involved in each day to day problem facing the university, they generally react in a most conservative manner befitting those who realize that they are as yet poorly equipped to deal with these complexities. I recall the remark by President Elliott of Harvard when in 1885 he was apprised of the rules for student government which had just been formulated by the Board of Trustees of Bryn Mawr College. He said, "Bryn Mawr College for young ladies will be out of business in a year. You cannot treat young ladies with that much freedom and responsibility." That particular student government is flourishing because it is real and everybody who participates in it knows that it is real. For those of us who moan about the lack of student interest in the multitude of committees and organizations that already exist, I suggest that you take a hard look at the real purpose of these institutions possessing gruesome immortality and ask if they have not long since outlived their purpose and have failed to take on secondary functions which justify their continued existence. Student committees, like faculty committees, can grow old and tired.

#### CHALLENGE OF ADULT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION

One final challenge which will face your university even more in the future than now and one which I am sure you are very much aware of is that of adult education and involvement. As an urban university more and more of your alumni will be from the immediate metropolitan area and will be increasingly involved in the affairs of the university. This can be a great source of support and strength, but it can also be a terrible drag and concern if the university is unable to count on its alumni when other pressures are drawn up against it. The urban university must be especially sensitive to the needs of its community at many, many levels and you will increasingly find yourselves involved in such diverse areas as urban renewal and continuing education for women. Both of these are serious social problems dealing with minorities in their treatment if not in their numbers. These urban challenges will often fall upon the shoulders of your student body who after all return at the end of each working day to every corner of the city and will

represent the university by their attitude and behavior. Will they derive a sense of concern and a sense of competence to deal with these questions from their experiences on your campus? Will the main thrust behind many of the student groups that exist and will exist at the University of Minnesota be oriented toward social amelioration and political activism where more than just impulsive acting out is involved but rather deep concern and directed action?

#### GROUPING STUDENTS FOR EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

These are only a few of the challenges that will face the great urban university of the future. I have avoided many that more properly fall in the realm of political and financial resources to meet the increasing enrollments and demands of ever growing technologies. There has not been time to suggest specific areas in which the university can prepare to meet these challenges directly. Let me merely suggest that a thorough understanding of the developmental processes underlying the growth of both the intellect and personality in each individual student will allow you to offer at your university the kind of curriculum best designed to foster these growth patterns within the context of the facilities that you will have at your disposal here at Minnesota. Just by way of example, you have it in your power to manipulate the formation of groupings amongst your student bodies in such a way as to enlist this powerful source of pressure in the direction that all of us as humanistically inclined educators support. You can do this by grouping students together in, say, freshman courses in such a way as to maximize their contact, both in and out of class and thereby overcome some of the barriers that young people have toward social interaction before they have developed a sufficient sense of confidence to overcome their shyness. The occasional sparks lit in the classroom will flare up again outside of class if these students have the opportunity to come into contact with each other. It is easy to make these arrangements in small residential colleges; it is a challenge to the ingenuity of schedule makers and administrators to arrange things at the University of Minnesota in this manner, but we are doing it at Michigan in our Pilot Project which now includes over 600 freshmen and hope to accomplish this and more in our Residential experimental college for 1200 students which we hope to open in September 1967. I can't go into details about the underlying rationale and the plans for this venture now but hope that during the discussion period someone will ask me to expand on this at great length. I would be very happy to do so. Let me merely point out that one of the fruits of understanding the basic developmental sequence pursued by most students will provide a base for the development within the university of a

multiplicity of educational environments such that the student by wise guidance and a bit of shopping around can find those sets of educational conditions and environments which best suit his potential and intellectual aspirations. Under those circumstances we can hope to maximize the development of each student through the concerted effort of the faculty and his group memberships.

I conclude by reminding you that college education must perforce proceed according to assumptions concerning what beginning students have in common. Where dissatisfaction with this state of affairs has been great, the tendency has been to go to the other extreme and accent the individuality of each student. A better view is that whereas each student is in some respects like all other students and in some respects like no other student, it may well turn out that in the matter of deciding upon educational objectives, possibilities, and instrumentalities, it will be best to consider the ways in which he is like some other students while creating diverse and pluralistic educational environments within and across institutions.



## THE ATTAINMENT OF INDIVIDUALITY <sup>1/</sup> \*

T. R. McConnell  
Professor of Higher Education and formerly  
Chairman, Center for Research and Development  
in Higher Education  
University of California, Berkeley

### IMPACT OF COLLEGE ON STUDENTS

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.

---

<sup>1/</sup> Some of the research referred to in this paper was done at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, and under a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

\* Presented at a Series of Seminars on the Social Psychology of the Future State Urban Campus, The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, March 3, 1966.

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."<sup>1/</sup>

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 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?

---

<sup>1/</sup> Jacob, P. E., Changing Values in College. New Haven: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1956, p. 6.

## INCREASING FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

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 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."<sup>1/</sup>

#### SEVERING PARENTAL CONTROLS

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

---

<sup>1/</sup> 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.



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 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.

#### UNSETTLING STUDENTS' VALUES

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 capitalistic 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.

#### SOCIAL ACTION IN A UNIVERSITY

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 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. "2/

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

---

1/ Sanford, Nevitt. Ibid.

2/ 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 (Mirneographed).



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 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.

#### RECONCILING INTELLECT AND EMOTION

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.

#### STUDENT IDENTITY

##### ESTABLISHING IDENTITY THROUGH DIVERSE GROUPS

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'."<sup>1/</sup>

#### DETACHMENT AND OBJECTIVITY

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

---

<sup>1/</sup> Anastasi, Anne, Differential Psychology. New York: Macmillan, 1958, pp. 6-8.

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 meaningful sense they resist enculturation and maintain a certain inner detachment from the culture in which they are immersed."<sup>1/</sup>

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."<sup>2/</sup>

#### DEVELOPMENT OF AUTONOMY

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

---

<sup>1/</sup> Maslow, A. H., Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper, 1954, p. 224.

