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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

The Problem

The upsurge in political radicalism among university students was certainly one of the most salient features of the United States of the 1960's. Protests against the war in Vietnam, against racism, and against alleged university complicity in these and other perceived injustices resulted in a political frenzy on many American campuses that rivaled that of politicized campuses in Latin American countries. And since this activism has been at the doorstep of various social scientists, there has been no dearth of studies on student radicalism and student radicals. However, most of these studies have been made at the so-called American "elite" campuses where student radicalism in the sixties was most pronounced; thus, profiles of Berkeley radicals


and radicals at the University of Chicago are prominent in the social scientific literature. On the other hand, relatively few attempts have been made to investigate the roots of student radicalism at other kinds of universities. This thesis is, in part, an attempt to remedy that deficiency by examining students from a large university whose student body is not elite and whose "tradition" is not of student radicalism.

The predominant focus of the research to date on recent American student radicalism has been on the family backgrounds of student radicals. Probably the most significant and ambitious attempt in recent years to synthesize these data on family backgrounds and integrate them into social theory has been made by the sociologist Flacks. Drawing on his own and other data indicating the affluence and social idealism of the families of student radicals, Flacks, in his early writings, contends that this new student radicalism is a reflection of a disjunction between the values of a certain kind of family and the values of

---


2 ibid.

the large multiversity and the society's occupational structure. The expectations of youth from certain family backgrounds, claims Flacks, are frustrated by a university increasingly impersonal and rationalized and by an occupational structure indifferent to the self and social concerns of these youth. A conflict between family socialization pattern and societal structure is thus seen as precipitating the American radical student movement in the 1960's.

Yet, as is indicated above, the literature available to Flacks in 1967 focused mostly upon students from the so-called elite campuses. What, though, about the radical students from non-elite campuses? Were and are they from the same kinds of backgrounds as the radical students at the elite universities? Do the vanguard and followers of radicalism at the non-elite university also come from the idealistic family? Are the same categories used to explain the rise of radical protests at the elite universities appropriate also to non-elite universities? These questions have for a long time remained unasked and unanswered.

As an inquiry into these questions, this thesis focuses on the relation between selected family value-patterns and one aspect or kind of contemporary student radicalism, the

---

2 Ibid.
advocacy of student power. In line with the exploratory purposes of this thesis, a qualitative research strategy has been employed. Thus, the test for which data are presented in this thesis does not constitute a test in the usual quantitative, statistical fashion. However, an attempt is made to summarize certain of the data through the use of elementary statistics. While the hypotheses to be elaborated later in this chapter are, of course, partially subject to verification by findings, much greater attention has been given to exploring and elaborating on various ways selected family value-patterns may or may not be related to student power demands. Of secondary interest is the extent to which factors other than family value-patterns contribute to the explanation of students' demands for student power.

While the topic of this thesis is of scholarly and sociological interest, it is of more broadly social interest and relevance as well. The specific aspect of student radicalism to which this thesis is addressed, student power advocacy, may yet become a focal issue of radical youth if they are increasingly unable, as it now appears, to influence public policy on more far-ranging issues. Students may continue to urge, and much more strongly, that the university involve itself more deeply in the problems of the country; and they may seek to make the university more relevant to their personal and philosophical concerns.
In either case, student power ideology may guide them in their struggle. Hopefully, the discussion in this thesis might help to facilitate a non-violent and well-reasoned solution to the conflicts which may result from these demands.

Theoretical Background and Review of Literature

The social scientific literature on just American student radicalism in the 1960's is significantly large, and even empirical studies of the phenomenon are numerous. Much of this empirical work circulates in the form of mimeographed studies done for theses and dissertations, so that all the recent literature is not easily accessible. A few social scientists, notably Keniston and Flacks, have both conducted empirical studies of American student radicals and have attempted to synthesize much of the literature on the subject. Especially of concern to both Flacks and Keniston are the family backgrounds of student radicals, and as the family backgrounds are the focal point of this study, much of the literature herein summarized is drawn from the writings of Flacks and Keniston and concerns the family backgrounds of student radicals.

The earliest studies of student radicals in the 1960's were done at the University of California at Berkeley after the Free Speech Movement's activities in 1964. Several
researchers were concerned with both personality attributes and family backgrounds of Free Speech Movement (FSM) participants and sympathizers. Watts and Whittaker, comparing students who sat in at Sproul Hall with a random sample of the Berkeley student population, found that the "sit-ins" had parents who were more academically elite than the parents of the random sample, judged in terms of number of M.A. and Ph.D. degrees held. In a study by Block et al., FSM participants characterized their parents as more permissive, less authoritarian, and less punitive than did the students randomly sampled. FSM'ers were also less likely than students randomly selected to find themselves in agreement with their parents on political and religious issues. Gales found that those sympathetic to the FSM were more likely to come from Jewish families. The fathers of sympathizers tended, disproportionately, to be liberal Democrats. Gales also found that some of those students favorable to the FSM agreed substantially with their parents (more than the average non-sympathizer) on political matters, but, on the other hand, other FSM sympathizers violently disagreed with their parents.

1Watts and Whittaker, op. cit., p. 53.
2Block et al., op. cit., p. 218.
3ibid. 4Gales, op. cit., p. 483.
5loc. cit., p. 484. 6ibid.
Block et al.\textsuperscript{1} found that FSM participants were likely to proclaim allegiance to values such as self-expression, intellectualism, and the importance of community, while students in the randomly selected group were much more prone to emphasize "Protestant ethic" type values such as competitiveness, self-denial, and ambition. Watts and Whittaker\textsuperscript{2} found FSM\textsuperscript{ers} less influenced by formalized religion. Gales\textsuperscript{3} found that support for FSM was highest among students majoring in the social sciences, the physical sciences, and the humanities, in that order, while lowest among majors in business administration, engineering, and architecture. This "Berkeley" literature deals with the same kind of students who are the focus of this study: those interested in university-centered issues and those whose radicalism might be channeled toward a university activism.

