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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Much research has been done in the area of socialization. Since socialization occurs throughout the life cycle, many studies have been done concerning the various stages at which socialization occurs. One of the areas frequently focused upon is occupational socialization. Occupational socialization entails not only the skills and knowledge one must learn before being certified as competent in his work, but the individual must also acquire the beliefs, values, and attitudes relative to that field. Many of these beliefs, values, and attitudes are thought to be taught in the professional school, and several studies since the 1950's have been implemented to study what they are and how they are acquired. These studies are presented in Chapter II. Little work, however, has been done to study the attitudinal effects of faculty members at a business college upon their students. Edgar Schein (1967) did research with groups of graduate students and found that executives and business faculty frequently have different attitudes pertaining to certain issues about business. Furthermore, he discovered that graduate students usually come into the school with attitudes somewhere between those of faculty and executives, but they often shift their attitudes in the direction of
their professors as the educational experience progresses.

The present study is a partial replication of that done by Schein. Instead of using only graduate students (who are already familiar with many teachings in the business school), undergraduates are also studied, including freshmen and seniors. Schein used beginning graduate students and followed them through the school experience. Such a study was not possible here, since only a portion of freshmen graduate from college and even fewer go to graduate school. This and other less important methodological differences between Schein's research and the present study are discussed in Chapter III.

Chapter IV is a presentation of the results of this study and a comparison of data derived from subjects at Western Michigan University (W.M.U.) with Schein's subjects at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.). It was discovered that (1) faculty exert little attitudinal influence on their students in most instances and (2) the faculty at the two universities seem to have different viewpoints about various aspects of business. Furthermore, students at W.M.U. did not shift their attitudes toward their professors on the same scales that the M.I.T. students did.

In Chapter V, a discussion of the results is given. Most attention is focused upon why support for the theory was found in two areas, but not in others. It is believed that the discrepancy is due to the function of socialization
at different educational levels. That is, freshmen might show attitude changes regarding certain issues, while graduate students show no such changes because of earlier socialization during their undergraduate training. Suggestions are then offered for future research.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The concept of socialization is one most central to sociology. It is based on the premise that one must understand human culture in order to understand human behavior. This culture is not inherent at birth, but is learned. Values, beliefs, and assumptions about proper and improper modes of behavior are acquired in the process of interaction with others. Common knowledge of others' expectations is indispensable because the individual must be able to predict how others will react to him to guide his performance successfully (O. Brim, 1966). Most often, socialization is an unconscious and unintended consequence of human interaction (Pavalko, 1971). For example, the mother who scolds her child for kicking her in the shin would very doubtfully think, "Here's a good chance for me to teach my child the conceptions of his culture about how to treat his parents." Rather, her main concern would be to eliminate his ever kicking her again. Nevertheless, the result of her scolding is a small contribution toward the child's perception of appropriate behavior. Socialization may also be explicit and intentional. Some public schools, for example, try to inculcate patriotism in their pupils. Regardless of intention, the
outcome of socialization is to produce conformity to shared values, norms, and expectations about role behavior.

One cannot, however, be socialized in childhood to successfully handle all of the roles he will occupy in the future (O. Brim, 1966:19). In later years, one must build on attitudes and skills acquired earlier and use them as a foundation for later learning.

During the past two decades, a noticeable shift has occurred in studies of socialization toward a focus on the socialization of adults (Pavalko, 1971:82). This interest is closely related to the role theory approach (Sewell, 1963:173-4). Since socialization refers to role learning—skills, knowledge, attitudes, values, and motives necessary to perform social roles, it follows that the child is not adequately prepared for the complex roles characteristic of later life.

There are some important differences between socialization in early childhood and socialization into an adult role. First, the adult mind is not a tabula rasa (Simpson, 1967:43). The adult already knows several roles and values which give him a perspective for evaluating his world. The process involves learning new norms and roles, relinquishing certain old ones, and sometimes having roles and norms that conflict (Pavalko, 1971:83).

Another major way in which childhood and adult socialization differ is in the degree of voluntariness with which
the individual enters a situation where socialization is involved (Pavalko, 1971:84). The child has little or no control over the forces that socialize him. Adults, however, usually initiate acts that lead to socializing experiences. Furthermore, they have more freedom to escape from those experiences which are discovered to be distasteful or uncomfortable. Often the individual submits to socialization by an organization in order to get something from that organization, e.g., a diploma. This information will be more relevant later in the paper.

Anticipatory Socialization

Since human beings have a unique ability to manipulate symbols, they are able to imagine what it would be like to occupy a role that they do not presently occupy (Pavalko, 1971:35-6). It is important here to point out that a person need not be a member of a group or an occupant of a role as a prerequisite for that group or the expectations of that role to have an impact on him. A person can, in effect, socialize himself based on his correct or incorrect assumptions about the group or role involved. This idea has important implications, according to Pavalko. First, it suggests that persons coming into formal socialization settings bring with them subjective conceptions about the roles to which they aspire. Thus, anticipatory socialization may aid or hinder a person's socialization, depending
on how closely his expectations match the goals of the organization.

Wright's (1967) research is a good illustration. In studying graduate students, he found that incoming students, being laymen, rarely begin training with expectations that match the orientation of the school. They are likely to be quite frustrated when these norms are less visible to the public than in some of the more visible professions.

Rosen and Bates (1967), who studied socialization in graduate schools, discovered that both the neophyte and the socializing agent have certain beliefs about how the process of socialization should operate. In actual practice, however, the socializing organization seldom even reached consensus on meeting such goals.

Socialization and the Symbolic Interactionist Perspective

Since socialization emphasizes an understanding of human behavior as the result of how individuals take into account the expectations of others, the topic of symbolic interaction should be discussed. As represented by Cooley (1922) and Mead (1934), the basic idea of this approach is that verbal and nonverbal interaction is the mechanism by which individuals receive inputs of others' expectations which result in continual modification of behavior and the development of self-concepts. One could easily extrapolate this to later life where occupational roles are learned.
Proper behavior, attitudes, and the development of a self-concept are the outcomes of interaction with one's significant others in the training environment.

Wheeler (1966:60) notes that when an individual moves to new interpersonal situations he faces problems of understanding the setting and coming to terms with its demands. In short, the person needs a workable definition of the situation. This definition of the situation is most frequently made clear by one's reference group.

The concept of the reference group first emerged from the work of Hyman, in an exploration of the process by which individuals arrive at a definition of their own status. He suggested that subjective judgments of status are arrived at by comparison "in reference to" some group or individual (Pavalko, 1971:83).

Schools and Reference Groups

Most studies have shown reference groups to make a powerful impact on one's attitudes and behavior. Newcomb (1967) found this to be the case in his study of students' attitudes at Bennington College. An orderly pattern of attitude change was noted, away from the students' relatively conservative parents and toward the more liberal faculty. Individuals whose personal prestige was high were typically those whose attitudes were conspicuously liberal. Those generally regarded as "resistant to community expectations"
usually held conservative attitudes and were so perceived by their peers. Many of these were near-isolates socially. That is, many of the non-changers tended to fight the community norms or be so little a part of the community that they were not even aware of those norms. Since the college experience was a temporary one, a follow-up study was conducted years later to see if these attitudes persisted through time. It was not only found that most of the students maintained their attitudes, but in those later years they also selected environments that were initially congenial to those attitudes and later supportive of them.

B. Brim (1966) studied the effect of teacher education faculty members on their students. After students took the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory at the beginning and end of the semester, a difference significant at the .01 level was found. The faculty were also tested twice. Although they differed from the students initially by an average of 31 points, the distance was reduced to 12.71 as the students' attitudes shifted toward the faculty position.

Edgar and Warren (1969) found that a teacher's major significant other is the person perceived as having the greatest power over the teacher in terms of organizational sanctions. Furthermore, they discovered that teachers' attitudes on many issues shifted toward those held by their superiors at a significance level of .001.

Similarly, Wallace (1966) tested the hypothesis that
an individual's manifested desire to gain entrance into a given group is related to his willingness to adopt the group's values in order to gain membership in that group. Using a sample of law students in his research, he found that the two variables of membership aspiration and adoption of group norms were in fact related.

Pease (1967) researched the "professionalization" of the doctoral student. He focused on the varying degrees of faculty encouragement and contact associated with students' participation in the professional activities of their fields. Pease hypothesized that the more contact a student had with the faculty and the more he was encouraged by the faculty toward any given professional activity, the more the student participated in that activity. He found little such relationship to exist in formal settings, but discovered a positive relationship between professional activity and faculty contact in informal settings.

Jacob (1957) did not find this always to be the case. Although he noted that some values do change during the college experience, he attributed little influence of the curriculum or quality of teaching to development of students' attitudes and values. He does concede, however, that some teachers do have a profound influence on some students. He does not explore in much detail the conditions under which this influence takes place.
Process of Socialization in Formal Settings

In this section, a number of questions not previously mentioned will be discussed. First, one might ask how socialization takes place in the setting of the formal organization. Are there various stages, each with a different content?

Simpson (1967), in a study of nurses, observed that socialization into occupational roles involves a sequential process of three phases. In the first phase, the nursing student wanted to serve others and wanted to be a nurse as a means to this end. Toward the end of this phase, she had learned that she had to have the specific skills necessary to becoming a nurse in order to be regarded as a nurse by others. In the second phase, the nursing student was mainly interested in applying technical skills. Interest shifted mainly toward acceptance as a professional colleague. In the third phase, professional values began to be internalized. It is not known whether the sequential socialization process of nursing students can be extrapolated to other areas of occupational socialization. Although Simpson's analysis seems reasonable, further research should be done to support or refute the generality of this theory.

