DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 674 HE 027 515

AUTHOR Terenzini, Patrick T.
TITLE Educating for Citizenship: Freeing the Mind and Elevating the Spirit.
INSTITUTION National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, University Park, PA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 15 Oct 93
CONTRACT R117G10037
NOTE 24p.; An earlier version of this paper was presented as the Keynote Address at the Annual Meeting of the Association for General and Liberal Studies (Memphis, TN, October 15, 1993).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Altruism; *Citizenship Education; Citizenship Responsibility; *College Environment; College Students; *Educational Experience; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; Outcomes of Education; Political Attitudes; Student Attitudes; *Student Development; Thinking Skills

ABSTRACT

This speech examines the relationship between the college experience and education for citizenship in the United States. The research evidence finds changes toward greater altruism, humanitarianism and sense of civic responsibility and social conscience during the college years. Most research also shows that students' political attitudes and values become more liberal and that students have a greater interest in social and political issues and in participation in the political process. Studies also indicate that students become more egalitarian in their views on the equality of the sexes. Clear and consistent evidence indicates that students make statistically significant gains during college in the use of principled reasoning to judge moral issues. Students also appear to become more independent of parents and somewhat more mature in their interpersonal relations. Whether these changes are due to the college experience or normal maturation at this age, the weight of evidence overall suggests that a statistically significant if modest part of the changes during college can be attributed to the college experience. Institutional differences appear to have little impact on changes in students' attitudes, values, or principled moral reasoning. Certain kinds of experiences do appear to be more important: particularly place of residence and the type of interactions with faculty and peers that the living situation promotes. (Contains 11 references.) (JB)

EDUCATING FOR CITIZENSHIP:

FREEING THE MIND AND ELEVATING THE SPIRIT

by

Patrick T. Terenzini
Senior Researcher and Associate Director
National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment
The Pennsylvania State University
403 S. Allen St., Suite 104
University Park, PA 16801-5252
Telephone: (814) 865-5917
BITNET: PTT2@PSUVM
Internet: PTT2@PSUVM.PSU.EDU

An earlier version of this paper was presented as the keynote address to the annual meeting of the Association for General and Liberal Studies. Memphis, TN, October 15, 1993. To appear in Innovation in Higher Education.

PROJECT R117G10037
CFDA 84.117G

EDUCATING FOR CITIZENSHIP:

FREEING THE MIND AND ELEVATING THE SPIRIT

There can be little doubt that American colleges and universities are, and have been, deeply involved in the preparation of our young for citizenship and for participation in a democratic society. Indeed, as historian Frederick Rudolph (1962) has put it:

> . . . the really important fact about Harvard College is that it was absolutely necessary. Puritan Massachusetts could not have done without it. Unable to set the world straight as Englishmen in England, the Puritan settlers of Massachusetts intended to set it straight as Englishmen in the New World. . . . They could not afford to leave (the future's) shaping to whim, fate, accident, indecision, incompetence, or carelessness. In the future the state would need competent, rulers, the church would require a learned clergy, and society itself would need the adornment of cultured men (pp. 5-6).

Harvard was not unique in having the preparation of students for community service and good citizenship as one of its founding purposes. The other eight colleges founded before 1770 had most of the same purposes, some more, some less. The role of America's colleges and universities in the preparation of students for productive and responsible membership in society has changed little over the years, although we occasionally lose sight of this portion of our institutional mission.

This morning, I want to share with you what the research on college impacts on students has to say that is relevant to the development of citizenship and the theme of this conference: "Liberal Education and the Public Spirit." But first, a little background.

In 1985, Ernie Pascarella and I (fools that we are) decided to review the past 20 years of research on the effects of college on students. Our decision led to a five-year scholarly journey which Ernie has characterized as somewhere between a not entirely successful assault on Mt. Everest and a forced march through ten miles of silly putty. It also spawned, for better or worse, our book entitled How College Affects Students:

Findings and Insights from Twenty Years of Research, published in 1991 by Jossey-Bass. The book synthesizes more than 2600 books, monographs, journal articles, conference papers, and research reports produced in the past two decades. It is some 850 pages long, including a bibliography of about 140 pages. Since it has a white cover, is quite large, and can seriously injure if lifted with the back rather than the legs, or if dropped from any height greater than a foot and a half, Ernie's wife, Diana, has dubbed it "Moby Book."