Most of the remaining relevant, accessible literature is concerned with left-radical students generally, especially activists or leaders of radical protests. These include, especially, anti-war protesters, militant civil rights advocates, and others who advocate radical social change in this country and are aligned to a left-wing

\textsuperscript{1}Block et al., op. cit., p. 217.
\textsuperscript{2}Watts and Whittaker, op. cit., pp. 54-5.
\textsuperscript{3}Gales, op. cit., p. 482.
movement. As mentioned above, the sociologist Flacks has conducted empirical studies of student radicalism and has summarized his own and other literature on the subject. His own empirical work in the middle 1960's includes: a comparison of a random sample of students sitting-in at an anti-selective service demonstration at the University of Chicago with a random sample of university students who either did not protest or were hostile to the protest; and a study of fifty students from mailing lists of various peace, civil rights, and student movement organizations in the Chicago area, these students being paired with an equal number of students matched for sex, neighborhood of parent's residence, and type of college attended. Data for the two studies were drawn from questionnaires and in-depth interviews. The detailed and fairly consistent picture which Flacks presents of the student protestor in the mid-1960's is presented below, as it is summarized in two of Flacks's early articles.¹

Activists in the academically elite schools studied come predominantly from upper-middle class families in urban and suburban areas.² Family incomes are disproportionately high, parents' educations are especially advanced,

and occupational status of both parents is especially high, with many drawn from the ranks of the professions.¹

Activist-producing families are typically quite secular, though a small minority of activists come from strongly religious families, most often of a liberal, social-concern orientation (Quaker, Unitarian, or Reformed Judaism).² Parents are also especially liberal in their political attitudes.³ The families from which activists come are characterized by an egalitarian, democratic, anti-authoritarian atmosphere.⁴ There is some evidence that activists' parents are less punitive and more lenient than parents of non-activists, but they have high expectations and set high standards for their children.⁵ Activists' parents are much more likely to read extensively, to attend cultural activities, and travel to "culturally enriching places" than parents of non-activists, while non-activists' parents are more likely to engage in recreational activities, hobbies, and social clubs than activists' parents.⁶

According to Flacks, activists' parents are also likely to encourage humanitarian concerns on their offspring and de-emphasize the importance of material success.⁷

Both activist parents and their children are apt to emphasize

the importance of intellectual and aesthetic activities and the opportunity for self-expression, while placing little positive value on personal achievement, religiosity, and conventional moral codes.\textsuperscript{1} Non-activists and their parents are likely to have more "conventional" attitudes toward the importance of achievement, adherence to religious and moral codes, and the importance of material success and security.\textsuperscript{2} But while value continuity between activist students and their parents is the rule, Flacks points out that the students do differ from their parents in their greater political radicalism. This is expressed in support for civil disobedience and other direct action tactics; in a distrust of and skepticism toward traditional liberal politicians and traditional liberal goals; and, generally, in a more alienated attitude toward American life.\textsuperscript{3} But Flacks cautions against overemphasizing these differences. Finally, Flacks points out that while many middle-class families are permissive toward their children, they do not share in the emphasis on humanitarianism and intellectualism of the parents of activists.\textsuperscript{4} Rather than taking a laissez-faire attitude toward their children, the parents of activists make conscious and systematic attempts

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Flacks, "The Liberated Generation," op. cit., p. 515.
\item ibid.  
\item Flacks, "Who Protests," op. cit., p. 139.
\item loc. cit., p. 140.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
to influence their offspring in intellectual and humanitarian directions.¹

It is with respect to the activist's relationships with his parents that the theory put forward by Flacks clashes directly with the theory of student rebellion elaborated by Feuer in his comparative and historical work, *The Conflict of Generations.*² Feuer, using Freudian concepts, contends that Oedipal rebellion is the underlying force behind student rebellion,³ and in his major work, both the Berkeley student revolt of 1964 and the Columbia student revolt of 1968 are given as examples of such Oedipal rebellion.⁴ Obscure and unconscious forces, originating in the child's early life and manifesting themselves in hatred of the father, are seen as triggering student revolt and account for the violent, often suicidal character of these revolts.⁵

While Feuer's theory has the advantage of being a comparative theory which attempts to explain a phenomenon

---

¹ibid.


⁴Feuer, op. cit., pp. 436-91.

⁵Kcniston, op. cit., p. 28.
which manifests itself somewhat similarly in different countries and different historical periods, its generality can also be seen as a significant shortcoming. As Keniston\textsuperscript{1} points out, the Oedipal rebellion theory, which is based upon psychoanalytic concepts, is not a good psychoanalytic theory, since the Oedipus complex is a universal phenomenon; a good theory, for example, should explain why American students revolted in the 1960's, but not in the 1950's, yet according to psychoanalytic theory, youth of all eras are victims of the Oedipus complex. Keniston\textsuperscript{2} continues his criticism of Feuer by pointing out that if the Oedipal rebellion theory is to explain anything, it must be modified to emphasize the importance of an extremely severe Oedipal complex as generating student rebellion. But Keniston\textsuperscript{3} points to studies that show that student radicals are no more "neurotic, suicidal, enraged, or disturbed than are non-radicals." Empirical evidence obtained about contemporary student radicals in America would seem, then, to lend little support to Feuer's theory.