<sup>2/</sup> Maslow, A. H. Ibid. p. 256.

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.

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. . . <sup>1/</sup> I am certain that these findings could

---

<sup>1/</sup> 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.

also be duplicated in certain other denominational colleges.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS

### INTELLECTUALITY AND AUTONOMY

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.

### STUDENT CHANGES AND INSTITUTIONAL IMPACT

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 significantly among the three small independent, highly selective, academically distinguished liberal arts colleges. One of the colleges in which a considerable number of students changed toward greater intellectual involvement 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.

#### INTELLECTUAL NONCONFORMISTS

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.

#### COLLEGE NOT TOUCHING STUDENTS' INTERESTS OR VALUES

In contrast to the colleges in which a large proportion 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.

#### BERKELEY'S FSM MOVEMENT

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, and their exciting potential for scholarship and creative expression. <sup>1/</sup>

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." <sup>2/</sup>

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 faculty and administration? There are, it is true, positive outcomes of the student revolt: a faculty committee has proposed a modest program of educational reform; the decentralization of authority from

---

<sup>1/</sup> 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).

<sup>2/</sup> Heist, Paul. Ibid.

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."<sup>1/</sup>

---

<sup>1/</sup> Keeton, M. T., "Crazy Like Parents." Antioch Notes, Vol. 42, No. 4, January 1965.



## THE UNIVERSITY CAN BE A PERSONAL PLACE\*

Earl A. Koile  
Professor, Educational Psychology  
The University of Texas

### STUDENTS AND THE UNIVERSITY

Today all over America college and university students have become controversial and we are more than a little perplexed by them. Hardly a week goes by without the newspapers, journals of opinion, and news magazines reporting diverse accounts of students and what they are doing. The popular interest is also paralleled within the university establishment by professional articles and reports of research on students and their campus environments.

The parents of the college students are heard from least, unless, of course, they happen to be journalists--or professors. On the whole, this preoccupation with the college student is a healthy enterprise and makes the university a livelier place in which to work; it may even yield needed educational reforms.

I must admit, however, that when I am away from my own campus and read current accounts of students I get the impression that no one is going to class, except perhaps a few faculty members who have not been invited to Washington. Yet, back on campus the classrooms are full, for better or for worse.

When I compare my own students against the descriptions I read, I am hard put to make the two fit. And yet, the descriptions have some pertinence. The problem is that students are described in "either-or" categories and they seldom fit them.

In a general way it is probably true that students are all the things we read about them, all the things we see in them, even the things we say about them. They may even be the things they say about themselves. What makes understanding them difficult, of course, is that in groups and as individuals they behave differently at different times and in different situations.

---

\*Presented at a Series of Seminars on the Social Psychology of the Future State Urban Campus, The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, April 18, 1966.

There may be both unhealthy and healthy aspects of this intensive focus on the college student, and I would like to mention some of them. If our need for understanding students is a need for containing and controlling them because of our own anxieties and doubts about what we are doing, we may not be able to take educational advantage of what students are telling us. If the search for what students are like ends only with broad generalized descriptions of student bodies and particular groups of students, we will not understand the rich, varied, and more subtle and unique qualities that every student possesses or has promise to possess.

So, while I want to share in the creation of murals depicting students and their campus life, I want to hope that we not lose our facility for individual portraits and that we not project portraits out of caricatures. For I am arguing that the good of it all--in higher education and in the larger society--can be determined only by its worth for the individual person. John Gardner could have been speaking for higher education a few weeks back when he said: "If the Great Society is to mean anything, it must mean something for the quality of our lives . . . a means to capture the benefits of technology without losing our individual identity . . . a society of opportunity, a compassionate society designed to serve the individual and preserve his dignity."<sup>1</sup>

Students need opportunities to examine accounts of what they are like with an awareness of individual uniqueness, of healthy departures from the norms--if they are norms--and with a mixture of involvement and detachment. It is natural that students be preoccupied with themselves and want feedback against which to test their own personality and behavior and their own development as persons. Current reports on students, taken alone, are not satisfactory as feedback for evaluation. While recognizing value in some reports, we can also recognize that students may over-subscribe, believing that this is what they are like, and feel pressed to act out the myths. They also may under-subscribe and ignore or deny some interesting and valuable aspects of behavior that may apply to them.

We might find it profitable to use some of the better descriptions of students in small group discussions with them to check out the relevance in a climate of free expression and exploration and to examine the discrepancies as well as the consistencies between reports of what students are like and how they see themselves. These discussions

---

<sup>1</sup>Newsweek, February 28, 1966, Vol. LXVII, No. 9, p. 23.

with students may help us to hear what they are saying about themselves and about their education.

### THE MEANING OF WHAT STUDENTS SAY

It is important for us to listen to students as deeply as possible. It would seem rash in each instance to decide to do what students say they want done or to interpret students' manifest behavior as direct evidence of their needs. I, therefore, am not advocating that we do what students say, but that we listen and do what their behavior tells us they need.

Let me illustrate briefly what I mean. Student action advocating reforms may grow out of the deep sense of conviction and commitment, at least a tentative commitment, to human values. It may also be a natural part of adolescent striving for maturity and a test of authority through which the student seeks to discover his own strength and limitations. The meaning of student actions is not always clear but often can be checked. In either event the students may be telling us that they need running room, that they are important, that they need to be valued, and that they need to be heard.

Students are pressing for involvement in college policy formulation and for participation in the university faculty committees. This push may mean many things and we can check out the meanings through listening to students. Its meaning may vary from campus to campus, from student to student, from group to group. It can mean disenchantment with the system and genuine desire for educational reform. Student pressures can mean that they want to be identified with important, worthy university goals and programs without knowing what their own contributions might be. Here again student action does not suggest that we rush them into membership on every university committee, but that we work with them in discovering what contributions they can make and what their efforts mean in terms of their own development as persons.