Our review covered a wide array of educational outcomes in ten general areas, but, as I said, I will focus this morning on findings that seem most closely related to the development of "citizenship," to "freeing the mind and elevating the spirit." I will not try to define "citizenship" in any precise fashion, but rather use it to refer generally to an individual's attitudes, values, dispositions, and behaviors that might shape the nature of that person's membership and participation in a democratic community.

The relevant research falls into several categories: 1) that on changes in students' political and social attitudes and values; 2) changes in their attitudes toward appropriate gender roles; 3) changes in students' moral reasoning (i.e., the basis on which they judge some belief, idea, or action to be "right" or "moral," and 4) changes in certain psychosocial dimensions relevant to citizenship (e.g., authoritarianism, dogmatism, and ethnocentrism).

Pascarella and I asked six questions of the research base, but this morning I will focus on only three of them, using them to organize the relevant evidence:

1) Do students change during college (in ways that are relevant to the development of good citizenship and participation in a democratic society)? And if so, how much and in what directions? (I guess that's really two questions.)

2) How much of any observed change is attributable to attending college (versus, say, normal maturation or forces outside the academy)?, and

3) Are the changes related to differences in students' experiences on any given campus? Put another way: Are there things colleges and universities can do purposely to promote citizenship?

Questions #1: Do students change during college in ways that might promote or facilitate good citizenship?

Given the social and political turmoil of the last two decades, it should come as no surprise that change in students' political and social value orientations have received more research attention than any other category of attitudes and values. The research in this area falls into three general subcategories, all of which are, I think, relevant to the development of citizenship: (1) altruism, social conscience, humanitarianism, civic activities, and similar "other-person" orientations in attitudes and values; (2) students' "liberal-conservative" orientations specifically applied in the political arena, as well as their formal political party affiliation preferences and political activities, and (3) general tolerance and respect for the civil rights and civil liberties of others.

Altruism, Humanitarianism, and Civic Values. With a few exceptions, the evidence is abundant and consistent in indicating that changes toward greater altruism, humanitarianism and sense of civic responsibility and social conscience occur during the college years. Estimation of the magnitude of these shifts is made difficult by the wide

variation in instruments, samples, and the period of time over which the changes occur. As an educated guess, I might estimate the degree of change to be in the 5-10 percentile point range.

Political Values. The evidence on changes in students' political attitudes and values is much the same as that relating to their more generalized social or civic orientations. A number of national studies have produced results almost invariably indicating changes during the college years in students' political attitudes and values toward more liberal political stances, greater interest in social and political issues, and greater interest and involvement in the political process. Estimates of the magnitudes of these shifts (e.g., Hyman, Wright, & Reed, 1975; Erikson, Luttbeg, & Tedin, 1973) made in the mid-1970s suggest percentage shifts toward the political left between high school and college graduation ranging from 12 to 30 percentage points. A more recent study (Dey, 1989), however, suggests freshman-senior gains may be substantially lower (+8 percentile points), down perhaps as much as 50% from the pre- to mid-1960s levels. These results suggest the possibility that the potential for college impact on students' sociopolitical attitudes and values may be somewhat less now than in the past. "Middle of the roaders" appear to be supplying the students who are doing the changing (Astin, Green, & Korn, 1986).

Civil Rights and Liberties. National studies dealing with changes during the college years in attitudes and values related to civil rights, civil liberties, racism, anti-Semitism, or general tolerance for non-conformity uniformly report shifts toward social, racial, ethnic and political tolerance and greater support for the rights of

individuals in a wide variety of areas.

Several national studies permit estimation of the magnitudes of the changes that appear to occur during the college years. One study (Nunn, Crockett, & Williams, 1978) found a 26 percentage point difference between the proportion of college graduates classifiable as "more tolerant" of nonconformity when compared with a sample of high school graduates (84 vs. 58 percent). Another study (Hyman & Wright, 1979), a massive analysis of thirty-eight national sample surveys (conducted from 1949 to 1975) and including approximately 44,000 adults (ages 25 to 72), found support for civil liberties, due process of law, the free flow of information (even when controversial), and for social, political and economic equality. Support for these positions was 40 to 50 percent more prevalent among college graduates than among elementary school graduates. Moreover, "Small increments of education anywhere along the way . . . were shown by several modes of analysis to have positive effects on values" (Hyman & Wright, 1979, p. 60).