On the contrary, Keniston\textsuperscript{4} points out that those culturally disaffected students most in rebellion against their parents are quite unlikely to be student radicals.

\textsuperscript{1}ibid.  \textsuperscript{2}ibid.  \textsuperscript{3}ibid.

For Keniston,¹ there are two ideal types of student dissenters existing on a continuum: the activist type already described by Flacks; and the culturally alienated student whose most prominent response is withdrawal and political unconcern. While the radical student is likely to accept the basic values of his family, the alienated student most often reacts strongly against his parents' values.² The alienated student is likely to see his father as having sold out to the establishment, and he wishes to avoid a similar fate.³ While parents of radicals are likely to encourage independence, the parents of Keniston's alienated student, especially the mother, are likely to be oversolicitous and constraining, though an affective relationship between mother and child is often present.⁴ Keniston⁵ contends that the alienated student is drawn from the same social stratum as the activist, but that he differs in both psychological and ideological development.

The theory that Flacks developed to account for student protest in the mid-1960's goes beyond his and others' findings, but it is not inconsistent with those findings. Flacks⁶ contends that two macro-structural trends, combined with a new pattern of familial relations, are crucial to

¹loc. cit., pp. 298-305.
an understanding of the emergence of student radicalism within the university. The first trend is in the university where "rationalization" predominates, entailing impersonality, competitiveness, and a direct involvement by the university with corporate and governmental bureaucracies. The second macro-structural trend is in the occupational sphere, where "coherent careers" outside of these bureaucracies are increasingly scarce. These two trends converge with a pattern of familial relations which involves a stress upon: democratic and egalitarian interpersonal relations; self-regulation; and values other than achievement, particularly intellectual, aesthetic, and political ideals.

Young people coming from families stressing these values are loathe to accommodate to the institutional expectations of the university where hierarchy, strict and external regulation, and the demands of competition and for achievement are the rule.¹ Friendships within the university, as well as socializing experiences outside the university, lend strength to their rebellion.² Finally, Flacks³ contends, the incentives of status and material success are relatively weak for students born into families where these are taken for granted. Thus, values

³loc. cit., p. 508.
emphasized in certain families have become personality traits of young radicals, who find universities and prevailing occupational opportunities unsuitable to those traits. Thus, for Flacks, student radicalism would be understood as a manifestation of the conflict between family and trends in the larger society.

The foregoing is a summary of the literature, directly germane to this study, available at the time the interviews for this study were conducted and the case studies written up. Since that time, however, an issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* has been released which includes articles that change considerably the complexion of the prevailing theory. Two of those articles, one by Mankoff and Flacks and the other by Laufer, are particularly relevant to this study and are summarized below.

The article by Flacks and Mankoff is somewhat of a rarity; it is an essay in which a theory previously set forth by an author is changed beyond recognition by the


same author in light of further data which fail to confirm that theory, and by history whose turns the sociologist can never completely predict. The data on which this paper is based are from a study of the "radical activist core" at the University of Wisconsin in 1968. From the data, Flacks and Mankoff conclude that although, on the whole, the veteran radical cadre come from "well-educated, liberal, permissive families residing in large cities" (as compared to a random cross-section of University of Wisconsin students), many of these "veterans" come from other family backgrounds, many more than would be predicted on the basis of the theory of Flacks previously described. Also, Flacks and Mankoff contend that data on radicals relatively new to radical causes indicate that the social base of the student movement is considerably expanding. Rather than coming from secular homes and professional families, many radical students are coming from Catholic or Protestant homes and from families of businessmen as well as of white-collar and blue-collar workers.

Flacks and Mankoff contend that the trends reflected in these findings, which they believe to be true of other elite and non-elite schools, seriously challenge Flacks's previous theory on the importance of childhood socializa-

1 Flacks and Mankoff, op. cit., p. 58.
2 ibid. 3 loc. cit., p. 64.
tion as a primary determinant of student radicalism. Instead, with the spread of student revolt, Flacks and Mankoff\(^1\) argue that attention must be focused on a "quasi-class consciousness" among American university students. This "quasi-class consciousness" seems to be the product of a cultural crisis, "rooted in the impact of advanced technology on traditional capitalist values," and the segregation of students in university enclaves, thus accounting for a great deal of mutual reinforcement of radical student attitudes. For Flacks and Mankoff,\(^2\) that student rebellion has spread to many students at so many kinds of universities is indicative of this trend. If, they argue, the factor of socialization were still dominant, as they contend that it was in the early 1960's, student rebellion would have reached no such breadth. In the final chapter of this thesis, the implications of this theoretical development for an understanding of the students studied for this thesis will be examined.

In the other recent article relevant to this thesis, Laufer contends that generational conflict is at the roots of contemporary student rebellion; yet his position differs significantly from the psychoanalytic theory of generational conflict popularized by Feuer and briefly discussed earlier.

\(^1\)loc. cit., pp. 61-2.
\(^2\)loc. cit., pp. 56-7.
According to Laufer, there are three prominent factors accounting for this generational conflict: (1) the impact of post-industrial society on the children of the middle class; (2) a change in the pattern of child socialization within the middle-class family; and (3) the disillusionment of middle-class youth with the politics and culture of post-industrial society, especially in view of its perceived intractability. Laufer views the student revolt as primarily a middle-class phenomenon, pointing especially to the predominant make-up of most university populations as evidence.