Students are reacting against established rules and regulations that have been on the statutes for many years. Their expressions may not mean that all rules, regulations and behavior standards should be overthrown or necessarily that they are pushing for a new morality. Their behavior may mean that they want to discover the relevance of the rules for their lives.

I do not want to deny that there are genuine differences in beliefs among students, faculty members, and

administrators and that some of them may not be reconcilable. I wish to suggest that the task for the educator is not necessarily to do what the students say, but to bring students into the process of discovering what they need and to develop programs based, in part at least, on these needs.

Recently a member of a university governing board, when approached by students on the need for broader counseling opportunities for individual students was puzzled that one day students wanted to be emancipated and to be involved in running the university, and the next day they wanted to be assured that professors and counselors were made available to help them guide their paths and directions through the university. There are interesting examples of such apparent inconsistencies. Students are inconsistent in their development. At the same time, I am not at all sure that the behavior of these students was inconsistent. In both instances they wanted to be helping faculty members and administrators on problems in the university and were asking faculty members and others to help them work with their problems.

#### STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE UNIVERSITY

Students are reacting strongly to the impersonal, organized, and bureaucratic life in America and in the university, but they are not certain about what to replace it with. In a vague way, they want closer relations with the faculty. They are rather clear about wanting to be involved in the policy-making processes of the university, but again, they are vague on what their roles would be. What they discover as they get onto more committees and into the labyrinth of academic procedures is that they lose their vigor, their freshness, and their simplicity in approach to educational problems. Still, they need to be involved--both for themselves and for what they may be able to contribute.

The argument for student involvement in educational reform, policy making, and other affairs of the university does not deny the value of the specialties and expertise of the administrators and faculty. It does insist that the students have contributions to make by virtue of being students, that they do have a special sensitivity to their own needs and perhaps to the needs of the larger society, and that the knowledge of the specialists will mean less unless it can be brought into some kind of meaningful relationship and understanding with and for students. Perhaps we can yet discover how student and faculty contributions can be interrelated to yield better educational policies, processes, and results.



## STUDENTS IN CAMPUS CONTEXT

One point is becoming increasingly clear to me. We cannot talk intelligently about college students any more without talking about the context of their behavior and without considering the behavior of adults around them. Usually this means faculty members, administrators, and other staff members on campus. At college we have little or no contact with parents, but we can look at how students relate to or react against faculty, staff, and other authority figures. This means that as educators we certainly need to give consideration to our own behavior in relation to students to try to understand what we may be doing to foster different kinds of student behavior.

It is true that faculties and administrators do need to know more about students, but they also need to know a great deal more about themselves in relation to students. Needed also is greater knowledge of the different elements in the campus environment and how they influence students and the educational process.

## HOW STUDENTS IDENTIFY

I believe that we need to learn more about the processes by which students identify with specific elements of the large university. The processes and nature of identification are important if we assume that students can influence and be influenced by people and programs in the academic community. We might find the identification processes associated with different types of subcultures within the university structure. Perhaps in the developing relationship between the student and the types of subcultures and groupings within the university we would witness a coming together of the psychology of the individual and the social psychology of the campus environment. We might come to understand which kinds of people and what particular program elements contribute most to the goals of education.

Many students feel presumptuous in thinking that they should be a close and interwoven part of the university community. Recently I had occasion to ask a group of fraternity men what they felt most closely associated with in their university, and what they considered as "theirs and not theirs" in terms of relatedness to them. The questions were worded in several ways to get their impressions of their own personal encounters and relationships with the university. Their answers came slowly. First they could agree that they felt more freedom in thinking of themselves as a part of the university when they were back home or away from campus during the summer. They seemed to be

saying that when others identified them with the university and when not everybody in the home community could be so identified, they too could feel a part of the university.

The upperclassmen frequently mentioned their major fields of study and contacts with professors in the field. Freshmen and sophomores made no such references. As might be expected, these men mentioned some of the campus organizations, including their fraternities, but there was reluctance to do this, for they were not sure that student organizations were relevant parts of the university.

Seniors expressed regret that they had not been more deeply involved in relationships with professors who were committed to ideas that might possibly suggest commitments for them; they expressed disenchantment with the system that emphasized grade-getting and with themselves for allowing the system to dominate them. Freshmen, interestingly enough, seemed to be expressing a zest for the gamesmanship required to survive in the system.

In this meeting, as in others which I have held in recent weeks with groups of students, there seemed to be an unusual interest in broad problems and issues in higher education and in their own university. Students are hungry to be involved in their own learning programs and to tackle the important problems of their university. They are a good deal less interested in the let's pretend activities on the campus and a good deal more interested in active involvement in programs with which faculty members and administrators are concerned. The most promising development in higher education today may be the press for active involvement of students in educational policy, program development, and evaluation.

While we know very little about how students identify with people and how they use the resources in the university, we can sense, as Dean Williamson has pointed out in his writings and speeches, that administrators and students are searching for new definitions of student-university relationships. The student activist movement and pressures for involvement in university affairs call attention to the need for new relationships. Parenthetically, there seems to be little going on in the search for new relationships between faculty members and administrators. This, it seems to me, is essential in the development of a climate for faculty growth and productivity.

#### "WARM BUT AGGRAVATING" RELATIONSHIP

Philip Jacob confronted faculty members and

administrators in higher education a few years ago with charges (a) that college students, for the most part, hold homogeneous values regardless of their backgrounds and the claims colleges make; (b) that colleges tend to homogenize their students rather than to foster individuality; (c) that liberal arts programs probably have no more effect on student values than the newer general education curricula or professional-vocational oriented curricula; and (d) that neither the quality of the teaching nor the method of instruction has more than minor influence on student value outcomes or judgments. Jacob also pointed out that student personality characteristics filter their learning experiences, but that some institutions do seem to have impact on the values of their students because of the unique climates, of appealing faculty members with strong values, and because of other unidentified personal experiences.<sup>1</sup>

Jacob concluded that "...college can contribute to the growth of a student's values only when it penetrates the core of his life and confronts him with fresh and often disturbing implications, which are different from those which he and his society have taken for granted. This can hardly occur as a by-product of a curricular assembly line. It requires a highly personal relationship between the college community and the individual student--a relationship that is warm and considerate, but at the same time mutually aggravating."<sup>2</sup>

Two conditions Jacob poses for college influence are, in my opinion, vital, even though not the only ones. That the higher learning must reach the student in deep and personally relevant ways is not news, but it apparently continues to be an infrequent occurrence for students. What intrigues me more are Jacob's suggestions that confrontations with students must have disturbing implications for them and that the personal relationship between the individual student and the academic community--presumably the faculty and staff--must be both "warm and considerate" on the one hand and "mutually aggravating" on the other.