Gender Role Attitudes and Values. With some exceptions (some of which might be questioned on methodological grounds), most studies also indicate that during the college years students become increasingly more egalitarian or "modern" in their views on the equality of the sexes. The shifts are apparent with respect both to educational and occupational opportunities and roles, as well as the distribution of responsibilities in marriage, family relations, and child-rearing. We are unwilling to estimate the magnitude of these changes, however, given the single-institution character of most of these studies.

Moral Reasoning. Clear and consistent evidence indicates that students make statistically significant gains during college in the use of principled reasoning to judge moral issues. It is difficult if not impossible to estimate with confidence the size of freshman-to-senior change, but the magnitude may be less important than the fact that the major shift during college is from conventional moral reasoning, where morality is seen as obedience to rules and meeting the expectations of those in authority, to post-conventional or principled judgment, which views morality as a set of universal principles of social justice existing independently of societal codification. This shift in and of itself represents a major event in moral development. It would also appear that the greatest gains in principled moral reasoning occur during the first or the first and second years of college. Because this conclusion is based on a small number of investigations, however, we must consider it tentative.

Psychosocial Changes. Students also change in the manner in which they engage and respond to other people and to other aspects of their external worlds. As students become better learners, they also appear to become increasingly independent of parents (but not necessarily peers) and to become somewhat more mature in their interpersonal relations, both in general and in their intimate relations with others. Moreover, consistent with the observed shifts toward greater openness in attitudes and values, the evidence quite consistently indicates that students gain in their willingness to challenge authority, in their tolerance of other people and their views, in their openness to new ideas, and in their ability to think in non-stereotypic ways about others who are socially, culturally, sexually, racially, or ethnically different from themselves.

Summary. The changes students experience in all these areas -- social, political, and gender role attitudes and values, principled moral reasoning, and certain psychosocial dimensions -- taken together, define a clear and general movement during the college years. That movement is away from a personal orientation characterized by constraint, narrowness, exclusiveness, simplicity, and intolerance. The movement is toward a perspective among students characterized by a greater individual freedom, breadth, inclusiveness, complexity, and tolerance for new ideas and others who are socially, culturally, sexually, racially, or ethnically different from themselves. As I read this evidence, it reflects a movement toward the freeing of the mind and the elevation of the spirit, toward the ability to function responsibly in a diverse and democratic society. The evidence reveals progress toward one of the fundamental goals of a liberal education.

But asking whether students change during college is not the same as asking whether students change because of college. Which leads me to our second question.

Question #2: To what extent are these changes a consequence of college attendance and not of normal maturation or of forces outside the academy?

As you might expect, identifying college's effects above and beyond those of normal maturation and other non-college influences is a messy business, and the body of research on net effects is substantially smaller than that simply documenting change during the college years.

Social and Political Values and Attitudes. Although the findings are somewhat mixed, the general weight of evidence supports the conclusion that college attendance does have a modest net effect on social conscience and humanitarian values above and

beyond the characteristics and values students bring with them to college. The evidence is more clear and consistent that college does have an effect on increases in students' political orientations and activities above and beyond background characteristics and precollege political values and attitudes.

Considerable evidence from a variety of sources points to positive, net effects of college attendance on students' attitudes and opinions on civil rights and civil liberties above and beyond a variety of background characteristics, age, and occupation. Probably the best study on this topic (Hyman & Wright, 1979), for example, after controlling a variety of relevant variables, found years of education positively and strongly related to support for civil liberties for socialists, atheists and communists; for freedom of information; for due process of law for extremists and dissidents; for public expression; for the value of privacy; for human values relating to abortion, and for equality of opportunity for minority groups. Support for these values increased consistently and dramatically with educational level.

An important issue in interpreting the evidence of education's effects on social and political attitudes and values is the link (or lack thereof) between attitudes and values, on the one hand, and behavior on the other. Several well-designed studies have, over the years, found evidence that while attitudes and values may change in the direction of civic responsibility and participation, support for specific governmental interventions (e.g., busing, gun controls) may lag behind. It is not clear, however, whether the explanation for these apparent inconsistencies lies in a difference between principle and action or in differences over various alternative courses of action that might be taken in support of

some principle.