With respect to the impact of post-industrial society, Laufer takes up an argument, presented earlier in the twentieth century by Mannheim, that generational conflict is likely to emerge in historical periods when rapid social change radically alters the position of youth in society. Laufer points to the radical transformation in such cultural aspects as consumption patterns, occupational and career training, residential patterns, communications systems, warfare and the like, as indicative of such rapid social change due to the applications of advanced technology; and Laufer sees the middle-class young responding, in their rebellion, to this historical experience.

1Laufer, op. cit., p. 80. 2loc. cit., pp. 82-3. 3loc. cit., p. 81. 4loc. cit., pp. 81-2.
Especially significant, he finds, is the position in which an increasing number of youth find themselves in danger of becoming déclassé, or at least underemployed, because of the unavailability of quality jobs for those who complete the college experience.\(^1\) Such an experience, Laufer\(^2\) claims, is likely to encourage the young in intellectual settings to develop critiques of the political and cultural system.

Laufer\(^3\) claims that the importance attached to the self-actualization of the child's personal potential in many middle-class homes contributes to the growing youth protest, though he thinks that parents are unaware of the ends to which this child-raising practice is likely to lead. Many middle-class parents, he contends, do not demand that their child submit to norms which conflict with the child's "inner needs."\(^4\) Middle-class parents emphasize the importance of personal potential and inner need out of a "fantasy" which "emerges out of the deprivation it felt forced to tolerate in order to obtain the rewards of security and status."\(^5\) But the responses of middle-class youth, Laufer\(^6\) argues, go far beyond parental expectations; the young do not tolerate the separation of the private and

\(^{1,2}\)loc. cit., p. 83. \(^{2,4}\)loc. cit., pp. 83-4.
\(^3\)loc. cit., pp. 85-6. \(^4\)loc. cit., p. 85.
\(^5\)loc. cit., p. 86. \(^6\)loc. cit., pp. 86-7.
the public as their parents did, insisting rather on the
primacy of those inner needs, even in the public arena.
This demand to integrate the private and public Laufer
views as an integral part of the "generational conscious-
ness."

Foremost, then, for Laufer is a generational con-
sciousness; conflict between the young and the old, mani-
festing itself in student rebellion, is cultural, politi-
cal, and value-oriented, but not primarily the venting of
interpersonal hostility, as is implied in the psychoanaly-
tic theory of Feuer. The conflict is public, not private;
it is a significant and real clash over political values,
not merely a manifestation of personal animosity.\(^1\) And
to a great extent, this rebellion is fueled by values
stressed by the parents of the young, but not taken as
seriously by the old as by the young.

The literature summarized above has provided the
basis around which the research described in this thesis
was conducted and around which the data collected have
been analyzed. The research objectives and hypotheses
set forth below have their origin in the early theories
of Flacks and Keniston. Unfortunately, the work of the
later Flacks with Mankoff and of Laufer was not available
at the time this project was conceived. However, it has

\(^{1}\)loc. cit., pp. 84-5.
been possible to integrate some of their contributions into parts of Chapters III and IV, where the case studies are analyzed. Yet the contributions of the early Flacks and of Keniston must be seen as the point of departure for this thesis.

Research Objectives and Hypotheses

Following the major theme of the early theoretical work of Flacks, the major thesis being examined in this paper is that predominant family value-patterns are related to student demands for power within the university. The specific concern is with two antithetical value-patterns and their relation to these demands. These value-patterns constitute a materialistic-idealistic ideal typology, i.e., two ideal types on polar ends of a continuum.

By the concept of materialistic value-pattern is meant a cluster of values encompassing a stress by the family on the importance of goods and status. Illustrations of this value-pattern are: emphasizing the importance of money and financial success, and/or the importance of status and upward mobility, and/or the instrumental importance of a college education as a means of gaining financial success or status.

The concept of idealistic family value-patterns refers to primary adherence by the family to one or more of the following values: (1) romanticism or the emphasis on the
aesthetic and aesthetic experience; (2) intellectualism or an emphasis on ideas and books; and (3) humanitarianism or the concern for the plight of others. An emphasis on religion alone by the family does not constitute adherence to the idealistic family value-pattern, as that value-pattern has been defined for this thesis. As is indicated above in the review of literature, Flacks, in his early work, found that religious belief and emphasis (except for a liberal, humanitarian religiosity), was more characteristic of those families better called "materialistic." However, some relationships between what might be called religious idealism and student power advocacy will be discussed in Chapter III.

Student power advocacy includes two components: an ideological component and a "willingness-to-participate" component. The ideological component involves a critique of the essentially passive role of the student in the university and a belief that students should, of educational necessity, participate in the university's decision-making structure. Implied, here, is a critique of the university as merely a training ground for teaching, engineering, or "breadwinning," and a concomitant belief that education can and should be an end in itself. Oftentimes, the student power advocate will talk of a community of scholars and will criticize an academic "dogma" which separates the student from the material of study. The "willingness-to-
participate" component has been included because the writer assumes that, if the student does believe in this ideology, it demands of him that he actively participate in the governance of the university and in the creation of his own educational program. The foregoing is a summary of several New Left critiques of the university which have guided previous student power movements in this country in the recent past.¹

While the materialistic and the idealistic family value-patterns are the major independent variable being considered, other family values are also considered. Attention is given to the political orientation of the family, its religious ties, and its child-rearing practices, and other patterns revealed in the course of the interviewing. In the concluding chapter, extra-familial factors will be considered as possible determinants of student power advocacy, and their possible relation to family value-patterns will also be discussed.