The roles of both the socializing agent and the neophyte should also be considered. Both come to the situation with ideas and beliefs about how socialization should
proceed. According to Rosen and Bates (1967:73-4), the agent must convey all the essential information to the neophyte in a manner required by the goals of the organization. Not only does he transmit knowledge, but he acts as a role model which represents the goal toward which the neophyte is moving. In contrast, the neophyte's task is to learn enough content of the discipline so that he can achieve his personal goal of being certified as competent in his field of study and go on to a career. In the training situation, he enters a subculture of peers whose norms and standards he must learn (Rosen and Bates, 1967:75-6). Also, since he enters the system voluntarily, he must accept the conditions it imposes. He is expected to acknowledge the authority of the socializing agents and subject himself to them in all matters relevant to the socialization process. This is done because of the expectation that the agency will certify his competence upon completion of training (Rosen and Bates, 1967:30).

Another issue that should be given at least brief attention concerns the type of person who initially enters the training situation. In professional schools and even colleges to some extent, a disproportionate number of students seem to come from families with middle-class backgrounds (Moore, 1970:67-70). Since those parents who have higher education consequently have higher incomes, they have greater ability to pay for the advanced education of
their children. Children and youth from "good" backgrounds also generally perform better in school; even if they do not, they are more likely to receive guidance. But the child from an economically deprived background, even though performing well in school, may be discouraged from "unrealistic" aspirations. The point here to be remembered is that those attending socializing institutions do not come from all strata of the society in equal proportions. It is possible that their attitudes are more closely related to, or receptive to, those of the socializing agents via their parents, assuming that parent-child attitudes are similar.

Another question that should be asked is: What are the limits of such socialization? Who can be socialized and in what situations? One limitation is the combination of an individual's biological capacities with the effects of earlier learning or the lack of it (0. Brim, 1966:20). In open societies characterized by high levels of achievement and motivation, upward mobility may lead a person to positions in which he is unable to meet the challenges because of limited intelligence, strength, or other attributes. Another limitation is that training does not always produce a completely socialized person. In fact, socialization prior to occupational entry is always imperfect and incomplete (Pavalko, 1971:100). Persons respond differently to the same stimuli. While some internalize most of
the occupational group's norms, others do so only to a very limited extent. Similarly, the socializing institution is part of the broader social system that helps to shape its goals. Its success or failure in socialization depends heavily on the fate of its recruits after they have returned to the broader social system (Wheeler, 1966:99).

Another important limitation is one that has been alluded to several times in this introduction. Socialization occurs throughout life and seemingly occurs again and again. Consider the following:

This process occurs in school. It occurs again and perhaps most dramatically when the graduate enters an organization on his first job. It occurs again when he switches within the organization from one department to another, or from one rank to another. It occurs all over again if he leaves one organization and enters another. And it occurs all over again when he goes back to school, and again when he returns to the organization after school [Schein, 1968:2].

The implication is that socialization to a situation may be limited to only that situation and that little carry-over occurs from one setting to the next. Schein (1968), for instance, in a recent study obtained results indicating that attitude changes toward the faculty in the university setting reversed themselves to a considerable degree within one year after graduation.

According to Schein (1968:3), if the novice has correctly anticipated the norms of the organization he is joining, the socialization process merely involves a
reaffirmation of these norms. But if the novice comes to the organization with values and behavior patterns which are out of line with those of the organization, he must redefine himself in terms of the new roles he is to be granted, and that may be a difficult process. Brim (1968: 203) supports this theory and adds that when the individual finds himself in such an environment he may leave it to be in surroundings that are less threatening. Success, then, depends on two factors which the organization cannot always control. The first is the initial motivation of the entrant to join the organization. If his motivation is high, he will be willing to tolerate uncomfortable socialization experiences. If his motivation is low, he may decide to leave the organization. Berlew (1966) adds that motivation is especially important during the first year of membership in the organization. Since the new member stands at the boundary of the organization, a very stressful location, he is likely to be more motivated to be accepted by the social system. At this point he is more receptive to cues from his environment than he will ever be again, and what he learns at the beginning will become the core of organizational identity.

Speculation about Social Responsibility

It is possible that tensions may increase in the future as business organizations hire younger managers,
since certain writers in the area are predicting that these younger managers are more socially responsible than were their predecessors.

Reich (1970), for example, wrote in his book _The Greening of America_ that American society is entering a new era, with today's youth ushering in a new kind of consciousness. This generation has seemingly condemned many of the empty values of existing society. They have rejected values of competition, i.e., seeing others as forces to be reckoned with and pursuing certain goals only because society has deemed them desirable. Instead, this generation has replaced these goals with more personal and socially responsible ones. Total honesty with others and with oneself have become the most important values. Reich expects this new breed of young people to have an increasingly great impact on American society in the future, too. If their priorities are, and continue to be, different from those of past generations, great changes may be in store for business. Ecological and ethical considerations, as two examples, may become increasingly important and possibly even transcend the profit-making motive.

Rosen et al. (1973) found some support for Reich's predictions. He and his associates conducted an experiment to assess the effects on business undergraduates of participating in a game representing a simulated society. The authors hypothesized that the participants would increase
their social awareness and concern about business as a result of playing the game. The game, called SIMSOC, creates situations which place students in various managerial roles, and they are faced with conflicts among personal, organizational, and societal goals. At the end of the experiment, the control and experimental groups were given questionnaires to fill out. The results indicated that the SIMSOC participants perceived major discrepancies between their ideals and the operative values in current business practices. They also felt a stronger desire for business to operate more for the benefit of society.

Sethi and Votaw (1973) also observe a new generation with more idealistic values and goals than their predecessors. Instead of desiring to be known by their occupational statuses or material possessions, they prefer to be known by their cultural tastes and life styles. The authors believe that many young managers coming into today's modern corporations bring many of these new values with them and may at some time have a major influence on business practices.

One cannot, of course, assume that business will inevitably become more socially responsible or that the "new generation" will necessarily have idealistic attitudes that will persist long after they have entered the job market. Little research has been done to study the long-term attitudes of these future managers. The idealism
which they learned in their youth might possibly change when they enter the world of work, and they could well become carbon copies of the "organization man." It is possible that many of them might even avoid working in such organizations in order to maintain their present values. As a result, only the more traditionally minded youth would ever join the world of business.

Nevertheless, if socialization into the applied setting does not change such idealistic viewpoints, if these viewpoints are prevalent among today's youth, and if many of these youth are recruited into business organizations, the above theories would have major implications.

Previous Research on Socialization of Occupations

Professional socialization

Research concerning socialization in professional schools was not done until 1952, when Merton et al. (1957) began direction of a study focusing on the medical school. In this study, a number of specific topics were looked at. It became apparent that the profession of medicine has its own normative subculture and a body of shared and transmitted ideas, values, and standards toward which members of the profession are expected to orient their behavior. The standards define acceptable and unacceptable modes of behavior. In general, a picture emerged of medical students slowly developing into full-fledged professionals.
with the skills, values, and attitudes necessary to the role of the practicing physician. As part of this same large study, Fox (1957) found that the medical student is intentionally "trained for uncertainty." That is, the student is provided with a foretaste of the ambiguities he may face when he assumes responsibility for a patient. He soon sees medicine as an enormous proposition that he can never hope to command completely and that its practice is largely a matter of conjuring possibilities and probabilities. He also learns not to be too presumptuous about his knowledge for fear of reproachment from his classmates, while an admission of ignorance on his part may evoke their approval. Also in this same broad study, Huntington (1957) traced the changing self-images of medical students. Freshmen seldom saw themselves as doctors, but rather as students. It is face-to-face interaction with patients, more than anything else in their role sets, that causes medical students to begin seeing themselves as physicians. This infers that self-images appear to be, in part, reflections of the expectations of others.

Soon afterwards, in 1956, Becker (1961) began another major study. The original intent of the study was to discover what medical school did to students other than giving them a technical education. In short, he assumed that they left medical school with a set of ideas about medicine and medical practice that differed from the ideas with which
they entered. Participant observation was used to gather data on the subjects. Two important professional values emerged—responsibility and experience. Becker did not go so far as to say that these values are dominant when the students become professionals, since the students' world is one of teachers and their patients. Such values as they acquire do not necessarily help in adjustment to the professional role, since they do not yet know what that role consists of. They cannot yet take on the professional role because the system in which they operate does not allow them to. They are not doctors, and the recurring experience of being denied responsibility makes it perfectly clear to them that they are not. It was also pointed out that medical students do not easily become what the medical school wants them to become. Their major concern is the immediate goal of getting through school. They become engrossed in matters which are of interest in the school but seldom have relevance outside of it. When participation in school ends, they give up these concerns, realizing that the concerns are no longer of value. Nevertheless, the school has a certain amount of impact on their long-range perspective being made more professional and specific.

In the same study, Becker and Geer (1958) traced cynicism and idealism in the students' training. Freshman medical students often became disillusioned after finding that they would not be near patients at all and after finding that
there is more to medicine than they could ever learn. As a result, many became rather cynical about their activities of the first year. This cynicism is specific to the educational situation. Instead of becoming cold and untouched by suffering and death, medical students in fact had simply become preoccupied with the technical aspects of cases because the faculty required them to do so. They found themselves dropping idealistic attitudes for those more relevant to the way the event affects someone in the position of a medical student. After the experience of medical school ended, the students' original idealism reasserted itself as conditions became more propitious.

Quarantelli (1964), however, in his study of dental students, discovered little impact of socialization on the neophytes. Freshmen and faculty members had almost identical perceptions of dental students. Furthermore, sophomores did not have a collective self-image closer to faculty perceptions than the freshmen had. Neither were their values closer to faculty values. In fact, where there was any shift in viewpoint for sophomores, it was in the opposite direction. The faculty, then, were not seen as influential in changing the values or beliefs of the students during the first year. It follows that the freshmen did not need to be socialized to new norms and non-technical standards, since their viewpoints were so similar to those of the faculty.
In an earlier study by Quarantelli (1961), it was apparent that dental students became socialized to respond to negative perceptions of their profession by the public. During the professional school experience, the students developed certain interpretations or beliefs to make for a positive self-image. For example, when faced with charges of being "sadistic mouth mechanics" they would counter that little pain is involved in most dental work, blame the patient for not having frequent check-ups, or say that pain is not caused deliberately. At any rate, the author did not specify where such attitudes had developed. It could easily have been from interaction with the peer group of students, through limited experiences with patients, or from interaction with faculty members.