Gender Role Attitudes and Values. The weight of evidence also fairly consistently indicates education-related changes toward more liberal views of the roles of women above and beyond those attributable to personal and background characteristics. Caution is nonetheless in order: Several of the studies that report changes in attitudes toward gender roles were based on cross-sectional designs that make it more difficult to attribute net change in student attitudes to the college experience. Moreover, even among those studies that followed the same group of students over time, most leave pre-college attitudes or values themselves controlled. Thus, differences in attitudes and values in this area between those who went to college and those who did not could well have been there in the first place.

Moral Development. The evidence further indicates that college also has a positive effect on the use of principled reasoning in judging the "rightness" of moral choices and actions. This effect holds even when controls are made for maturation and for differences between those who attend and do not attend college in level of precollege moral reasoning, intelligence, and socioeconomic status. As with attitudinal and value changes, however, the net impact of college on moral behavior is less clear. Based on a synthesis of two separate bodies of research, however, we hypothesize a positive indirect effect. By that I mean college enhances the use of principled moral reasoning which, in turn, is positively linked to a variety of principled actions.

Psychosocial Changes. Declines in authoritarianism and dogmatism, and increases in students' internal sense (locus) of control, intellectual orientation, personal adjustment,

and general psychological well-being can all be attributed to college with moderate-to-considerable confidence. College's contributions to the declines in authoritarianism and dogmatism appear to be strong, but its effects in the other areas are much more modest, even small.

Summary. While not totally consistent, and certainly not without rival explanations, the weight of this evidence overall nevertheless suggests that a statistically significant, if modest, part of the broad-based changes in attitudes, values, moral reasoning, and relevant psychosocial characteristics occurring during college can be attributed to the college experience. Perhaps of equal importance, the net effects of college, particularly in the areas of social, political and gender-role values, appear not to be simple reflections of trends in the larger society across the last two decades. Rather, college attendance seems to have an impact on values and attitudes in these areas which is generally consistent both within and across age cohorts.

Well, if students' change in a variety of ways that are consistent with the development of good citizenship in a democratic society, and if at least some of those changes are attributable to college attendance and not merely to normal maturation or to forces in the society at large, what are those things colleges and universities can do to maximize their impact in these areas? That's Question No. 3.

3. **Are There Changes Related to Differences in Students' Experiences on Any Given Campus?** (The "Within-College Effects question)

Social and Political Attitudes and Values. The research on the effects of academic major field is unclear. Social science and humanities majors appear more often than not

to experience greater gains in social liberalism than majors in business, engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences, and these findings emerge whether various pre-college characteristics, including initial social orientation, are controlled or not. One well-designed study (Thistlethwaite, 1973), however, after adjusting for initial value status, found that similar one-year effects disappeared when changes over a two-year period were examined. Changes in the percentage of variance in political participation and in liberalism associated with major fields ranged in absolute magnitude from zero to only 3.2 percent.

Coursework and other academic program involvement do appear to exert an influence on political attitudes and values, although the evidence is far from unambiguous. Several studies suggest taking courses in the social sciences is related to increases in political liberalism, as well as to changes in other social attitudes and values. Other studies, however, find few or no differences between students in political science courses or other formal programs and those in control groups. The author of one literature review (Lamare, 1975) concluded that the evidence on the relation of formal political science coursework and value change is best characterized as "a pattern of reinforcement and accentuation, but not radical alteration" (p. 428).

Some evidence suggests that the content of a class may be less important than the manner in which it is taught. One well-done study (Chickering, 1970) reports strong inverse relationships between change toward civil libertarianism and teaching practices in courses where lectures dominate and where extrinsic rewards (e.g., grades) are important. In contrast, greater, positive changes occurred in classes that encouraged

discussion and open argument and whose students gave intrinsic reasons for being enrolled (e.g., "I was interested in the subject.").