In following out the implications of the qualitative research strategy of detailed, relatively unstructured interviews employed for this study, the focus of this thesis is not on the statistical relationship of family value-pattern to student power advocacy, but rather on the way

that these value-patterns are related to student power advocacy. Thus, the specific concern of the case studies which comprise most of Chapter III is with the continuity and discontinuity between the value-patterns of the student and his parents. This theme of continuity and discontinuity is developed in the early works of Flacks discussed above; there Flacks suggested that students are radical because they are living out the values of their parents. If such is the case, then one might expect student power advocates to rely upon the "idealistic" values which their parents emphasized to them as children. Hence there are two major research hypotheses:

_Hypothesis 1._—Students coming from families with idealistic family value-patterns are more likely to be student power advocates than are students from families having materialistic value-patterns.

_Hypothesis 2._—Radical students will justify their own positions in terms of their families' idealistic value-patterns.

A third hypothesis is suggested by the import which Flacks gives to the protest of students from idealistic families:

_Hypothesis 3._—The prime focus of student power advocacy within the university will come from such children living out the values of their parents.

In addition to the foregoing, an inquiry will be made into the relationship between family value-pattern and student power advocacy for students coming from families emphasizing a materialistic value-pattern. It is through
a detailed analysis of the precise relationship between student and family values that the usefulness of the categories, as a tool used to understand student radicalism in a non-elite university setting, can best be evaluated.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The Sample

In order to fulfill the research objectives outlined in Chapter I, a small sample of students was needed that conformed to three general requirements: (1) the students must have been from a non-elite university setting; (2) they must have been willing to take part in a lengthy interview; and (3) their number must have included a disproportionate number of student power advocates, as it was feared that a random sample would include only a few such radical students. Such a sample became available as a result of short structured interviews, conducted by students from an advanced sociology class on students from a non-elite midwestern university and concerning themes closely related to those of this thesis. Eighty students agreed to such a lengthy interview, of whom thirty-two became the sample on which this thesis is based. These thirty-two were contacted by the interviewers, and an interview was arranged at the interviewee's convenience, often after the student's last morning or afternoon class. These students were interviewed during the first two months of 1971 in a faculty office in which furniture was rearranged to accommodate an interview situation.
At the time the students were first contacted, the interviewers assured the potential interviewees of anonymity and confidentiality. None of the students contacted for an interview expressed overtly any fear of the personal interview situation, and no student refused an interview explicitly for that reason. A decision was made beforehand to interview between twenty-five and forty students, and in order to get the thirty-two final interviewees, attempts had to be made to interview all of the original pool of eighty students. Most all of those students eventually interviewed were contacted by phone. Several of the students, though, had no phone, and short letters were sent requesting an interview. These letters were almost all disregarded. Some students who had appointments for interviews did not appear, and only in some cases was an effort made to recon tact the student. After the thirty-two interviews, the two interviewers decided that there was enough material already collected to obviate the recon tacting of those who did not appear for interviews.

Tables 1, 2, and 3 reveal some possibly relevant characteristics of the sample of students herein studied. As can be seen from Table 1, males and females are almost equally represented in the sample. All of the students are white, and sophomores and seniors are somewhat over-represented (Table 1). Since students in the social sciences and humanities have been shown, in previous research
(see Chapter I), to be more sympathetic to activism and more likely to be activists, it is understandable that this sample, chosen because it included a disproportionate number of students radically inclined, would include a disproportionate number of students from the social sciences and humanities.

TABLE 1
SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Distribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math, Natural Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only four of the fathers of the sampled students did
not finish high school, and one of those received his education before 1920 (Table 2). Almost one-third of the fathers have at least completed college (Table 2). Most of the mothers are high school graduates, but less than college graduates (Table 2). Most of the mothers work, though thirteen are housewives. Included among the jobs at which they work are: professional dietician, medical technologist, nurse, and secretary. Most of the working mothers, however, are involved in minor clerical or sales work.

TABLE 2
PARENTAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate and/or training school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended, but did not complete college</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate and/or graduate school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost half of the fathers belong to an occupational category which encompasses craftsmen, skilled workers, and public employees (Table 3). Only four of the thirty-two come from "professional" families, those--according to the early Flacks and Keniston (see Chapter I)--which are likely
to breed activists and those sympathetic to activism (Table 3). Included among the professional fathers are a doctor, a veterinarian, and a lawyer. Most of the families are of moderate income ($10,000-$15,000) with a few families having incomes over $25,000 (Table 3).

**TABLE 3**

**FATHER'S OCCUPATION AND FAMILY INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father's Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (doctor, lawyer, teacher, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business manager, engineer, insurance agent, contractor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsman, proprietor, policeman, fireman skilled worker</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, sales worker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled worker (service or domestic)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $9,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $19,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $24,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $29,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other most salient characteristic of this sample is the number of students from Catholic homes. Twelve of
the thirty-two students interviewed have at least one parent who is a devout Catholic, and most all of those twelve have two Catholic parents. Most of those coming from families where religion was strongly emphasized were from Catholic families.

Finally, due to the disproportionate number of student power advocates sought out for the sample, this sample appears to the investigator to be an unusually "radical" group. Many of the thirty-two students interviewed do have severe criticisms of the United States and of the values they believe it stands for. Though most all of them are against the use of violence, the militancy of several carries them to the brink of an advocacy of violence. Apparently a sizeable number of this group are of the "angry young generation."