Lortie (1959) studied law school students but saw little socialization occurring. Since law school is so removed from actual practice and thus from many everyday realities, the law school was seen to have a limited impact on the students concerning the realities accompanying their profession. Students complained that they were ill-prepared for the mechanics of law and lacked preparation for the problems of establishing a career. Most socialization, then, apparently came in the years after law school.

**Socialization into other occupations**

So far, attention has focused exclusively upon
socialization into the professions. Since most early studies were centered around professional socialization, these were presented first. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that socialization occurs only in professional training. On the contrary, socialization in some form occurs during later life in just about any role one occupies. Since this paper is focusing on occupational socialization, several more examples not specific to the professions will be discussed. It should become apparent to the reader that socialization occurs in all occupations.

Wamsley (1972) analyzed two institutions of military socialization to show two different sets of skills and attitudes being learned. One institution, the Aviation Cadet Pre-Flight Training School, puts a premium on heroic qualities like loyalty, unity, obedience, hardiness, and zeal. Beginners were initiated by being treated to feel fumbling, inept, helpless, and outraged. When they became upperclassmen, they helped to "socialize" new recruits by giving them the same kind of hazing. The Officer Training School, by contrast, is managerial in nature and is useful in coping with the larger political and technological environment. They were not hazed or "chewed out," but were dealt with as managerial supervisors deal with subordinates. All were to act as gentlemen and to treat one another as such.

Bryan (1965) provides some detailed information
concerning induction and training of prostitutes at the call girl level. Prostitutes were found to have a value structure transmitted as maximizing gains while minimizing effort. Other attitudes are also transmitted. Frequently, it is postulated that people are easily corruptible and that prostitution is no more dishonest than the everyday behavior of "squares." Values such as fairness to other "working girls" or to a pimp may also be taught. Since the male is considered corrupt or honest only because of lack of opportunity to be dishonest, it is thought to be only appropriate that he be exploited as he exploits. Girls are taught how to make the "pitch," how to use alcohol and drugs, how to obtain the fee, how to converse with customers, and, occasionally, physical and sexual hygiene. Occasionally, the trainer may even arrange to eavesdrop on the interactions of the girl and the client and later discuss her performance. The apprenticeship functions primarily for building a clientele. The girl is drawn out from training not because she is fully trained, but because she has developed an adequate clientele.

Carroll (1971) examined the effects of different types of theological seminaries on the outcomes of professional socialization. The religious community type was observed to be the most conservative in theological orientation, the vocational theological seminary was middle-of-the-road, and the graduate school in theology had students socialized to
be most liberal.

Two studies were done on the socialization of symphony musicians, although neither showed an influence on attitudes by teachers, peers, or the school experience. Kadushin (1969, 402-4) noted that although a professional self-concept does develop during music school attendance, it does not take place through a reference group or role-model phenomenon. Rather, it develops through professional performance. The school's function is not to change values, but to improve musical skill. Westby (1960) conducted a similar study, dealing with the symphony musician's career experiences.

Finally, Berlew (1966) observed the relationship between a company's expectations of a new employee and his performance, finding that those who had the most expected of them performed best.

Education for business management: Edgar Schein

The present study is a partial replication of Schein's research; therefore, a detailed description of his work (1967) follows at this point so that the reader may be able to detect the methodological differences between Schein's work and this paper.

Schein was probably the first to give attention to the role that the graduate school of business plays in the socialization of managers. His study concerns several
classes in the graduate school of management at M.I.T. and compares attitudes prior to entry with those held at graduation. It also relates patterns of change in students to attitudes held by senior managers and the faculty of the school. He states that most people assume that a professional school teaches the "correct" attitudes toward one's future occupation, and he questions whether the school always teaches the attitudes and values prevailing among practitioners at a given time, or whether it attempts to redefine the profession by teaching attitudes and values that the faculty wish to see in the profession at some future time (Schein, 1967:603-4). Thus, Schein's major question is to know precisely what role the professional school plays in the growth of the profession. He attempts to illuminate this subject by comparing student attitudes with two reference groups--faculty and executive.

Graduate students, Sloan fellows, and faculty at M.I.T., as well as a number of corporation executives, participated in the study. (Sloan fellows were middle-level managers, about 30 to 40 years old, who were sent to the school by their companies to obtain the S.M. degree in management in an intensive 12-month program.) Attitudes were surveyed with an objective questionnaire consisting of 100 belief or value statements, each of which could be answered on a 4-point scale by "strongly agree," "mildly agree," "mildly disagree," or "strongly disagree." These
were selected from 190 original items in terms of ability to discriminate between groups presumed to be different, ability to produce a reasonable variation in response within at least some of the groups surveyed, and ability to reflect a content area presumed to be relevant to the managerial role (Schein, 1967:605). Attitude change was assumed to have taken place if a significance level of .05 was found on a t-test using each man's original and final scores over the two-year program in business management.

The questionnaire items were later summarized into six clusters, with each cluster broken down into several scales. Each scale was itself a summary of several questions. Mean scores of the various groups for Clusters I, II, and V, which this study replicates, are shown in Figures 1, 2, and 5; Clusters III, IV, and VI, which will not be replicated, are shown in Figures 3, 4, and 6.

The first cluster of items (Figure 1) dealt with labor-management relations, business-government relations, corporate responsibility, and relations to society. The author found clear differences between executives' attitudes and those of the faculty, with executives being against labor and government intervention and in favor of broad corporate responsibility. It was also noted that the administrative policy, production, and marketing groups were closest to the executives, while the finance group was usually furthest away. A pattern emerged in which
Scale 1: Management-Labor Relations
(Low score means favoring freedom from labor intervention)

Scale 2: Business-Government Relations
(Low score means favoring freedom from government intervention)

Scale 3: Corporate Responsibility
(Low score means belief in broad corporate responsibility)

Scale 4: Relations to Society
(Low score means low cynicism)

Fig. 1.—Mean scores of Schein's subjects on Cluster I, Business in Society. (E = Executives; F = Faculty; S1 = Sloan fellows at initial testing; S2 = Sloan fellows at end of program; G1 = Graduate students at initial testing; and G2 = Graduate students at end of program.)
Sloan fellows and graduate students fell between executives and faculty, although their attitudes shifted in neither direction. On the fourth scale, faculty and executives overall differed only slightly, although there was a considerable spread of scores within the faculty group. Students shifted slightly, but not significantly, toward cynicism.

The second cluster (Figure 2) was made up of two scales which measured cynicism. The first scale dealt with all aspects of management on which a cynical response could be expressed. The second scale concerned the degree to which the respondent believed that one must sacrifice his morals or ethics in being a manager. The results indicated that the faculty were most cynical and the executives were least cynical. The Sloan fellows started out closest to the executive position and did not change much, while the graduate students started out closest to the faculty and also did not change.

The three scales making up Cluster III focused on the kinds of beliefs and assumptions that might guide a person's general management strategy (Figure 3). Scale 7 measured belief in the classical theory of business organization, scale 8 dealt with general conservatism, and scale 9 focused on conservatism about change and stability. The executives were found to be more in favor of traditional management principles than the faculty. They were also
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Scale 5: General Cynicism

(Low score means low cynicism)

Scale 6: Amorality of Managerial Role

(Low score means belief that one can be moral as a manager)

Fig. 2.—Mean scores of Schein's subjects on Cluster II, General Cynicism.

(E = Executives; F = Faculty; S1 = Sloan fellows at initial testing; S2 = Sloan fellows at end of program; G1 = Graduate students at initial testing; and G2 = Graduate students at end of program.)
Scale 7: Classical Management Theory  
(Low score means belief in the classical theory)

Scale 8: General Conservatism  
(low score means high conservatism)

Scale 9: Change and Cosmopolitanism  
(Low score means belief in the value of stability and low career movement)

Fig. 3.--Mean scores of Schein's subjects on Cluster III, Management Theory and Attitudes. (E = Executives; F = Faculty; S₁ = Sloan fellows at initial testing; S₂ = Sloan fellows at end of program; G₁ = Graduate students at initial testing; and G₂ = Graduate students at end of program.)
noted to be more conservative and to be less likely to value change and career movement. On all three scales, students started out near the executive position and changed toward the faculty average. The students became, then, less traditional, more liberal, and more convinced of the value of change and career movement.

The four scales in Cluster IV dealt with human relations in business (Figure 4). Scale 10 measured the respondents' faith in the typical worker's capacity and motivation. Scales 11 and 12 tapped beliefs about group incentives and decision making as contrasted with individual incentives and decision making. Scale 13 measured the respondents' degree of interpersonal orientation. Although the faculty and executives did not greatly differ on any of these scales, large differences were revealed among the faculty subgroups. Overall, students' scores began as middle range and shifted toward higher interpersonal orientation, greater faith in workers, and greater belief in group effort.