Recent research on collaborative and cooperative teaching approaches is consistent with these findings. While these approaches take varied forms, they have several characteristics in common, among them a reliance on the "joint intellectual effort" of students or of students and teacher together. Collaborative learning requires active participation by those involved, who typically work in groups of two or more. Among the goals of collaborative instruction are student involvement in their learning, cooperation and teamwork, and promotion of a sense of civic responsibility to other members of the learning group (Smith & MacGregor, pp. 9-12). According to Vince Tinto, my colleague in the National Center who has been studying the effectiveness of collaborative learning approaches, involvement in such groups appears to engender in students a sense of educational citizenship, a sense of their responsibility to participate, an awareness of their responsibility not only for their own learning but also for the learning of others. Such instructional interdependence leads, Tinto believes, to "a deeper appreciation for the importance of community in their lives and the need to become responsible for one another. In giving students a valued voice in their own learning, they come to understand the importance of allowing others to have a similar voice" (Tinto, undated).

Earlier research found that students who live on-campus enjoyed an advantage over commuter or off-campus students in the likelihood that they would change more on a variety of personal dimensions. For example, after controlling precollege characteristics

and status on the values being studied, living in a residence hall is consistently and positively associated with increases in altruism and support for civil liberties and racial integration. Residential effects on sex-role attitudes, however, remain virtually unexplored.

More recent studies, however, suggest that the residential advantage is indirect rather than direct, more one of environment than of physical place. These more recent investigations find that residential effects are mediated by students' levels of academic and social involvement with faculty members and peers. And it is these academic and interpersonal experiences with peers and faculty that seem to have the greatest impact on educational outcomes.

For example, a small but reasonably consistent body of research indicates that residence in a living-learning center (LLC) has significant net effects on students' gains in autonomy, personal independence, intellectual dispositions, and on declines in authoritarianism and dogmatism. More importantly, nowever, when students' interpersonal contacts and relations with other students and faculty members are also taken into account, LLCs exert their influence on students not so much through their structural, organizational, or programmatic features as through the interpersonal relations they foster or facilitate among the major socializing agents -- other students, faculty members, and administrators.

Similarly, as noted earlier, within institutions and across value areas, academic major field appears to be less influential than the interpersonal associations students have with faculty members and peers in the departmental context. Studies using the major

department as a predictor variable tend not to find significant differences in the amount of personal change over time. Major department -- when understood as a disciplinary unit -- may be too far removed from students' experiences. When the department is understood as an interpersonal setting, however, when it is seen as a learning context in which students and faculty interact in a variety of intellectual and social ways, reliable differences in student outcomes are more likely to appear regardless of the discipline. The degree of value consensus and homogeneity among students and faculty members also appears to exert an important contextual influence on student socialization and value change. We are, however, only beginning to understand the precise dynamics and causal flow of the influence among students, peers, faculty members within departments and residence units.

Gender Role Attitudes and Values. Given the limited evidence, little can be concluded about differential effects in sex role attitude change associated with academic major field. A number of studies indicate movement toward more egalitarian orientations as a consequence of college coursework related to women's roles in society and the modern family. Some of this evidence suggests that students initially the most traditional in their views of sex roles change more than their initially more "modern" peers. Most of these studies, however, are based on opportunistic class samples and fail to control for initial gender role attitudes (students enrolling for these courses, compared to those who do not, typically score higher initially in sex role liberalism). Thus, student self-selection remains as a plausible alternative to course effects in explaining the changes that are

observed. Moreover, no light is shed on the permanency of any course-related attitudinal or value changes.

Moral Development. The evidence pertaining to the influence of different college experiences on principled moral judgment is also somewhat equivocal in terms of offering consistent, replicable findings. College experiences in which an individual is exposed to divergent perspectives (e.g., living away from home, intellectual interactions with roommates), or is confronted with cognitive moral conflict (e.g., courses presenting issues from different points of view and emphasizing discussions of moral dilemmas) were, however, reported by students as having a salient influence on their moral development. Interactions with upperclassmen in residential facilities (perhaps through exposure to more advanced stages of moral reasoning) and assuming new personal responsibilities (such as social role-taking) also appear to influence moral development. However, it is important to note that students also have a role to play: the extent to which an student takes advantage of these opportunities, particularly those having an intellectual or academic content, is also an important determinant of growth in moral reasoning during college.