It seems to me that if an aggravating relationship is to have more than nuisance value for a student it must honestly represent a deep concern or dilemma of the institution which can be shared with students. For example, staff members who keep talking to their students about student desires to be

---

<sup>1</sup>Habein, Margaret L., editor, Spotlight on the College Student, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1959, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Op. cit., p. 5.

involved in policy formulation and in their rights as citizens are far more likely to create a mutual respect and a climate for learning than staff members who simply show their aggravation directly toward the students for being a bother. What I am saying is that it seems all right to be concerned, even aggravated, so long as the focus of concern or aggravation is on real problems and we do not scapegoat students. It requires a very special university climate to maintain a balance of warmth, perspective, and patience to search for the real problems and issues.

Faculty members and administrators, like students, often may fight the wrong battles in the wrong arena. We have seen this going on in the student demonstrations over the country. While honest convictions have been represented and have been acted upon in the arena of student freedom, responsibility, and civil rights, there has also been some acting out of hostile and aggressive behavior stemming from deeper and more personal psychological needs. Similarly, college administrators often may be tempted to use the current arena in which they find themselves (whether involvements over relationships with students or with faculty) to express their own frustrations which result from unresolved conflicts in other problem areas associated with their terribly demanding tasks and their own self-structures.

## STUDENTS AND THE FACULTY

### STUDENTS STILL NEED THE FACULTY

Gardner Murphy of the Menninger Foundation, in a recent symposium said that college students "...need breadth of curriculum within which...to achieve specialized mastery..., a high degree of individualization in the teaching given them..., [and] ...the warmth, the intimacy, the identification possibilities which come only from a teacher who believes in them as individuals and has enough time, thought, patience, leisure, imagination, and faith in human nature to be able somehow to offer all this so that the individual student feels it."<sup>1</sup>

There is much concern among students even some faculty members about the lack of contacts and personal relationships between students and faculty. We know in some general way that faculty members and students are important to each other, even though each may be important to the

---

<sup>1</sup>"The Challenge of College Teaching: A Plea for Individuation," The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 26, No. 4, December 1965, pp. 399-407; quote from pp. 403-404.



other for different reasons. For generations the persistent problem of student-faculty relationships has not been well understood in terms of how student-faculty interaction influences the behavior of both.

David Riesman<sup>1</sup> suggests that students are guarded, that they fear closeness with faculty members. The reason, he points out, is that teachers are more effective and students fear being influenced by them. This is to suggest that the faculty members cannot be written off, that they must be taken seriously and that some students tend to feel somewhat in awe in relation to their professors.

What, then, do students want in relation to faculty? Eventually we will need to know more about which students get what in relationships with which faculty members.

#### FACULTY MEMBERS WHO CARE

Meanwhile we continue to recognize the importance of having a lively, dynamic, zestful faculty member who cares about students, but who might care even more about helping them learn what his discipline can mean to them personally and perhaps professionally. If a faculty member is to care about students, more often than not a legitimate medium of his caring should be his specialty, which in itself might be enough if he concerns himself with how it can have relevance in the lives of students. No teaching of any subject need be perfunctory if it can be an experience of relevance both for faculty and students. But if the professor's discipline, as he teaches it, has no significance for him, can it possibly then have significance for his students?

In expressing the belief that a person's specialty can enhance his relationship with students and need not be a bar to involvement with them, I recognize that specialization can be a bar and that it has been in colleges and universities over the country. The argument is not against specialization, for to deny the value and need for specialization would be to deny living in this century. I simply want to press the argument that specialization can work for people, even in relationships.

#### WAYS OF CARING

While discussing the importance of relationships in which people care about each other and care about learning,

---

<sup>1</sup>"Student Culture and Faculty Values," Spotlight on the College Student, edited by Margaret L. Habein, American Council on Education, 1959, pp. 8-31.

I am not advocating that faculty members be fathers and mothers to students in any paternalistic sense. Paternalism may be a form of authoritarianism wrapped in the cloak of knowledge and expertise which only the authority can have and which students must accept on his terms. And, of course, caring about each other is not enough. The college student, as well as the faculty member, needs to learn to care about his area of study and inquiry, and about the meaning his discipline can have in terms of one's commitments to life and to the society in which his life is lived.

But this raises the paramount question of how do we, as faculty members or persons, learn for ourselves, and how do we communicate to our students something of the process by which we continually develop a renewed zest for living, for exploration, for meaning and productivity.

One task, it seems to me, is to try to bring the students to the edge of our thinking in our specialty and to share with them the problems and dilemmas we face in our research, in our encounter with ideas. Clearly, this is more difficult in some disciplines than in others. Yet I find students most receptive to difficult and complex ideas if the intent is to enable them to discover the relevance in their lives and in the society in which they are living.

#### DICHOTOMIES NOT HELPFUL

The dichotomies in educational program conceptualizations in higher education do not help us. I am speaking of the dichotomies between thinking and feeling, between theory and application, between content and process, and between learning from books and lectures on the one hand and learning from experience on the other. These dichotomies tend to obscure what takes place in learning that is deeply meaningful to the student as a person.