Collection of Data

The interviews on which this thesis are based were generally just less than an hour in length. The topics covered in these interviews included: parent's occupation, education, and income; student's political attitudes and attitude toward student power; student heroes and villains; family characteristics and predominant family value-patterns; student peer-groups; and miscellaneous subjects related to these. Information was also obtained about the student's sex, race, age, marital status, classification,
and major field of study. Appendix A includes those questions which "guided" the interviews. Extensive notes were taken during and after the interviews by the two interviewers, Dorsey and McEvoy, and an extended summary of each interview was written.

Although certain information was, of necessity, gathered from each interviewee, an attempt was made by the interviewers to create as unstructured an interview situation as possible. Some questions were very straightforward, but other subjects were more difficult to discuss, and every attempt was made by the interviewers to encourage a frank and honest response, unaffected by what the interviewee thought the interviewer wanted. While standard suggestions or possible answers were given to the interviewee, it was stressed by the interviewers that it was the interviewee's responsibility to structure his response in accord with his own experience. In addition, the interviewers attempted to see what was meant by the labels the students attached to such factors as specific family values. Through these means, it was hoped, the advantages of the case study approach were maximized.

Before the interviews began, this interviewer spelled out two kinds of in-depth information which were to be obtained from the interviews. First, information about the respondent's family was viewed as crucial. Accordingly, the interviewers requested information on three aspects of
the respondents' family situations: (1) the structure of family decision-making, including perceived parental permissiveness or strictness; (2) the predominant family values (intellectual, humanitarian, artistic, achievement-oriented, religious, etc.); and (3) the extent of the generation gap perceived by the respondent between himself and his parents and the ways in which this gap was manifested. The interviewee was also asked to give other information about his family or student life which he considered important, but such information was not collected for each respondent. In Appendix A are listed the kinds of questions used in gathering the above information. Also, in the concluding section of Chapter III, some of the difficulties encountered in gathering these data are discussed.

Secondly, information was to be obtained about the student's position with respect to student power in the university, especially concerning student participation in academic affairs. Primarily what was sought was the strength of the student's commitment—if he had a commitment—to student power, and the tactics he thought were legitimate in pursuit of those student goals within the university. As the concern of this thesis is radical leftists, the so-called New Left model of student power advocate is taken as the paradigm; and this type is roughly defined by the student's commitment to the following goals
and values: student participation in educational reform, belief in and commitment to a college "community," the critique of the "narrow" vocationalist understanding of the university, and an insistence on an active role for students in the university as an essential educational activity.

Special care was taken by the interviewers in gathering the above data to insure complete responses, and in the discussions between interviews by the interviewers, means of insuring completeness were reviewed. Thus, it was deemed essential by the interviewers that they understand just what a particular response meant, since among college students, situations and relations are defined quite differently. This problem was found to be especially salient in dealing with the student's advocacy of student power; it was often revealed that a student's initial favorable response to a question about student power belied other attitudes which were inconsistent with student power advocacy as originally defined. By asking students such questions as: "How should students exercise such power?" and "How essential is it?" it often became apparent to the interviewers that the students should not be classified as student power advocates. Through the use of such probing and specific questions, it was hoped that the interviewers could both come to a fuller understanding of the interviewee and also more accurately present him as
a subject of the case study.

Analysis of Data

As is stated above, the primary focus of concern in these case studies is the continuity and discontinuity between values of parents and students. In the case studies presented in Chapter III, one paragraph describes the student's family and its values, a second describes the student's position with respect to student power demands, and a third brings these two together to see if they lend coherence to one another, that is, to see if the predominant family value-pattern is a key to the understanding of the student's stance toward student power. Throughout the case studies, the major aim is to understand the student, to focus in on his life in order to examine salient features, whatever they may be, which may help to explain, in the wide sense of that term, the student's position toward student power. In this way, it was hoped, theoretically relevant findings and new insights might be obtained.

Throughout the months of interviewing and the additional months in which the chapter of findings was being written, this investigator worked very closely with the other interviewer and investigator, McEvoy. Together, the two investigators went over, for this investigator's purposes, those interviews McEvoy had conducted; and
McEvoy carefully briefed this investigator on each of them, sometimes adding additional comments to the summaries which had been written after the original interview. It was with this assistance that this investigator categorized the students for the purposes of analysis into categories based on family value-pattern and student power advocacy. McEvoy also carefully examined this investigator's interpretation of each of the case studies of the students that he interviewed, and in several instances McEvoy made either corrections or additions. Through this cooperative effort, it was hoped that the validity of these case studies would be maximized.
CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter is organized into four sections. In the first section, the sample characteristics outlined in Chapter II are related to the dependent variable, the students' demands for power within the university. In the second and third sections, case studies are presented in which family value-patterns and other factors are related to student power demands. In the final section, these findings are summarized, and further analysis of the findings is presented.

Conditions Associated with Student Power Demands

Tables 4 through 9 relate selected characteristics of the sampled students to the major dependent variable in this study, the demand for student power. As revealed in Table 4, the females in the sample are disproportionately included among the student power advocates. Almost 50 percent of the females (eight of seventeen) as opposed to 20 percent of the males (three of fifteen) have been classified as student power advocates. Table 5, revealing student power advocates by class, shows no pattern. More
seniors and sophomores are student power advocates, but more of them are included in the sample.

**TABLE 4**

**ADVOCATES OF STUDENT POWER BY SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Non-Advocate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5**

**ADVOCATES OF STUDENT POWER BY CLASS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Non-Advocate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 6, almost all (ten of eleven) of the student power advocates major in either the social sciences or humanities. Three of these had another major in a social science or one of the humanities. No one of the major fields of study drew a substantial proportion of the student power advocates; religion, sociology, speech, English, psychology, art, and political science majors are all represented. A special education major is
the only exception to the predominance of humanities and social science students. The findings here are consistent with previous findings about the major fields of study of student activists. (See Chapter I.)