Cluster V concerned various aspects of employee-organization relationships (Figure 5). Scale 14 dealt with beliefs about the rights of the organization to obtain and use "personal" data such as characteristics of the employee's wife in making decisions on promotions. Scale 15 measured respondents' cynicism about how one gets ahead in business organizations, while scale 16 tapped the respon-
Scale 10: Faith in Workers
(Low score means high faith in workers)

Scale 11: Individual vs. Group Incentives
(Low score means belief in group incentives)

Scale 12: Individual vs. Group Decision Making
(Low score means belief in group decision making)

Scale 13: Interpersonal Orientation
(Low score means high interpersonal orientation)

Fig. 4.—Mean scores of Schein's subjects on Cluster IV, Attitudes Toward People and Groups. (E = Executives; F = Faculty; S₁ = Sloan fellows at initial testing;
S₂ = Sloan fellows at end of program; G₁ = Graduate students at initial testing; and
G₂ = Graduate students at end of program.)
Scale 14: Right to Privacy
(Low score means belief that employee should not have rights to privacy)

Scale 15: Cynicism about How to Get Ahead
(Low score means low cynicism)

Scale 16: Cynicism about Conformity Pressures
(Low score means low cynicism)

Fig. 5.--Mean scores of Schein's subjects on Cluster V, Individual-Organization Relations. (E = Executives; F = Faculty; S₁ = Sloan fellows at initial testing; S₂ = Sloan fellows at end of program; G₁ = Graduate students at initial testing; and G₂ = Graduate students at end of program.)
dents' beliefs about the extent of conformity pressure in organizations. Executives were found to be more in favor of the use of personal information, less cynical about how one gets ahead, and less cynical about conformity pressure in business. The student groups fell between the executives and the more cynical faculty. While their attitudes shifted in the direction of the faculty on all three scales, only scale 14 represented a significant shift.

Cluster VI did not focus on one particular area, but three different ones (Figure 6). Scale 17 tapped beliefs of whether a manager should be a generalist or a specialist in some management area, scale 18 dealt with various truisms in management, and scale 19 concerned attitudes about organizational size. On scale 17, faculty and executive attitudes were found to be similar as they seemed to favor specific skills, while students favored more general skills and did not shift their attitudes over time. On scale 18, faculty and executives differed about truisms of management, with the students being more similar to the executives. They maintained these attitudes over time. On the final scale, 19, executives were discovered to favor large corporations more than did the faculty. Neither student group shifted from its position intermediate between the executives and faculty.

To summarize Schein's findings, faculty and executive attitudes differed on at least half of the scales, with
Fig. 6.—Mean scores of Schein's subjects on Cluster VI, Miscellaneous.

(E = Executives; F = Faculty; S₁ = Sloan fellows at initial testing; S₂ = Sloan fellows at end of program; G₁ = Graduate students at initial testing; and G₂ = Graduate students at end of program.)
executives opposing intervention by labor or the government, favoring broader corporate responsibility, showing less cynicism about all aspects of business, being more conservative and favoring traditional management principles, and being more in favor of using "personal" information about employees. Secondly, faculty attitudes tended to differ as a function of teaching area. Thirdly, the initial attitudes of students tended to be intermediate between those of the faculty and those of managers on most scales. Finally, in the student groups there was a tendency toward adoption of faculty attitudes. Further investigation relevant to these last two points is the main focus of this thesis.

Research Objectives and Statement of Hypotheses

Probably the greatest oversight in Schein's research design is the fact that he used subjects who, in most cases, had had extensive exposure to business school faculty members. That is, many of the graduate students he used may have had as much as four years of exposure to business faculty in their undergraduate training. Thus, if the faculty were in fact instrumental in shaping beliefs and attitudes of graduate students, they were quite likely to shape to some degree the beliefs and attitudes of these same students as undergraduates as well. This could mean that the incoming graduate students were already somewhat
socialized toward faculty attitudes, which could just as easily explain why significant shifts in graduate students' attitudes were found in only 6 of the 19 scales. Most changes were found in Clusters IV and V. Although it is true that graduate students were never initially close to the faculty on many items, it is possible that a significant shift may have also occurred from an even greater point of divergence when these students were undergraduates. Schein never explicitly considered these questions in his published research.

The present study is a partial replication of that done by Schein, but focuses on attitude change of both undergraduate and graduate students as a function of faculty influence. Some alterations in Schein's research design were made to narrow the study into a manageable one for the purposes of this thesis. First, executives were not studied, since Schein's data seem adequate and since executives' attitudes are not as relevant to this specific inquiry. Also, since this study is temporally limited, it was decided not to study a single group of freshmen and follow them throughout the schooling experience. Instead, separate groups of seniors, graduate students, and freshmen are compared. A possibility exists, of course, that each of these groups has had different life experiences; therefore, a longitudinal study might be more desirable. At the same time, it should be pointed out that an enormous subject
attrition rate would occur if a longitudinal type of study were performed. In any event, practical limitations prevented such an ambitious study.

The main theoretical question, then, is: Do the faculty of a business school significantly influence the attitudes of their students at all educational levels? An empirical analysis using students with little or no exposure to business-related values as well as those with greater amounts of exposure should help answer such a question.

A second theoretical question inquires whether faculty at one business college have the same general viewpoints on most business-related issues as faculty at other business colleges. That is, do business faculty in most schools share a common business ideology? A comparison of two sets of faculty subjects and their attitudes should shed some light on this subject.

The two questions discussed above can be translated into the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1.--Association of students with faculty in a college of business will lead to progressive attitudinal changes of the students in the direction of attitudes held by the faculty.

Hypothesis 2.--Faculty members in business colleges have a common ideology concerning various aspects of business.

These hypotheses will be empirically tested for support in a study involving the attitudes of freshmen, seniors, and graduate students as they relate to faculty
at a midwestern state-supported university. Specifically, college freshmen, having the least amount of contact with faculty members, are expected to hold attitudes that differ most from attitudes held by the faculty concerning various aspects of business. College seniors, having relatively more contact and exposure with faculty than freshmen but less than graduate students, are expected to hold attitudes intermediate to freshmen on the one hand and graduate students on the other. Since they have had more contact with their professors than have the other two groups, graduate students are expected to hold attitudes closest (of the three student groups) to faculty attitudes. If the results are as expected, the first hypothesis will have been given support.

It is also possible that business faculty espouse a common ideology about business that transcends individual business colleges. If such a business ideology exists, then scores of faculty members at the university in the present study (W.M.U.) will be similar to those of faculty members at a high-prestige eastern school (M.I.T.). Although no test of statistical significance will be made, a general comparison will help determine whether such a common viewpoint exists concerning various issues of business.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Sample

All available full-time faculty in the business college at W.M.U. were individually asked to fill out an attitudinal questionnaire and mail it to the researcher. The faculty were representative of the accountancy, marketing, management, and business law areas of the university's college of business. Those who agreed to participate in the study included 10 of the college's 14 accountancy faculty, 8 of its 13 marketing faculty, 5 of its 6 business law faculty, and 11 of its 13 management faculty. In total, 34 of the 45 faculty members of the business college participated. There were too few respondents from the finance area to be included in the analysis. A second group consisted of freshmen (N = 28) from two introductory classes in business, who were given questionnaires and asked to return them to the instructor during the following week. On the questionnaires, many indicated that they were undecided about what area of business in which to major. For this reason, a breakdown by major field is not given for freshmen. A third group was also requested to fill out the same questionnaire—seniors from the above-mentioned areas of business. Of these, 8 were majoring in business law,
were majoring in marketing, 19 were majoring in accountancy, and 13 were majoring in management. A total of 63 seniors participated in the study. Finally, classes of graduate students from the same areas were asked to fill out the questionnaire. Of these, 11 were accountancy graduate students, 11 were in marketing, 3 were concentrating on business law, and 20 were in management. In all, 45 graduate students participated in the study. This corresponds to approximately .04 percent of total freshmen, 10 percent of total seniors, and 22 percent of total graduate students enrolled in the business college.

The mean age of the freshman group was 18.5 years. The average senior was 22.9 years old, and the mean age for graduate students was 28.2 years. Students were also asked if they had ever worked full time in business. Of those who answered affirmatively, 50 percent were freshmen, 52 percent were seniors, and 66 percent were graduates. While all categories show high percentage, the figures nevertheless indicate that graduate students have had the most work experience and freshmen have had the least.

Altogether, 350 questionnaires were sent out. Of these, 200 were returned, although only 170 were usable. Returned questionnaires were excluded when respondents failed to fill out essential information such as their level of study and/or curriculum.

Respondents were selected from the following college
classes:

1. Accounting
   a. Financial Accounting III (senior)
   b. Control and Analysis (graduate)

2. Business Law
   a. Legal Aspects of Employment (senior)
   b. Legal Controls of Business (graduate)

3. Management
   a. Motivational Systems (senior)
   b. Introduction to Management Science (graduate)

4. Marketing
   a. Consumer Behavior (senior)
   b. Marketing Research (senior)
   c. Marketing Management (graduate)

5. Business Education
   a. Industry and the Business World (freshman)

Two points should be clarified about these classes. First, many of the graduate respondents from the management area were gathered from courses in other areas of business. Second, while it may at first appear that the freshmen comprise a totally different population from other groups because of their taking a course in business education, it must be made clear that this is the introductory course for business students, and most get their first exposure to business through that course before they later go on to become business majors.
Scale for Measurement of Managerial Attitudes

Although Schein used 6 clusters and 19 scales, the present study utilized only 3 clusters and 9 scales, to keep the analysis at a manageable level. Consequently, the questionnaire consisted of only 44 items, although some are used to compute the score for more than 1 scale. It might be repeated, for the purpose of clarification, that Schein had originally designed a questionnaire of 190 items and later factored out 100 of them into 19 scales as most appropriate for his analysis. Therefore, since only a portion of his scales are used here, only 44 items were included in the questionnaire. Some discussion of the construction of the scales is found in Chapter II.

Business in society

Cluster I is made up of four scales. These deal with labor-management relations, business-government relations, attitudes toward breadth of corporate responsibility, and degree of cynicism regarding business-consumer relationships. The specific items used to make up this and other scales are located in Appendix A. Schein interpreted these scales as follows:

Scale 1: Low score means favoring freedom from labor intervention.
Scale 2: Low score means favoring freedom from government intervention.
Scale 3: Low score means belief in broad corporate responsibility.
Scale 4: Low score means low cynicism regarding business-consumer relationships.