Research and experience growing out of group dynamics, group psychotherapy, and social interaction generally, and increased knowledge of individual behavior, suggest value in integrating theory and its application to specific situations; value in imposing no limits on the reaches of the intellect and the breadth of the emotions of students; value in allowing, actually fostering, the explorations of ideas and feelings wherever they seem to go, seeking meaning in them whether they manifest themselves in experiences called ideas or in experiences called feelings.

Fortunately, most of us know professors who never seemed to be aware of the false dichotomies in education. Often these are the professors about whom there is a good

deal of subjective judgment and persistent evidence from students as well as from colleagues testifying to their good teaching. These are the professors who do seem to make a difference in the lives of students; who do seem to excite them; who do seem to combine the intellectual and personal worlds--combining, perhaps, in Gardner Murphy's term, "...fire in the belly and power in communication." These are the professors for whom both love and knowledge are relevant in learning.

### INDIVIDUALIZING AN EDUCATIONAL ENCOUNTER

I have talked about the need for learning to have relevance. How do we make an educational experience personally relevant? What are the degrees of relevance? We know (a) that some learning may be intensely relevant now and that other learning may become relevant later; (b) that we have to be concerned with present and future relevance; (c) that all learning cannot be relevant every hour of the day, if for no other reason than our inability to withstand intensity and so much stress; and (d) that to individualize does not mean one-to-one relationships exclusively between faculty members and students, or even between counselors and students, for that matter. We all know about highly relevant personal experiences that take place in a group or even in a crowd.

So while the matter of personal relevance is of importance, we have difficulty in defining it for students. In some ways we know that they have to define it for themselves. Our curriculum has not allowed enough of this. I am slowly coming to the point where I am willing for the faculty member to define personal relevance, but only for himself, not for the student. I am coming to discover that I do not have as much to say as I thought I did about what is important for students. Consequently, I am about to settle for an answer to the question of what is relevant and important for me. If I can do this and attempt to share concerns of importance, including the knowledge, skill, personal meaning, and values, and leave more room for the students to discover what is relevant for them, there is more likely to be an educational encounter between my students and me.

### LABELS AND THE WORTH OF A PERSON

In the years ahead perhaps we will be more able to value a wider variety of students because of their inherent worth as people. Perhaps, for example, we will value a striving member of a minority group more as an individual whose worth as a person is sufficient basis for our attention and concern rather than as an example of success in

representing his group well. Perhaps, also, we can involve ourselves with students less able and less bright who deserve access to opportunities for learning. Our purposes in valuing and devaluing students are subtle indeed.

Not long ago a clinical psychologist in a university counseling center worked diligently with a young lady whose success in college was not marked by high scholastic achievement. Over time he was indeed helpful to this young lady; she started him on his way to becoming a good counselor. In a conference he discussed his interest in her, and out of the discussion he discovered that he had come to value her during the early phases of counseling, despite her unattractive features and low marks, because her scholastic aptitude test scores were beyond the 95th percentile. And he finally came to discover, with some embarrassment, that in all probability he would not have regarded her as a "worthwhile case" had her score been below the 20th percentile. Does a test score tell us the worth of a person?

These labels plague us in the university world. Consider what we must do unwittingly, without awareness, to "bad" students, "unmotivated" students, and to a host of other types that somehow displease us and therefore become "unworthy."

As for the student, where can he find adults with whom to identify in the process of his own development as a person if he does not seek the symbols and the labels that we value, if he is not high on the test scores, if he is not a striver and grade-getter? It is small wonder that so many students in the state universities take themselves off the race track, hoping for some sort of meaningful self-realization and development outside.

#### WHO HELPS THE FACULTY?

Sometimes I get the impression that the switch has been made from blaming the students to blaming the faculty for some of the problems we now face on large campuses in our efforts to make the learning experience and environment a more personal world. It is easy to blame either group--the students for being reluctant scholars or not scholars at all and the faculty for being less interested in the students than in other matters.

In considering what to do about our dilemmas, it seems unlikely that faculty members are going to do any more than they are now doing. Moreover, it may be that faculty members are not going to be changed greatly through exhortation, consultative relationships, education, or even psychotherapy.



Consequently, rather than to limit the focus on the individual psychology of students, it seems more likely that these problems should be confronted on the basis of a social psychology or sociology of the campus in which a gigantic effort is made to change the value structure for faculty members, to reward teaching and evidence of interest in students as individuals, and to work our way toward a psychology of the individual faculty member.

There is little reason to believe that faculty members who want to be in relationships with students can themselves successfully stem the tide of competitiveness for research funds in a milieu where much is done for the good of education in general, but far less is done for the good of educating the individual student. Unless the university world is made a good deal more personal for the faculty it is not likely to be made more personal by the faculty for the students.

In addition to attempts to change the social value structure of the campus we also have to give additional attention to attracting different kinds of faculty members. This brings us to another possibility, which is to try to change the graduate school toward an emphasis on teaching and humaneness in relationships with others, instead of an emphasis on research. Parenthetically, I wonder if we are beginning to scapegoat the graduate schools for lacks in the faculty just as we formerly scapegoated the public schools because students somehow were not what we wanted them to be or did not know what we thought they should know. At the same time the graduate schools are vulnerable and not without some responsibility for the dilemmas we face.

If we look to faculty members as important persons whom students use in identifying with the intellectual values and learning within the university, the question must be raised: How do faculty members identify with their universities? We know that faculty members tend to identify with their disciplines on a national level and that they may serve many constituents. How important and influential are their students as constituents, as one audience? Who enables the faculty member to become a part of the university community? Does the president, the academic vice president, or the academic dean have as his unique responsibility the fostering of new definitions of faculty and university relationships?

On the local level faculty relationships with the university will vary among different specialties and according to professional interests, and will be affected by the value structure of the university rewards system. Whatever the factors, a faculty member who feels closely identified with his university is likely to be a different model from a faculty member

who feels little connection with his institution. A faculty member who sees himself as a good teacher is likely to model somewhat different attitudes and values from those modeled by a faculty member whose primary interest is research.