While these interventions appear to enhance moral development, it is clear that their effect, as well as the effect of any specific college experience, is substantially smaller than the effect that can be reasonably attributed to four years of college. One possible explanation for this is that, the influence of college on principled moral reasoning -- like college's influence on other outcomes -- is the result, not so much of

any single experience, but rather of the cumulative impact of a set of mutually reinforcing experiences.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Well, what does all of this have to say about educating for citizenship, about freeing the mind and elevating the spirit? Several conclusions are suggested, and some, at least, have implications for immediate practice.

First, it is clear that students change during the college years in a variety of ways consistent with the promotion of citizenship and responsible participation in a democratic society. These changes are modest in size, however, and they tend to be smaller than the changes in learning and cognitive skills. These changes occur in students' sociopolitical attitudes and values, including gains in altruism, humanitarianism, social conscience, and civic activity; increases in "modern" gender-role attitudes about the appropriate occupational, social, and family roles of men and women. Gains in principled moral reasoning are also apparent, as are shifts in students' relations with individuals and groups in their external worlds, including increases in mature interpersonal relations and declines in authoritarianism, dogmatism, and ethnocentrism. As I have noted, the general direction of these changes is away from a personal orientation characterized by constraint, narrowness, exclusiveness, simplicity, and intolerance, and toward a perspective with greater emphasis on individual freedom, breadth, openness, inclusiveness, complexity, principled moral reasoning, and tolerance. In short, the trends are quite consistent with what one might expect of a liberal education.

Second, in most cases at least, a portion of the changes in students' attitudes and values, psychosocial development, and principled moral reasoning can be attributed with some confidence to college attendance above and beyond normal maturation and what students were like when they entered college. Students do not, of course, live in isolation from the world about them, and some portion of the overall observed changes in attitudes and values no doubt reflect the influence of changes in our society as a whole. But the evidence fairly clearly indicates the presence of college affects both within and across age cohorts, suggesting the college experience also plays a part. As one might expect, however, these "net" effects are smaller than the total effects.

Third, while I have not reviewed the relevant evidence this morning, it is worth noting that few college effects in these areas can be attributed to the kinds of institutions students attend. Once students' entering characteristics are taken into account, institutional differences based on size, type of control, curricular mission, wealth, selectivity, or prestige appear to have little impact on changes in students' attitudes and values, or principled moral reasoning. There are a few exceptions to this conclusion, but even where such institutional effects are discernible, they tend to be small. My point, and it is quite clear in the literature, is that what happens to students after they arrive on campus has far more impact on student change than the kind of institution they attend. One clear implication of this is that our current definitions of institutional "quality" need revision. Another implication is that what we do with students is more likely to make a difference in student learning than are the resources we have available. Institutional effects are likely to depend more on the curriculum offered, the quality of teaching, the

nature of the instructional methods used, and the nature and frequency of student-faculty interaction than on the size of the library, the entering test scores of students, the proportion of the faculty holding the terminal degree in their field, educational expenditures per FTE student, or other indicators of institutional wealth, prestige, and advantage.

Fourth, certain kinds of campus experiences consistently appear to shape student change in these areas. Where students live during college is particularly important. Students living on-campus change to a greater extent in virtually every area than do students who live at home. Students living in private, off-campus quarters, or in a fraternity or sorority house, change to intermediate degrees, and commuting students change the least. A growing body of evidence, however, suggests that the actual place of residence may be less important than the kinds of interpersonal interactions with faculty and peers it promotes or constrains. The challenge is to find ways of making the citizenship-related benefits of on-campus residence more readily available to part-time and commuting students, whether they attend a community college or a four-year institution. The absence of residential facilities is a non-trivial obstacle, but a number of possibilities hold promise for at least reducing the gap if not closing it completely. Those possibilities include the redesign of orientation and academic advising programs and processes to emphasize interpersonal contact with other students and faculty; orientation programs that introduce new students to one another, to faculty, and to the intellectual life of the campus; orientation programs for parents or spouses, particularly those of first-generation students; curricular and course structures that are more suited to individual student

differences and needs; instructional approaches that emphasize active and collaborative student involvement in their learning; community service opportunities; clubs and other activities that bring students and faculty into more frequent contact outside the classroom, and even short residential experiences (e.g., on weekends).