**TABLE 6**

**ADVOCATES OF STUDENT POWER BY ACADEMIC MAJOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Non-Advocate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math, Natural Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the student power advocates in the sample have fathers who at least attended college. While just over half of the fathers of the sampled group attended college, graduated from college, or went on to graduate school, nine of the eleven student power advocates have fathers from this group (Table 7). Oddly enough, almost half of the fathers of student power advocates attended, but did not finish, college.

No pattern is revealed in examining student power advocacy according to level of mother's education. Mothers
### TABLE 7

PARENTAL EDUCATION AND STUDENT POWER ADVOCACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Advocate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended, but did not complete college</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended, but did not complete college</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

who at least attended college are only slightly overrepresented as mothers of student power advocates (five of twelve as opposed to six of twenty), as seen in Table 7. This interviewer found, however, that the most intellectually-oriented mothers were not college graduates.

Table 8 indicates that the student power advocates sampled for this study come disproportionately from families where the father's occupational group is one which includes business manager, engineer, insurance agent, and contractor. Six of the ten students having fathers in this occupational
TABLE 8

STUDENT POWER ADVOCACY AND FATHER'S OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Non-Advocate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (doctor, lawyer, teacher, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business manager, insurance salesman, engineer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsman, proprietor, fireman, policeman, skilled worker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, sales worker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled worker (service or domestic)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

group are student power advocates. Only one student power advocate comes from a professional family, although four students coming from professional families are represented in the sample (Table 8). And finally, while slightly more student power advocates come from families of higher than average income, the figures revealed in Table 9 reveal no significant differences.

In summary, student power advocates are somewhat over-represented in the following groups: females, social science or humanities majors, and those having fathers who at least attended college.
TABLE 9

STUDENT POWER ADVOCACY BY FAMILY INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Non-Advocate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 15,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 - 20,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 - 30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Case Studies

Table 10 reveals the break-down of student power advocates by predominant family value-pattern. It is evident that the small sample interviewed is in accord with Hypothesis 1. All four students coming from families with an idealistic family value-pattern expressed a strong commitment to increased student power in university affairs. Eight of the ten coming from a family where the materialistic family value-pattern was emphasized fall into the group that did not favor a substantially increased student voice in university affairs. Eighteen of the sample had families where neither pattern was emphasized; five of the student power advocates were from families where neither value-pattern was emphasized.

In the following pages, brief descriptions are given
TABLE 10

STUDENT POWER ADVOCACY AND PREDOMINANT FAMILY VALUE-PATTERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value-Pattern</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Advocate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealistic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialistic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of those students coming from families with either an idealistic or materialistic family value-pattern, and for each student the relevance of this family value-pattern for an understanding of the student’s demands for student power is considered. A fictitious name has been used for each interviewee to preserve his anonymity.

Case study #1

Sue, a white eighteen-year-old freshman majoring in Spanish, comes from a small town near the university. Her father is an insurance salesman earning about $20,000 per year. When asked about her family’s values, she at first hesitated, saying that there is little unusual. She went on to explain that her parents are “materialistic,” a characteristic which she finds herself reacting against. For her parents, it was and is important that she should marry “into money” and hang around with “good kids” (mean-upper status). Little emphasis was placed, she admitted,
on intellectual values, though her parents did encourage her to attend college. Sue's parents are "staunch Republicans," and though she indicated some identification with the Republican party, she took much care to assert her political "independence" and "moderation."

Though Sue indicated that she favors change in the university, that is "liberalization," she seemed to find little to complain of, and she indicated that she thinks that any needed changes could be resolved peaceably. She has many questions about student demonstrations and demonstrations (radicals and conservatives she finds equally extreme), and she thinks that they are often not constructive in their approach to things. She admitted to finding the younger faculty members she has encountered at the university quite open to new ideas, and her own quest for new ideas seems to find a suitable ally in the university as it is now. The "cosmopolitan" air of the campus she finds a pleasant change from the atmosphere of the small town from which she comes.

This writer finds it difficult, in the case of Sue, to relate family value-pattern and the unwillingness to demand student power. Sue has quite a different approach to things than her parents, and many of her parents' values seem not only to her, but to the interviewer as well, something that she has left behind. Her own search appears to be a philosophical one wherein the intrigues of politi-
cians, campus or otherwise, seem irrelevant. Sue indicated that she is more concerned with the meaning of life than she is with the politics of the university. And her search seems to be self-inspired.

Case study #2

Lynn, a white twenty-two-year-old senior majoring in English, comes from a reverent Catholic family. Her father, a plant manager for a manufacturing corporation, earns about $15,000 a year. Lynn talked most about her mother's influence on her and her two brothers and one sister. According to Lynn, her mother believes she gave her and her siblings a sound moral basis when they were young, and she is confident now in their ability to make their own decisions correctly. Lynn stated that her parents always emphasized the importance of school, the necessity to achieve, and that money was important. Lynn spoke of this very matter-of-factly, with a reserved humor. According to Lynn, she is of a different age than her parents. What was and is so important to her parents--money and security--is taken for granted by Lynn. She understands their values, though; they lived through rough days during the depression, and if she had lived through that age, she admits that she too might hold her parents' values. She gets along fairly well with her parents now, but with four years of college having passed, there is distance between them.
Lynn's attitudes toward student protest over university affairs are mixed. But the whole situation is of much less importance to her than the problems of black people in this country and the problem of the war in Vietnam, issues well covered in the course of the interview. Lynn feels that students should have only a small voice, ideally, in the administration of the university, though she admitted that some changes must be made and is sympathetic to student protests aimed at changing selected aspects of university policy. She claims not to be the political type (partly because she sees woman as being apolitical), and thus an activist stance within the university doesn't particularly appeal to her. She prefers to work quietly and efficiently, and she is now working for a government-sponsored educational program.