The attitudes, behavior, and budget decisions made by academic administrators certainly influence faculty relationships with the university. Faculty members are more likely to become involved in internal university affairs, even matters other than instruction, and come to feel a part of the university when they are valued for such involvement.

I would suggest, however, that the students themselves are potentially the most influential people in involving the faculty with the university, in making the university a more personal place for faculty members as well as for students. Students are likely to have more direct influence, of course, on the faculty members who care about teaching and who are willing to have some connection with students than on those who do not teach. Moreover, I am coming to believe that students are potentially the most influential agents for changing the value and rewards system within the university so that good teaching and the scholarly work it entails may be as important as basic research, publications, and grant getting.

## PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

### CAN UNIVERSITIES CHANGE?

The university, a source of developing new knowledge, now shows signs of willingness to discover knowledge of itself--its culture, its students and faculty. Recently, studying students in the university setting has become a halfway respectable activity for psychologists. Only the bolder or devil-may-care sociologists, even now, are willing to study the campus social systems in the face of pressures from their colleagues to do more "scholarly" work. The cultural anthropologists, to my knowledge, are still drawn to the rituals of tribes and cultures in faraway places rather than to the rituals and tribes on the campus. While we have been slow to study how to influence change in the university, we have begun to study how the university influences students.

Burgeoning studies of campus environments promise to tell us more about how to conceptualize the campus as a social system comprised of student and non-student cultures, and how the different campus subcultures influence student-faculty relationships and student learning.

A few private colleges are often cited as examples of colleges that influence students through reinforced student cultures which seem to grow out of a variety of programs and encounters among students and faculty members. Hopefully, some of the studies undertaken in the large urban universities will tell more about the subcultures of the campus and offer clues about how we can create, change, and take advantage of existing subcultures to promote individual and institutional values and to foster individual differences.

As we read the history of higher education, we may be struck by the profound influences one faculty member or administrator had on the development of an institution and its climate for learning. I wonder if it is still possible for one or even a few persons to excite the attention and attract the devotion of enough students and faculty members in the large university community to change the course of events and to foster a particular kind of climate? I would like to think so. Perhaps soon we will know enough to describe with clinical detail and objective accuracy the features of campuses where students, faculty, and administrators can bring about change and the characteristics of campuses where change seems unlikely if not impossible.

#### EVALUATION, NOT GRADES

If you want to intimidate students, give them unlimited freedom or more freedom than they can possibly use or know what to do with. If you want to intimidate faculty members, give them opportunities to teach on a give-and-take basis in any discipline or across disciplines without the security and protection of the structures of the department, of the courses and labels, and most of all, of the power inherent in the credit and grading system of the university.

I happen to believe that in the university of the future the grading system will have to go. I question whether or not it can be justified or defended on educational grounds. The system seems antithetical to the goals and processes of learning, not an inherent part of them. Grades have been likened to money by some observers and this is a good analogy. Students learn quickly how to use grades to barter; they learn what price they are willing to pay for what kinds of grades in what courses. Some pay dearly for grades that have shallow meaning while others pay whatever is necessary and come through with relative calm and detachment and without an encounter with learning. Again, like the barter system with money, grades get substituted for things that are more important; they become the symbols and get substituted for the essence.

In experience-centered learning, grades are irrelevant and become inconsequential. It should be noted, however, that there is a continuing need for evaluation by both students and faculty members, but an evaluation that focuses on what is learned in the deepest possible sense and what relevance the learning experience has for students and for faculty.

What is bothersome about the present wave of interest in student evaluations of faculty members and instruction is that the process possesses many of the same weaknesses inherent in the way faculty members evaluate students. The forms often ask the wrong questions, they are carried on by students without sufficient and direct faculty involvement and responsibility, and they take on the guise of objectivity where objectivity as such may not be important, or as important as intelligence and wise judgment about more subjective factors.

Again, one of the problems in the present systems of faculty grading and student evaluations of faculty is that they do not value or even allow for failure. Failure should be recognized as a vital part of learning, and we must be free to fail in order to grow, to develop, to change. Greater freedom to fail may allow us the imagination and resourcefulness to discover instances where failure actually may turn out to be success. This is another way of suggesting more openness to some of the outcomes of learning and some of the processes in which we engage.

While group psychotherapy may not be the mode of conducting classes, I have learned through such groups that individual behavior which appears to be self-defeating and destructive for both the person and other members of the group may become the most productive and constructive force in the group for helping the members and the individual to learn new coping behavior and to explore originally threatening but later enlightening ideas of how to help themselves and others! Again, what I am saying here implies no dichotomy between the student's everyday living or emotional life and his intellectual life. Quite the contrary, the total experience of the student is the best medium for integrating his total learning enterprise within the university.

#### SHORTCUTS ARE DECEPTIVE

The spirit of our time and culture encourages us to seek shortcuts and to streamline activities, and at the same time to seek greater participation in the diversity and richness of life available in our society. In keeping with this attitude, we find that there is so much knowledge and that it is developing so rapidly, we are having difficulty deciding what to teach by what process. Sometimes in looking at the



catalog and the listings of the courses I get the impression that knowledge is packaged for delivery.

There is so much to know that the student feels like a fraud if he masquerades as a liberally educated person--and so does the faculty member. But the expanding amount and complexity of knowledge makes it even more important that those of us interested in teaching and learning understand more about the relevance of learning for the individual student and his own development. I hasten to add, however, that to become a person the student needs more than himself to focus on as a primary aim in life. So does the faculty member! It is for this reason, among others, that it is futile and unnecessary to dichotomize sharply between knowledge and the student.

The curriculum and the faculty try to shortcut the world of experience for the student through selection of knowledge and planned learning activities. To some extent we actually can do this. We cannot do it, however, by packaging knowledge and handing the packages to students.

Students themselves also try to shortcut their development through bypassing or pretending to bypass some stages of behavior. This shows up largely through "acting out" behavior in some of the demonstrations and through the "beat movement" where students are reacting against a life they have little experienced or little understood. But it is difficult for either students or faculty to shortcut student development. Sooner or later the students are likely to discover that they have to fill in the gaps in their own background, in their own developmental processes.