**General cynicism**

Cluster II consists of two scales. The first scale deals with all aspects of management on which a cynical response can be expressed. The second scale considers the degree to which the respondent believes that one must compromise his ethics and morals in being a manager. Scale scores were interpreted as follows:

Scale 5: Low score means low general cynicism.

Scale 6: Low score means the respondent believes that one can be moral as a manager.

**Individual-organization relationships**

Cluster III (Cluster V in Schein's analysis—scales 14, 15, and 16) deals with various aspects of relationships between the employee and the organization. Scale 7 identifies beliefs about the rights of the organization to obtain and use "personal" information about employees. Scale 8 taps beliefs about how one gets ahead in business organizations, and scale 9 concerns the respondents' beliefs about the extent of conformity pressure in business organizations. Interpretations are made below:

Scale 7: Low score means belief that the employee should not have rights to privacy.
Scale 8: Low score means low cynicism about how to get ahead.

Scale 9: Low score means low cynicism about conformity pressures.

Scale Analysis

The respondent groups were then compared with one another to test the previously stated hypothesis.

The important general question is: Do the different student groups vary among themselves in respect to their ranked differences from the faculty? To put the question in another way: Are the students significantly different from one another? How is this difference related to their divergence from the faculty? To answer this question, a form of the Friedman two-way analysis of variance was adopted. (A detailed description of the Friedman test is found in Siegel, 1956:166-73.) The Friedman test is used with ordinal data to test the null hypothesis that k samples have been drawn from the same population. To implement the test, the data are first cast in a two-way table having N rows and k columns. The rows represent different cases, and the columns represent the various conditions. The scores in each row are ranked separately. In the present analysis, students' levels of study are treated as conditions (k = 3), while scale items are indicated by rows. The key question then becomes: Are freshmen, seniors, and graduate students significantly different from each other.
over the range of individual items? Each condition—freshman, senior, and graduate student—is ranked according to its difference from the faculty. Those most different from faculty are given a rank of 1, those most similar to the faculty receive a rank of 3, and those who score in the middle are given a rank of 2. Table 1 presents an applied example of the Friedman test, showing significance at the .03 level on scale 6.

Table 1
Ranked Scores of Scale 6 under Three Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ($R_i$)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p = .03$

Ranks are then summed for each column as shown in Table 1. Now if the null hypothesis stating that all the columns came from the same population is true, then the distribution of ranks in each column would be a matter of chance and should appear in all columns with about equal frequency. If, however, scores of items are dependent on the conditions (i.e., if the null hypothesis is false),
then the rank totals would vary from one column to another. A significance level of .05 was chosen on this and all other scales in order to reject the null hypothesis.

To determine whether the rank totals of each column \( (R_j) \) differ significantly, Friedman has developed a statistic designated as \( Xr^2 \). When the number of rows and columns is not too small, \( Xr^2 \) is distributed approximately as chi square with \( df = k - 1 \), using the formula below:

\[
Xr^2 = \frac{1}{Nk(k+1)} \sum_{j=1}^{k} (R_j)^2 - 3N(k+1)
\]

where

\( N = \) number of rows
\( k = \) number of columns
\( R_j = \) sum of ranks in \( j \)th column
\( \sum_{j=1}^{k} \) directs one to sum the squares of the sums of ranks over all conditions.

When the number of rows or columns is too small, Friedman directs the reader to use another table of probabilities developed for analysis of smaller samples.

It should also be added that randomness is not assumed for this particular study. Rather, a kind of case study is a better description. Since all available faculty were used and students only had an equal chance of participating if they attended the classes selected for the study, randomness was not possible.

Of course, a test for significance, while necessary,
is not in itself sufficient. One must also "visually" inspect the data to see if the groups line up in the hypothesized order. For example, significant differences might be found, but it might also be discovered that seniors are closest to faculty, freshmen are next closest, and graduate students are furthest away. In such a case, it would be difficult to attempt an explanation.

Finally, the present data are descriptively compared with Schein's to check for simple differences in mean scores between his subjects and those participating in this study. These differences might be due to a number of factors, including, but not limited to, the orientation of the school and social backgrounds of the students.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Cluster I: Business in Society

The reader will recall that the four scales making up this cluster deal respectively with labor-management relations, business-government relations, breadth of corporate responsibility, and degree of cynicism regarding business-consumer relationships. All mean scale scores and chi square scores from the Friedman test are shown in Table 2. For more detailed data, see Appendix B.

In general, the first hypothesis was supported on only two of the nine scales (3 and 6). Although Schein found significance on some of the other scales, the present study did not. Possible explanations for the divergence in findings are given in Chapter V. It was also found that the W.M.U. faculty were more extreme than were their students in every case and were somewhat closer than the M.I.T. faculty to the position of Schein's executives. Finally, W.M.U. students seemed more cynical about business practices than did any other group except M.I.T. faculty.

Scale 1: Management-labor Relations

Scale 1 indicates that the faculty group favors free-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management-Labor Relations</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Low score means favoring freedom from labor intervention)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Business-Government Relations</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Low score means favoring freedom from government intervention)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corporate Responsibility</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Low score means belief in broad corporate responsibility)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Relations to Society</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Low score means low cynicism)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>General Cynicism</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Low score means low cynicism)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Amorality of Managerial Role</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Low score means belief that one can be moral as a manager)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>$Xr^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster III: Individual-Organization Relations&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7—Right to Privacy (Low score means belief that employee should not have rights to privacy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>4.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8—Cynicism about How to Get Ahead (Low score means low cynicism)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9—Cynicism about Conformity Pressures (Low score means low cynicism)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The reader is referred to Chapter III for an explanation of the use of $Xr^2$. For a more detailed discussion, see Siegel (1956:166-73).

<sup>b</sup>p < .05.  
<sup>c</sup>p < .03.

<sup>d</sup>Cluster V and scales 14, 15, and 16 in Schein's study.
dom from labor intervention more than any other group, as shown by its low score of 2.60. A relatively large discrepancy is apparent when the W.M.U. faculty score is compared with that of the M.I.T. faculty (3.00).

Although graduate students held the score nearest the faculty, their score of 2.77 was closer to those of the other two groups of students (freshman, 2.80; senior, 2.85) than to that of the faculty.

The chi square statistic from the Friedman test revealed no significant differences among the student groups regarding their ranked differences from the W.M.U. faculty ($\chi^2 = .0$). It should also be pointed out that on this scale Schein's graduate students had similar scores to all of the students in the present study.

Thus, since it seems that on this subject of management-labor relations all student groups had quite similar attitudes and since their scores closely match those of Schein's students, it is conceivable that students have consistent attitudes toward management-labor relations and are not inclined to change them.

It seems plausible that a finding of strong commonality on the scales between the two groups of faculty could give support to the idea that business faculty at most or all universities have common viewpoints on certain issues. An inspection of the data, however, indicates that such a common ideology among college business professors on the
issue of management-labor relations does not exist.

**Scale 2: Business-government relations**

Again the W.M.U. faculty were found to be the most extreme group in favoring freedom from government intervention (2.49), and again they were found to be clearly distant from the student groups (freshman, 2.63; senior, 2.85; graduate student, 2.64). In contrast, Schein's faculty group scored about 2.75 and, therefore, could be said to favor government intervention. Again, as in scale 1, no similarities were found regarding a common ideology on this scale.

The first hypothesis did not hold for this scale. In fact, the freshmen were closest to the faculty. The Friedman test showed a significance level of .07, and most of this difference can be attributed to the divergence of the seniors. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported.

Schein's graduate students scored an average of approximately 2.45 on this scale, a score that is clearly different from that of his faculty subjects, as well as those students presented here. Moreover, his student subjects did not shift their attitudes in the direction of the M.I.T. faculty. It seems, then, that faculty have little influence over their students' attitudes concerning business-government relations, since neither Schein's research nor the present study give support for the notion.
Scale 3: Corporate Responsibility

On this scale, the first hypothesis was supported. That is, the respective order of mean scores for faculty (2.71), graduate students (2.59), seniors (2.45), and freshmen (2.34) is as predicted. A significant difference at the .05 level was found on the Friedman test.

A comparison with Schein's faculty (2.75) reveals a similarity in scores to faculty at W.M.U. It seems, then, that the W.M.U. faculty believe in relatively more specific acts of corporate responsibility in a fashion similar to beliefs held at M.I.T. and that perhaps faculty have a common ideology on this particular issue. That is, a possibility exists that many business faculty members at most universities share this viewpoint. Also, it seems that freshmen believe in more general kinds of corporate responsibility even more than do corporate executives. Although a progressive shift occurs during education, apparently even the graduate students favor corporate responsibility as broad as that espoused by the corporate executives (who scored approximately 2.55 on this scale).

Significant attitudinal shifts were not found in the M.I.T. graduate students' scores, since they initially scored 2.70 on the scale and could be said to display similar attitudes to the M.I.T. faculty.
Scale 4: Relations to society

This scale also reveals the faculty as the most extreme group (2.37). Their score indicates a low degree of cynicism regarding business-consumer relationships. Schein's faculty scored approximately 2.40, nearly the same as faculty subjects in this study. Thus, a common business ideology seems apparent on this issue.

The students at W.M.U. seem more cynical when compared to their faculty counterparts. The graduate students, who were closest to the faculty, scored 2.69, while the freshmen and seniors both scored 2.81. The Friedman test revealed no significant differences among the student groups (p = .273). The M.I.T. students also hovered in the 2.70 range without significantly shifting toward their professors.

Summary of Cluster I

First, W.M.U. business faculty are apparently more sympathetic to business in their beliefs about labor and government intervention, corporate responsibility, and business-consumer relationships than are any of the student groups studied. They were found to be favoring freedom from intervention, favoring broad corporate responsibility, and were less cynical about business-consumer relations.

Second, the general hypothesis tested in this study--of graduate students scoring closest to the faculty,
freshmen scoring furthest away, and seniors scoring inter-
mediately—held only for scale 3. It should also be noted
that Schein found no significant changes on scale 3. This
discrepancy will be discussed further in Chapter V.