While major field of study seems to have little relation to students' personal growth, the interpersonal climate within a department, regardless of the discipline, does appear to make a difference. This climate is a product of many forces, of course, including (among other things) the nature and frequency of students' interactions with faculty and other students, faculty availability to students outside class, faculty members' "psychosocial accessibility" to students, faculty members' perceptions of their roles (e.g., mentor vs. lecturer/researcher), and the degree of faculty and student consensus on the department's educational purposes and goals. Departmental climate is also, of course, a function of the faculty reward system and the behaviors it promotes.

While there is little evidence that level of participation in extracurricular activities has a significant effect on citizenship-related change, we suspect such activities -- particularly community service and leadership opportunities and roles -- may have important indirect or mediating effects, influencing the kinds of people with whom students come into contact and the content and nature of their interactions.

Fifth, it is clear from the evidence in the areas on which I have concentrated that faculty members and students' peers are significant forces in shaping many of the changes students experience during college. In most of the areas I have reviewed, the peer influence may be dominant, but faculty clearly play an important role. and their sphere of

influence is not limited to the classroom and academic advising. The faculty's influence is primarily a function of both the nature and frequency of their contact with students, both in- and outside of class. Faculty influence is particularly influential when it involves intellectual or course-related topics of discussion. And most importantly, college's effects appear to be particularly strong when faculty and peer influences are mutually supportive and reinforcing.

Finally, student changes in these (and other) areas during college are complex and interrelated. Changes in one area appear to be dependent upon, and/or to facilitate, changes in other areas. This appears to be particularly true with respect to changes involving students' cognitive skill development, principled moral reasoning, and attitudes and values. The network of these interrelationships is very much like a spider's web: When the web is touched in one place, the effect is felt throughout. One implication of this interconnectedness is that there may not be any single programmatic or policy lever an institution can pull and expect to make a significant difference. Rather, the greatest impact may well come from pulling more, smaller levers more often and in a coordinated, consistent, and mutually supporting way.

When I began, I noted that one of the fundamental purposes behind the founding of the colonial colleges was the preparation of the young for citizenship and for participation in a democratic society. While that has always been part of our purpose, it may be more important now than ever. We have, as Tinto has suggested, "too long let the education of college students be dictated by the parochial and self-serving demands of work and career mobility and have all but ignored the importance of civic education" (Tinto,

undated). If we are to remain a civilized and civil society, if we are to avoid complete emersion in self-interest and tolerance for only those who share our values and interests, if we are to avoid a future America divided along racial and economic lines, then we must take steps to ensure that our educational programs promote a sense of civic and community responsibility and participation. We must understand, and we must help our students understand, that our individual and collective interests are intricately and inextricably intertwined. Let us teach our students not only the value and importance of independence, but also the value and importance of interdependence.

Thank you very much.

REFERENCES

Astin, A. W., Green, K., & Korn, W. (1987). The American freshman: Twenty-year trends, 1966-1985. Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, Graduate School of Education, Higher Education Research Institute.

Chickering, A. W. (1970). Civil liberties and the experience of college. Journal of Higher Education, 52, 125-128.

Dey, E. (1989). College impact and student liberalism revisited: The effect of student peers. Unpublished manuscript, University of California at Los Angeles, Graduate School of Education, Higher Education Research Institute, Los Angeles

Erikson, R., Luttbeg, N., & Tedin, K. (1973). American public opinion: Its origin, content, and impact (2nd ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.

Hyman, H., & Wright, C. (1979). Education's lasting influence on values. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hyman, H., Wright, C., & Reed, J. (1975) The enduring effects of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lamare, J. (1975). Using political science courses to inculcate political orientations. Teaching Political Science, 2, 409-432.

Nunn, C., Crockett, H., & Williams, J. (1978). Tolerance for nonconformity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rudolph, F. (1962). The American college and university: A history. New York: Vintage.

Smith, B. L., & MacGregor, J. T. (1992). What is collaborative learning? In A. Goodsell, M. Maher, & V. Tinto (Eds.), Collaborative learning: A sourcebook for higher education. University Park, PA: The National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment.

Thistlethwaite, D. (1973). Accentuation of differences in values and exposures to major field of study. Journal of Educational Psychology, 65, 279-293.