We know that students are uneven in their development, that growing up is zigzag and also one-sided. It is not unusual for us to discover among students and faculty members intellectually gifted persons who are stunted emotionally. It is surprising that so many of our students are unaware of their deeper feelings and live under the surface of their skin by responding to the more superficial emotions.

Often burdening intellectual demands encourage students to suppress their emotions as though these were not a part of the basis for a person's achievement and development, even for the most effective rational life. Consequently, students who appear to be grown up physically and who have mature and thoughtful ideas often are naive and lacking in any sense of understanding of their own inner emotional life.

In the university of the future we will need to distinguish those shortcuts which are genuinely helpful from those

which are harmful, those experiences which are basic to student development from those which are superfluous, those activities which facilitate continued student learning from those which foster disenchantment and alienation from the educational enterprise. Progress will be made indeed when we can specify those learning experiences which provide a blend of emotion and intellect having relevance simultaneously for faculty and for students.

### ONE LIFE FOR STUDENTS

For the student, campus life and intellectual life need not hold antithetical values. To fail to recognize this in learning programs is to lose much of the vitality of both in contributing to student development. The experience-centered world outside the classroom can no doubt give meaning to intellectual encounters, just as the world of ideas and intellectual excitement in classroom work and instruction at its best can be brought to the problems and experiences which students encounter in campus activities.

It seems likely that students will have to take the initiative in bridging this cultural divide. Faculty members and staff have been either disinclined or unsuccessful at the task. It is true, of course, that as more faculty members become interested in what students do outside the classroom and as psychologists and sociologists attempt to understand student use of campus activities for their development, there is closer communion. In the main, however, the institutional structure in the large university is against a merging of the two cultures and the discovery that both can be complementary and serve as the larger curriculum.

### FROM FACULTY ADVISING TO FACULTY AND STUDENT MODELS

For years we have watched programs of faculty advising and counseling initiated enthusiastically, flourish perhaps for a period, and then disappear or fade into perfunctory tasks of routine registration advising. Occasionally programs are kept alive and seem to manifest some special vitality that is nourished by the institution's climate and value system. My experience has been that these programs seldom survive for long in the university. We attribute the causes of failure to: (a) lack of faculty interest; (b) lack of time for such activities; (c) lack of know-how and staff development opportunities for faculty participants; and (d) failures to build the advising activities into the university value and rewards system.

These causes no doubt are relevant, but there are other perhaps more vital causes. One problem is that for freshmen

we have no effective way of discovering a basis for meaningful student-faculty relationships in advising. Faculty members have not had opportunities to be accepted or rejected as models by the freshmen. Nor have they been stimulating inspirational teachers.

I would like to suggest that we turn the system upside down and allow juniors and seniors to choose faculty advisers who are models and then study the nature of the relationships and the uses students and faculty can make of them.

Faculty members who are chosen and who are willing to participate in such a program would be receptive to learning about student development, sensitive to the problems students face, and perhaps open to understanding the processes by which students and faculty members enter into real encounters. I have no doubt that such an experience involving faculty members and students would contribute both to faculty conceptions of students and to their conceptions of teaching.

One of our problems in the universities is that we want freshmen to behave as though they were graduate students-- or junior faculty members. Accordingly, we organize the system to induce student-faculty relationships to lead to this kind of behavior and it does not come about. Still, this does not mean that we cannot discover ways to foster meaningful relationships between faculty members and incoming students. Traditionally, and perhaps rightfully, we think of faculty members as the logical persons for freshmen to emulate. At the same time we know that there are not enough accessible faculty members who appeal to freshmen.

We have not begun to utilize as resourcefully as we can the vast potential that the upperclassmen possess in doing important work with entering lower division students. What exciting possibilities the use of upperclassmen holds for working in a continuing fashion with entering freshmen, perhaps alongside some of the faculty members! The upperclassmen themselves, of course, would be the greatest benefactors and reap rewards from attempts to discover and understand the problems of entering freshmen and to bring the resources of the university to bear on them. More importantly, the upperclassmen would gain through striving to be humane persons who harness thoughtful and honest concerns into action programs for other persons who are entering their university world. Such programs, moreover, could offer opportunities to enable both freshmen and upperclassmen to strengthen their identification with the institution.

Faculty members and administrators may hold that encounters with freshmen are the prerogative of the faculty.

The use of upperclassmen as models cannot be overlooked, however, particularly if the upperclassmen can take as their models some of the professors with whom they have established meaningful relationships. Thus, in setting up a system whereby juniors and seniors can work closely with faculty models they have chosen out of the course of their university experience, these upperclassmen may then participate in experience-centered learning through work with entering students. If students are valued as part of the academic community, the entering freshmen need not feel that they are getting second best, that they are being shunted off to "student assistants."

While I am making a case for students and faculty members to engage directly in experiencing the world around them and for more intimacy in relationships, I also want to recognize the need for them to get away from intimacy, to get away from small groups, or to get lost in a crowd. Certainly the universities can provide healthy diversions and even escapes from intimacy that no small college can imitate.

#### FEW FEMALE MODELS

By now it may be clear that I am very much interested in the ways students use faculty members as models. A pertinent observation is that universities are notably lacking in mature adult female scholars and teachers who may serve as subjects of emulation among students. I know few women university professors with whom both male and female undergraduates might identify in their own search for self-definition. Fewer women complete the Ph. D. degree. Those who do, if they are married, need to be where their husbands work and may take time out of their careers to have babies and raise families. Women often may be discouraged from entering an academic career in the large university because it is more difficult for them than it is for men to reach tenure appointments. Why this is so is not entirely clear. I suspect that there is a good deal of stereotyping of women. The fact that we cite as unusual the examples of able women we know in academic life may be testimony of our own subtle prejudice and stereotypic ways of looking at women in professional life.