Third, on two scales Schein's faculty were similar to
those presented in this study for the W.M.U. faculty, while
on two other scales they were not. For a graphic compari-
son, see Figure 7 below. This seems to suggest that busi-
ness faculty have a common ideology or common beliefs and
values toward certain issues, but not toward others.

Fourth, on all scales it was found that the faculty
displayed attitudes that were clearly different from those
of their students. A profile of subjects' attitudes is
given in Figure 8. From this, it can be inferred that students are far from completely socialized when they leave graduate school, since their attitudes are so distant from those of the socializing agents. This too will be discussed in Chapter V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1—Management-Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low score means favoring freedom from labor intervention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2—Business-Government Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low score means favoring freedom from government intervention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3—Corporate Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low score means belief in broad corporate responsibility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4—Relations to Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low score means low cynicism)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8.—Mean scores of all W.M.U. subjects on Cluster I, Business in Society. (F = Faculty, s = seniors, g = graduate students, and f = freshmen.)

Cluster II: General Cynicism

The two scales in Cluster II consider various aspects of cynicism in business. Scale 5 is an index of general cynicism toward business practices, while scale 6 taps
attitudes about the morality of the manager's role in business. An analysis of these scales follows.

Scale 5: General cynicism

The faculty were found to be the least cynical of all the groups on this scale (2.32). Furthermore, the order of students' scores was reversed from what was expected, although significant differences among the student groups were not found. The graduate students, then, were most cynical (2.54), the seniors were intermediate (2.45), and the freshmen were the least cynical of the students (2.42). Clearly, the first hypothesis was not supported.

Schein's faculty, who scored 2.60, were much more cynical than were W.M.U. faculty toward business. In fact, Schein's least cynical group, the executives (2.30), were closest to the W.M.U. faculty subjects of this study. Schein's graduate students, however, hovered around a score of 2.50 and were somewhat similar to all the W.M.U. sample of students. Since they began with scores similar to the faculty, a significant attitude shift could not be expected.

Scale 6: Amorality of the managerial role

The faculty were found to strongly believe that a person can be moral as a manager, as shown by their score of 1.81. Furthermore, the first major hypothesis tested was strongly supported. A significant difference at the
.03 level was found among the groups, and they lined up in the order of faculty, graduate students (2.16), seniors (2.41), and freshmen (2.62). Therefore, it is quite conceivable that amount of faculty exposure and contact does significantly alter students' perceptions of the managerial role to put the management profession in a more favorable light.

Schein's faculty had a score similar to the W.M.U. faculty of this study (1.90). His graduate students, who scored about 2.20, were similar to graduate students in this study, but not similar to our seniors and freshmen. It can be said, then, that the business school does seem to function to give one a favorable image of his profession. This finding is supported by other research (Quarantelli, 1961; Bryan, 1965).

Summary of Cluster II

First, faculty again exhibited the most extreme scores of all groups, being least cynical and believing most strongly that one can be moral as a manager.

Second, on one scale (morality of management) the faculty clearly differed from the M.I.T. faculty, while on the other (cynicism) a similarity of scores emerged.

Third, the first hypothesis was strongly supported on scale 6, but not on scale 5. Schein's graduate students did not change attitudes on this scale. An explanation
for this difference between the W.M.U. and M.I.T. studies is found in Chapter V.

Fourth, the faculty again clearly differed from the students on scales 5 and 6. A profile of this difference is given in Figure 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5—General Cynicism (Low score means low cynicism)</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6—Amorality of Managerial Role (Low score means belief that one can be moral as a manager)</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 9.—Mean scores of all W.M.U. subjects on Cluster II, General Cynicism. (F = Faculty, s = seniors, g = graduate students, and f = freshmen.)

Cluster III: Individual-Organization Relations

Cluster III analyzes attitudes toward rights to privacy, cynicism about how to get ahead, and cynicism about conformity pressures. (This cluster corresponds to Cluster V in Schein's research. For the purposes of this paper, Schein's scales 14, 15, and 16 will be treated as scales 7, 8, and 9.) Three scales are involved. On the first scale, a low score is interpreted to mean that the employee should not have rights to privacy. On the second and third scales, high scores indicate high levels of cynicism about
individualism in business. The scales are discussed in order.

Scale 7: Rights to privacy

The W.M.U. faculty scored lowest on this scale (2.71), although the results indicate that they still seem to value an individual's privacy. The first hypothesis was not supported, however. Seniors scored closest to the faculty (2.72), differing from them by only one hundredth of a point. It might be noted that this is the only scale where the faculty scored closely with the students. Graduate students were found to be furthest from the faculty (2.91), while freshmen (2.87) were intermediate between seniors and graduate students. The differences, however, do not seem to be consistent. The student groups were not found to be significantly different from one another (in differing from the faculty) on the Friedman test.

The W.M.U. faculty, however, were very distant from Schein's faculty, who scored 3.20 on this scale. M.I.T. graduate students, however, significantly changed their scores from 2.70 to 2.95 in the direction of the M.I.T. faculty. From this it can be seen that M.I.T. and W.M.U. students shared similar views about rights to privacy; but, while Schein found significant attitude shifts in students toward those attitudes held by their faculty, such a finding did not occur in the present study.
Scale 8: Cynicism about how to get ahead

The faculty were again found to be the least cynical group (2.73), although their scores were high enough to characterize them as still being "relatively" cynical. Here they scored about the same as Schein's faculty (2.75). Schein's graduate students, however, began with scores of 2.60 and shifted moderately to 2.80 in the direction of their own M.I.T. professors. Students at W.M.U. were somewhat more cynical; although there were no significant differences among the groups, freshmen scored 2.88, seniors scored 2.96, and graduate students scored 2.90. Obviously the first hypothesis was given no support on this scale, since freshmen were closest to the faculty and no change was apparent.

Scale 9: Cynicism about conformity pressures

The faculty were found to be least cynical (2.22), as they were consistently discovered to be on the other scales. Graduate students were next to the faculty with 2.40, while freshmen and senior groups scored the same at 2.55 and were, therefore, the most cynical groups. The Friedman test showed no significant differences, and the first hypothesis was not supported.

Schein's faculty scored about 2.40 and, therefore, were somewhat more cynical than the faculty analyzed here.
His graduate students scored near the M.I.T. faculty initially and did not change. This compares to the freshmen and seniors who showed no change, and only a little change is observed in the W.M.U. graduate students. In general, it might be said—on the basis of the scale results here—that W.M.U. students are more cynical about conformity pressures than are their professors, while M.I.T. students are similar to their professors in viewing conformity pressures. It seems, however, from the somewhat low scores of all groups that neither the students nor the faculty in either study are highly cynical.

Summary of Cluster III

First, faculty scored lowest on all three scales, which indicates that they do not favor rights to privacy as much as do their students, that they are least cynical about how to get ahead, and that they are least cynical about conformity pressures. It is possible that, if faculty are not cynical about individual needs for privacy, they would not see the necessity to protect privacy.

Second, the faculty at W.M.U. were discovered to be similar to the faculty at M.I.T. on one scale while different from them on two others, thus not giving much evidence for a common ideology here (see Figure 10).

Third, the faculty scores were similar to students' scores on one scale (rights to privacy), but not on the
other two. Figure 11 shows a profile of the various groups.

Fig. 10.—Comparison of W.M.U. and M.I.T. faculties on mean scores of Cluster III, Individual-Organization Relations.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7—Right to Privacy</td>
<td>(Low score means belief that employee should not have rights to privacy)</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8—Cynicism about How to Get Ahead</td>
<td>(Low score means low cynicism)</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9—Cynicism about Conformity Pressures</td>
<td>(Low score means low cynicism)</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 11.—Mean scores of all W.M.U. subjects on Cluster III, Individual-Organization Relations—Cluster V and scales 14, 15, and 16 in Schein's study (F = Faculty, s = seniors, g = graduate students, and f = freshmen.)
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Fourth, the first hypothesis was not supported, even though Schein had found a significant shift on scale 7.

General Summary and Conclusions of Results

To refresh the reader's memory, it was expected that graduate students' attitude scores would be closest to faculty scores, seniors would score somewhat further from the faculty, and freshmen would be furthest away. In the present study, this major research hypothesis was borne out on only two scales. These scales dealt with: (1) attitudes toward amorality of the managerial role and (2) attitudes toward corporate responsibility. It should be noted that Schein did not find significance on either one of them in his study. Of course, data were gathered in different ways, with Schein's research being a longitudinal study and the present study using different groups. This, however, was not expected to alter the results. The difference might be a function of a different emphasis of material or issues by the professors of a given school. Certainly there are other interpretations that are possible, and these will be discussed in Chapter V.

It should also be pointed out that the W.M.U. business faculty had a more "extreme" attitude than did their students in every case. But while the M.I.T. faculty members were seemingly very down on business and cynical about its practices, the W.M.U. faculty were relatively more defensive.
of business practices. Thus, the M.I.T. faculty seemed to be attempting to socialize students toward what they idealized in the profession of management, as opposed to what actually existed. On the other hand, while generally being somewhere between Schein's sample of executives and the M.I.T. faculty, W.M.U. faculty seemed to be trying to socialize students more toward what corporate executives idealize in business. This phenomenon suggests a vital question to this research: Are the faculty at W.M.U. closer to Schein's sample of executives or to the M.I.T. faculty? Such a question has important implications. If they are closer to the executives, Schein's strong statement, that business professors (in general) may be redefining the profession, could be unwarranted. Whether or not such a redefinition is desirable is not at issue. Rather, Schein could be making a statement that may not be true of all business schools. In this final analysis, a profile is shown in Figure 12 that depicts the differences among W.M.U. faculty, M.I.T. faculty, and Schein's sample of executives.