But the point of this comment is not the problem of prejudice toward professional women, but the need for them in the education of young men and women in the universities. While there may be no experimental evidence to show clearly how they would contribute as models for students in the academic community, I hope that we can formulate some interesting and sensible hypotheses that can be checked out in the research--both for male and female modeling.



## TRANSITIONAL SEMINARS FOR SENIORS

We have been diligent in developing orientation programs for students entering the large universities. I would like to suggest that we give attention to a different kind of orientation program for seniors, for students who are leaving the university and who are in transition from the university world to the larger society.

Many seniors are beset with doubts about the future, about what their college education means now that they are about to leave. Contacts in discussions with student leaders in their senior year often reveal the depth of their concern about what they are going to do next, not simply in the professional world but with their own lives in deeply personal ways. Students in campus leadership positions may be inclined to look back to question whether or not they spent their time wisely in the activities in which they engaged. I would like to suggest that it may be worthwhile to institute programs of orientation of a very special sort to provide opportunities for seniors to have close contacts with faculty members and other adults to explore their natural and healthy concerns about themselves and about the future.

Seniors probably are examining the validity of their values now more closely than they have before. College seniors developing new kinds of expectations for the adult world can no longer use the somewhat protective institutional setting of the college either for support or for justification of immaturity if it still persists. Nevitt Sanford points out from the Vassar studies that old values may have been tossed aside, but new values and self-identities have not been formulated clearly with sufficient stability and confidence to be considered reliable.<sup>1</sup>

It is rather surprising that more universities have not set up senior seminars in which small groups of seniors, with interested, perceptive, and knowledgeable faculty members, can have an opportunity to explore their development, aspirations for the future, and connections with the immediate past. We probably would continue to discover both similarities and differences in the concerns of men and women, but women are bothered more than before about how to integrate the roles of career, marriage, and educated woman in the community.

---

<sup>1</sup>"Knowledge of Students Through the Social Studies," Spotlight on the College Student, Margaret L. Habein, editor, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1959, pp. 47-89.

## STATE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

We may feel discouraged with the state of higher education because so much of what goes on in universities has little to do with the education of students as persons and because so many of us get so caught up in research, consultation, the preparation of lectures and speeches, and academic huckstering generally that we have few significant contacts with students. On this state of affairs, Professor J. Glenn Gray of the Philosophy Department of Colorado College, writing in the May, 1965 issue of Harper's<sup>1</sup>, warns that "...we deepen the rift between the generations and at the same time increase the sense of impersonality, discontinuity, and absence of community that makes college life less satisfactory in this decade than it used to be..." Professor Gray continues, "...nowadays nearly everyone looks to education for salvation as once we had looked to religion or to a political ideology. But before we succeed in building the Great Society, we shall need to resolve the doubt and bafflement about its validity and worth in the minds of those who are in college who should serve as leaders. Many of the harrassed young men and women I teach, at any rate, have not yet decided what sense, if any, their existence has."<sup>1</sup>

We may feel greatly encouraged, however, in the current attention given to understanding students and in evidence that some faculty members do devote time and attention to understanding students and to helping them make knowledge relevant to their lives. I feel a sense of elation in what seems to be a growing concern among students for their own education. Students are seeking to become engaged with each other, with their universities, and with the world. I am heartened by student interest in their own college and university experience and am encouraged that their own education may become one of their causes. It is a worthy one and one they can do something about.

Higher education is much in the public eye, and powerful professional, political, and social forces are at work to mold it to serve the public good. But, for me the most exciting development in this decade is the prospect for active involvement of students in the affairs of higher education and in the educational process.

This talk has represented a kind of smorgasbord of ideas and comments on higher education. In different ways

---

<sup>1</sup>"Salvation on the Campus: Why Existentialism Is Capturing the Students," Harper's, Vol. 230, May, 1965, pp. 53-59; quote from p. 59.

I have tried to say that the university can and should be a personal place for learning and for development both for the students and the faculty. But students and faculty, mostly the students, will have to see to it that the needed educational reforms are brought about. Too, students and faculty members must become willing to know and to be known to each other and to share their authentic concerns while experiencing the frustrations and joys of learning and of living as people.



## **TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION COMMITTEE**

### **CELEBRATION COORDINATOR**

**Robbie Engelmann**

### **COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRMEN**

**Mary Crane  
Barb Hall**

### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**Walt Bachman  
Ed Fashingbauer  
Mary Frentz  
Irene Hadley  
Jeff Halter  
Tom Hays  
Kent Hazen  
Eric Hucke  
Tim Jeffery  
Penny Kelly  
Joe Labat  
Mary Marrazzi  
Valerie Moore  
Gregg Nelson  
Bonnie Newman  
Carol Paajanen  
Dick Schrader  
Mike Stacy  
Ann Suker  
Maggie Tressel  
Vince Wagner  
Charlotte Weber**

### **CMU STAFF COORDINATOR**

**Tom Stark**

## **TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY SEMINAR COMMITTEE**

### **SEMINAR CHAIRMAN**

**Keith McFarland  
Assistant Dean  
Institute of Agriculture**

### **PROGRAM**

**Edmund G. Williamson, Chairman  
Dean of Students**

**Paul H. Cashman  
Assistant Vice President for  
Educational Relationships and  
Development**

**Elmer W. Learn  
Assistant to the President**

**Robbie Engelmann**

**Sheldon Gulinson**

**R. Thomas Perry**

**James Rustad**

**Gordon L. Starr**

### **FINANCE, FACILITIES, AND ARRANGEMENTS**

**Gordon L. Starr, Chairman  
Director of Student Unions**

**C. Luverne Carlson  
Director of University Services**

**Harold Smith  
Director of University Bookstores**

**Daniel Paskewitz**

**Mary Watson**

### **PUBLICITY AND NEWS RELATIONS**

**William L. Nunn, Chairman  
Director of University Relations**

**N. Lawrence Bentson  
Alumni Association Representative**

**William Brooks**

**Penny Kelly**

**Alan Ominsky**