An inspection of the results shows that W.M.U. faculty are about midway between the M.I.T. faculty and the executives on three scales—1, 2, and 3. On scale 5, W.M.U. faculty were closest to the executives. On two scales where M.I.T. faculty were close to executives (4 and 9), W.M.U. faculty scores were far from those of both other groups. The nature of these two scales indicates, however,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1—Management-Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2—Business-Government Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3—Corporate Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4—Relations to Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5—General Cynicism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6—Amorality of Managerial Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7—Right to Privacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8—Cynicism about How to Get Ahead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9—Cynicism about Conformity Pressures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 12.—Comparison of W.M.U. faculty, M.I.T. faculty, and executives. (E = Executives, M = M.I.T. faculty, and W = W.M.U. faculty.)

that W.M.U. faculty are the most defensive of the three groups toward business. Scale 4, which deals with corporate responsibility, shows W.M.U. faculty taking a relatively traditional approach. Their mean score indicates that they believe business is doing enough in the area of social responsibility and that it is not obligated to do any more. On scale 9, W.M.U. faculty are obviously more defensive of business, since they are least cynical of all the groups
surveyed about conformity pressures in business. On scale 7, W.M.U. faculty were far from the executives and the M.I.T. faculty. Finally, on scales 6 and 8, W.M.U. faculty averaged approximately the same scores as the M.I.T. faculty. Thus, only on scales 7 and 8 were they furthest from the executives.

With regard to W.M.U. faculty, then, it seems that Schein's argument concerning a common critical front is weakened on seven scales, since the W.M.U. faculty were either midway or closer to the executives on four scales (1, 2, 3, and 5). They were most defensive about business, of all the groups studied, on scales 4 and 9 and were slightly less critical than the M.I.T. faculty on scale 6. That is, they were generally less antagonistic about various aspects of business. One certainly cannot say that differences do not exist between W.M.U. faculty and the executives, however. It is possible that the faculty at this midwestern school also may have wishes to redefine certain aspects of business practice. But that is not to say that they wish to change the same aspects of business that M.I.T. faculty want to change. Certainly the orientations of the schools are somewhat different, and it is frequently noticeable that professors are attracted to certain universities because of existing orientations toward the curricula at those universities. The above interpretation is only one of several that can be made. Nevertheless, it is one to be reckoned with.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Interpretation of Positive Findings

From the results it can be seen that only two scales supported the first hypothesis, that graduates would be closest to the faculty, freshmen would be furthest away, and seniors would score between the other two groups of students concerning attitudes toward business. The second hypothesis, concerning the commonality of faculty attitudes at several universities, also received little support. A possible explanation, discussed in Chapter IV, is that faculty may be attracted sometimes toward certain universities because of their academic orientations. The remaining discussion in this chapter will center on the first hypothesis, since it is the major focus of the present study.

The most significant scale was 6, which deals with beliefs that one can be moral as a manager. Since the literature cited (Wallace, 1966; Quarantelli, 1961; Bryan, 1965) supports the viewpoint that people tend to have favorable perceptions of their occupational fields, one might expect business students to favor their future life's work more as they are increasingly exposed to it. While Schein did not find significance on this subject, it must be pointed out that his students, being at the graduate level,
had seemingly already committed themselves to the field of business, and they began the program believing that one can be moral as a manager. This can be shown by their low score of 2.20. Therefore, no significant change could be found toward a more favorable image of the profession, since that favorable image was already developed in the students' minds.

Significance was also found on scale 3, which assessed attitudes about corporate responsibility. Since significance was not found on so many other scales, one might wonder why it was found on this one. A somewhat speculative explanation will be ventured. It seems that "corporate responsibility" is a rather ambiguous term to the layman. While he might, upon hearing the term, think of pollution control and safety standards, his knowledge is still limited about what the concept entails. To a certain extent, freshmen fit the description of laymen. Until they have had several courses in business, it is doubtful that they know a great deal about the meaning of the term. Seniors would know relatively more about it, while graduates should be well acquainted with the term. This concept may somewhat differ from those measured on other scale items because of its more technical nature. Most people seem to have some opinion about labor or government intervention in business affairs; they often express cynicism or optimism about business; and they frequently make judgments about the
morality of managers and how they get ahead, as well as the extent to which they have to conform to certain sets of standards. When the subject of corporate responsibility comes up in the conversation, however, probably no more than two or three facets of it are familiar, and most of its content is learned in the business management classroom. The point to be made, then, is that students are more dependent upon faculty as models to transmit information, opinions, and critical evaluations because of the subject's ambiguous nature. Until the students enter the world of work, the faculty will probably continue to be the major transmitters of attitudes about corporate responsibility. It should also be added that, while students may discuss the subject among themselves, much of the information they have received may have been first shaped by the faculty.

Again, it is possible that Schein's students, being graduates, already were familiar with the various aspects of corporate responsibility and already had well-formed attitudes about it.

Reasons for Lack of Significance

Clearly, the first research hypothesis was not supported by most of the scales. It must be concluded that the faculty had little influence in shaping students' attitudes. It was seen that in nearly every case no student group scored near the faculty. It is possible that M.I.T.
and perhaps other high-prestige schools stress different issues in their curricula. Since Schein taught at such a school, his familiarity with such issues may have influenced his selection of items for the questionnaire he developed. Perhaps these particular issues have not been given so much attention at W.M.U. If a questionnaire had been developed to suit the orientation of its business college, much more significant results might have been found. For example, one school may have several faculty members who are oriented toward issues concerning corporate community activity, while another school might ignore this issue and focus on a different one.

It is also a possibility that some teachers may have a profound influence on some students. If this is the case, strong changes in students' attitudes as a function of one faculty member's influence would be obscured by measuring the effects of all faculty upon all students. This study, of course, did not seek to measure the effect of individual faculty members. Had it done so, it is quite likely that some faculty members would be shown to influence many students tremendously, while other faculty members would have practically no effect.

A question should also be raised on the students' motivations to be accepted as members of the academic business group. According to Wallace (1966), one will fit his values to those of his reference group according to his
desire to attain membership in that group. Since business is not as close-knit a profession as medicine or dentistry and since a college degree in business can qualify one for a variety of fields instead of a single field, his desire to be a part of the group is somewhat minimized. Furthermore, it is likely that many faculty at a large college of business would not even know students' names, let alone their attitudes about various aspects of business. In a medical, dental, or other close-knit school characterized by a relatively small number of yearly admissions, faculty and students would have more opportunity to interact in informal settings. According to Pease (1967), this enhances students' participation in professional activities, and this effect might be extended to influencing their attitudes as well. According to Newcomb (1967), for example, close association between faculty and students seemed to be a variable resulting in students' increasingly liberal attitudes. For all these reasons, then, students may not have seen the need to accept faculty values, since opportunities for close ties with faculty members were limited. Since Schein gives no such descriptions of M.I.T., a comparison cannot be made. Therefore, this reasoning may or may not apply to his study.

Finally, it must be asked whether students in either study were sons and daughters of upper middle- or upper-class, executive-oriented parents and, consequently,
displayed attitudes that might be construed as characteristic of those groups. If students at W.M.U. had such backgrounds, it did not show up in their attitudes. Their scores were frequently opposed to those of Schein's sample of executives. At M.I.T., however, students were somewhat closer to the executives' position than were W.M.U. students. Since M.I.T. is a high-prestige school, it might be inferred that many upper middle- and upper-class persons attend there. While this study did not have the purpose of analyzing business attitudes as a function of social class, it would make an interesting future research project.

Social Responsibility Revisited

In Chapter II, some attention was given to the topic of a new generation of socially responsible youth who are more idealistic, have more personal goals in life, and are more dissatisfied with business as it currently exists. Since students at W.M.U. were found to be relatively more cynical than Schein's sample of executives or their faculty counterparts, perhaps some discussion should be given to the subject. First, it must be pointed out that when students finally make careers of business their true reference groups may be peers and superiors in the organization. Faculty members, although helping to socialize students to a certain degree, do not always represent the applied interests of businessmen. Therefore, any divergence
of beliefs, opinions, or attitudes between neophytes and businessmen is important. As stated in the theoretical chapter, the fewer the differences, the easier the adjustment. When differences are greater, however, so are the necessary accommodations. According to social communication theory (Festinger, 1950), one will first make attempts to change significant others. That failing, he will rationalize to change himself. If he does not feel that he can change himself, he ceases to compare himself with those significant others. It seems that one could interpret this to mean one of two things. First, he might leave the organization, seeing his views and those of people in the organization to be totally incompatible. This would be especially dysfunctional to the organization when the individual's skills are exceptional, rare, or essential. The other alternative is that he would behaviorally and verbally conform but refuse to believe that he is one with the group. Because of the importance of this subject, further research should be done to determine the conditions under which the nonconformist chooses each of the alternatives.

Research Limitations and Model for Future Research

This, like any other study, is subject to a number of limitations which limit its absolute value. One of the more serious of these limitations is the effect of reference groups other than faculty members on the individual.
One cannot deny that individuals often acquire beliefs and attitudes from a number of reference groups at a time. Because of this factor, it is impossible to distinguish the specific attitudes instilled by each group. The problem becomes even more complicated when issues are of a general type that nearly anyone can discuss, as opposed to more specific issues relevant to only two or three reference groups. All one can do, then, is to present issues which are of relevance to both faculty and students and assume that, if attitude changes take place during the educational experience toward the position of the faculty, they may be due at least partially to faculty influence.

Another problem deals with anticipatory socialization as discussed in the second chapter. It is believed that the individual is drawn to the field of study with a set of expectations about that field. If he finds that the field of study is not what he expects or desires, he may withdraw from it. One cannot tell, then, what percentage of all students are socialized into the profession. It is possible that only those whose expectations are already receptive to what they find will remain in the field.

A third area, which is not a genuine problem, should be realized as a boundary for interpreting the results. The nine scales presented in this paper represent attitudes about various areas of business. One cannot, however, say that a student is cynical in all areas of business because
his score on the scale denotes high cynicism or that one believes only in broad corporate responsibility in all instances because his scale score indicates such a belief. Attitudes about business are many and diverse. While a person may be expected to be somewhat consistent on many attitudes, he probably will not be uniform on all of them. Each attitude is the center of a set of interlocking beliefs, and a somewhat logical rationale usually exists for it. Becker and Geer (1958) came to a similar conclusion concerning medical students' cynicism. Although medical students were found to be cynical about certain aspects of medicine, they could not be labeled as cynical concerning all of its facets.

Another limitation concerns the use of Schein's questionnaire in the present study. Because of the way it is written, many who were asked to participate in this study expressed resentment about certain items, and a few business faculty refused to cooperate in the study. The major complaint of those antagonistic to the questionnaire was its apparent anti-business bias. Although the questionnaire was not intentionally designed to give a distorted view about business, it was nevertheless frequently perceived in that manner. A few faculty conceded later, in informal conversations, that they had given somewhat different scores to certain items to guard against the questionnaire being interpreted to give a slanted view about business.
Others expressed resentment because certain questions were too broad to give an adequate answer. They complained that most business decisions are limited to very specific situations, and broad opinions about business practices do not take this into account. Therefore, they often chose middle-of-the-road answers, although they might have given answers at either extreme depending on the specific situation. A final criticism of the questionnaire was made by some women. Although only a few females were found in the business college, some of those who could be located seemed to perceive the questionnaire items as being sexist. Two refused to participate for this reason, and a few frequently crossed out such words as "man" and replaced them with "person."

Another limitation of this study is the use of different groups as opposed to a time study. There is a very real possibility that many differences in attitudes among the groups are due to the different sets of life experiences each group has had, which seems to be the most serious threat to the validity of this study. To deal with this problem, research should be implemented to determine the nature of these qualitative differences among different age cohorts and if they actually exist. Secondly, it must be determined whether these differences might affect such a comparison between groups. At present, though, the reader should be aware that this may be, but is not necessarily a confounding factor.
Finally, as alluded to earlier, this type of study does not measure the influence of certain faculty members on their students. There is a possibility that individual faculty members may function to socialize their students toward certain viewpoints that are not shared by other faculty members. Research has not been done here, but there seems to be a great need for it as a beginning for broad understanding on this topic. There is, after all, little agreement about faculty influence on student attitudes. Therefore, a somewhat narrower unit for analysis may be in order to facilitate agreement. If the researcher is not aware of an individual instructor's effect on his students, it does not seem likely that he could study aggregates of students and at the same time understand the mechanisms by which attitude change takes place, thus obscuring much information. There should be a model study of socialization in various educational institutions which would focus on the individual instructor's influence upon his students in some limited block of time (i.e., during a single course). Since no known research presently exists, it should soon be begun. Such a study should analyze separately each individual classroom of students and instructor. To assess the beliefs and attitudes the instructor is trying to instill, an interview should be conducted to discover the issues he plans to cover and how he stands regarding those issues. A questionnaire based
on this interview should be devised separately for each class. This questionnaire, being made up of very specific items on very specific issues, should minimize to some degree the effects of other reference groups, since the issues' relevance to them may be minimized. The questionnaires should be administered at the beginning and end of the course and a t test administered for each set to find significant differences. While such a study would be too narrow and specific to explain the school socialization process in full, it should nevertheless help clear up the issue of whether some faculty can actually influence students' attitudes. This is a necessary propaedeutic research, which should take priority over other kinds of research in this area.
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APPENDIX A

All of the items used in the questionnaire for this study are shown below and are arranged by clusters and scales. The first column of numbers represents the order of items used in this study, while those numbers in parentheses represent the sequence of the numbered items in Schein's research. Subjects responded to all items on a 4-point scale (1 = strongly agree, 2 = mildly agree, 3 = mildly disagree, and 4 = strongly disagree). An asterisk indicates reverse scoring.

Cluster I: Business in Society

**Scale 1: Management-labor relations**

15. (23)* Managers are not always sincere in their dealings with other people.

16. (32) Management will usually do what is best for its employees without outside influence from unions.

17. (35)* The average employee's standard of living would not be what it is today had it not been for the efforts of labor unions on his behalf.

23. (45)* Most employers think only of their profits and care little for their employees' welfare.

27. (57) A man who is willing to work hard in industry does not need a union to protect him.
Scale 2: Business-government relations

1. (1) Governmentally operated projects cannot compete with private enterprise because they are less efficient.

3. (6) Government should be headed by men trained in business techniques and sympathetic to the cause of business.

6. (10) Private enterprise working through a market economy provides the most equitable distribution of society's goods and services.

13. (38) Government competition with private enterprise is unfair and should be eliminated.

18. (38) Government competition with private enterprise is unfair and should be eliminated.

25. (53) The legal system of this country is generally slanted against big business.

26. (55) Management will usually do what is best for its employees without outside influence from the government.

37. (81)* "Price fixing," contract rigging, and other similar activities by leading American business firms show that the federal government must take a more active role in the policing of private enterprise.

39. (86) Present tax laws tend to stifle capital expansion by business more than they encourage it.

41. (92)* Compulsory arbitration should be instituted in vital industries, such as the steel industry, to insure our country against work stoppages which jeopardize national defense.

43. (99) The welfare of society is best achieved if all businesses pursue profit to the best of their ability.
**Scale 3: Corporate Responsibility**

8. (13) Corporations have a definite obligation to take a stand on political issues.

12. (22) Corporations have a definite obligation to support liberal arts colleges.

14. (27) Corporations have a definite obligation to give money to charity.

32. (69) A corporation must be responsible for the health and welfare of its employees and their immediate families.

33. (32) Corporations have a definite obligation to be actively involved in community affairs.

**Scale 4: Relations to Society**

4. (7)* Most consumers' products manufactured today have been designed to last not more than a few years.

7. (11)* Proper advertising can sell virtually any product.

11. (19)* A corporation with a good public image can sell even an inferior product.

30. (65) The most important objective of a company is to manufacture and sell products which are useful to society.

**Cluster II: General Cynicism**

**Scale 5: General Cynicism**

13. (26)* The good manager is willing to make decisions which will hurt others.

15. (28)* Managers are not always sincere in their dealings with other people.
16. (32) Management will usually do what is best for its employees without outside influence from unions.

19. (40)* The good businessman is basically a cold, calculating kind of person.

20. (41)* Most corporations do not have clear objectives which can serve as guides to executive decisions.

21. (42)* Industry's basic idea is to drive you as hard as it can and give you as little as possible.

23. (45)* Many employers think only of their profits and care little for their employees' welfare.

24. (46)* It is the tough, driving, impersonal man who really gets ahead in industry.

33. (74)* Many managers are suspicious of their business associates.

34. (76)* Some degree of cynicism is a valuable attribute in a manager.

Scale 6: Amorality of managerial role

10. (17)* The hardest part of a manager's job is having to compromise his own ethics and morals in order to get his job done.

19. (40)* The good businessman is basically a cold, calculating kind of person.

31. (66)* Managers often have to treat people unfairly to get their job done.

40. (91)* Most managerial jobs require a person to compromise his ethics or morals to some degree.

44. (100)* Religious teachings cannot be strictly observed in the business setting.
Cluster III: Individual-Organization Relations

Scale 7: Right to privacy

9. (16)* The private life of an employee should be of no direct concern to his company.

22. (43) A young man entering industry should be careful in selecting a wife to make sure she will fit into his career plans.

28. (60) The private life of an employee is properly a matter of direct concern to his company, for the two can never be completely segregated.

35. (78) A wife's social grace and attractiveness play a significant role in her husband's rate of advancement.

42. (93) Nowadays when industry hires a new manager, his whole family should be screened as an indication of his potential for advancement.

Scale 9: Cynicism about how to get ahead

2. (3)* The man who gets ahead in industry is the man who has someone sponsoring him.

5. (9)* The man who gets ahead in industry is the man who knows the right people.

15. (28)* Managers are not always sincere in their dealings with other people.

Scale 9: Cynicism about conformity pressures

21. (42)* Industry's basic idea is to drive you as hard as it can and give you as little as possible.
29. (64)* Most large corporations are placing more stress on the "corporation loyalty" of the employee than on his individual growth.

36. (30)* A large corporation tends to suppress individual creativity.
APPENDIX B

The mean scores of each item on the questionnaire are shown below for the various groups. Mean scale scores are shown in parentheses. It should also be remembered that items are identified by the numbering system used in this study, as opposed to that used by Schein.

Cluster I: Business in Society

**Scale 1: Management-labor relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(X = 2.80) (X = 2.85) (X = 2.77) (X = 2.60)\]

**Scale 2: Business-government relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scale 2—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\((X = 2.63) \quad (X = 2.85) \quad (X = 2.64) \quad (X = 2.49)\)

### Scale 3: Corporate responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\((X = 2.34) \quad (X = 2.81) \quad (X = 2.59) \quad (X = 2.71)\)

### Scale 4: Relations to society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\((X = 2.81) \quad (X = 2.81) \quad (X = 2.69) \quad (X = 2.37)\)
### Scale 5: General Cynicism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X = 2.42 \quad X = 2.45 \quad X = 2.54 \quad X = 2.32 \]

### Scale 6: Amorality of Managerial Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X = 2.62 \quad X = 2.41 \quad X = 2.16 \quad X = 1.81 \]
Cluster III: Individual-Organization Relations

### Scale 7: Right to privacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X = 2.87\) \(X = 2.72\) \(X = 2.91\) \(X = 2.71\)

### Scale 8: Cynicism about how to get ahead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X = 2.88\) \(X = 2.96\) \(X = 2.90\) \(X = 2.73\)

### Scale 9: Cynicism about conformity pressures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X = 2.55\) \(X = 2.55\) \(X = 2.40\) \(X = 2.22\)