Lynn is another for whom the materialistic family value-pattern in which she was raised no longer is as relevant as it once may have been. Her concerns are partly humanitarian, growing somewhat out of a Catholic faith in which she no longer participates. But her humanitarianism doesn't put primacy in the university's role as savior. She does things herself. Again, the writer finds it difficult to relate the materialistic family value-pattern to the student's failure to demand a much increased role for students in university affairs.
Case study #3

Carol, a white twenty-two-year-old senior majoring in sociology, comes from a Catholic and staunchly Republican family. Her father manages a service station, and he earns between $12,000 and $15,000 a year. Her mother, a housewife, has a college degree. Carol stated that her parents tried to transmit a belief in "success—the American way." Patriotism and financial success were important in her family, and she claimed that her brothers and three sisters all still believe in those values. Her parents, she stated, were very strict. Carol attended Catholic schools before she attended college, and this was a way, she claimed, for her parents to limit her contact with "undesirable" people.

But Carol does not believe in "success—the American way," as do her parents. Politically, she is very sympathetic to the Black Panther movement and its leaders. She is militantly anti-war and anti-establishment generally. Her militancy does not leave off at the university. Carol responded "great" to recent student initiatives across the country; it's about time, she claimed, that students grow up and "get the privileges of those who don't go to college." She is also critical of the ties of the American university to the "military-industrial complex." She contends that this is the student's univer-
sity, and since it is students who must put up with teachers, courses, and the like, it's only proper that students have a right and responsibility to participate in university decisions. Carol even stated that violence to property is a legitimate tool in the hands of students who have exhausted the regular channels for change within the university; and she believes that, in the case of student violence in the past, it has been the university's intransigence, rather than student irrationality, which has been the primary culprit. Carol has been a "university" activist in the past, though she is not now active in the movement for student power; "there are too many other things to do."

Carol is reacting strongly against the materialistic family value-pattern. She believes that commitment to the materialism of her parents would cover up the many injustices in American society and obscure the fact that success is not open to all. Her own realization that success is not open to all came after her freshman year, while working at a summer camp for underprivileged Blacks and Whites. She finds that a lot of young people go through the university with a very uncritical attitude; they believe that the "American way" is generalizable, and they use the university as a steppingstone for their own personal gain. They won't go out of their way to change the world. Carol's attitude toward student power
in university affairs seems part and parcel of her rejection of the ways of the so-called "establishment"; the university is unresponsive to the needs of its members, she stated, just as society is unresponsive to underprivileged groups.

Case study #4

Dave, a white twenty-year-old junior majoring in history and planning to attend law school, is the son of an attorney from a nearby large city. His father earns over $30,000 a year. Dave classifies his parents as conservative--religiously, politically, and otherwise--but he understands their conservatism. He points out that they grew up during the depression and World War II when the situation was much more difficult than today. One of the aspects of their conservatism is a value-pattern very similar to the materialistic pattern, as defined for this thesis. Money, education, and security were stressed by his parents, and Dave's father has especially high hopes of Dave attending law school and becoming a lawyer.

Dave classified himself as a "liberal since high school," and in this respect he differs from his parents who are conservative Republicans. His attitudes toward increased student power in the university seem those of the liberal. Students can be wisely placed in some positions, he suggested, but with respect to some decisions,
concerning curriculum, for example, students should have very little or no power. He complains about certain professors who won't let their beliefs be challenged, or who find as their raison d'être the flunking out of students, and it is to these sometimes frequent vices to which, Dave believes, students should direct their attention. His, though, is not the more militant student power ideology which questions the traditional teacher-student relationship, or which sees in the student an equal member of a university community.

Dave prefers to keep quiet now, keep "clean," get his law degree, and then he can do something; and his father breathes a sigh of relief. Like several other students interviewed, Dave is more concerned about exploited minority-group members and exploited draftees than exploited students. And it would be along those lines that any activism in which he might participate would fall. For him, the university, by giving him a degree, will enable him to do something about the state of the world. It is a means to an end, though certainly not an inimportant means. But, on the other hand, Dave's concerns seem not with status or money, but rather with security and the possibility to do a few good turns for others. The university is more of a place of accreditation and reflection than a springboard for social action or for an exercise in democracy.
Case study #5

Judy, a white twenty-one-year-old senior majoring in elementary education, is the daughter of a college-educated insurance agent earning about $20,000 a year. She characterizes her family as primarily "conservative"; it has strong ties to the Presbyterian church, and in the family observance of the law was always stressed. Money was important to all in the family, and it is important to Judy. Stress was also placed on college attendance and on the importance of social status.

Judy's views, political and otherwise, have not changed much since she entered college. Her own political leanings, like those of her parents, are to the Republican party. She is hostile to increased student power in university affairs; in the interview, she contended that students have a right only to "voice opinions, not to participate in university administration." Students haven't the knowledge, experience, or insight of the faculty or administration. Generally she is satisfied with her program of study; she complains only about an occasional foolish course requirement.

There definitely is, here, a continuity between the "materialistic" value-pattern of Judy's parents and of Judy herself. Her own stance, which she openly professes, is in agreement with her parents' emphasis on money and status. And she views the university, as would her parents,
as a means of gaining those two commodities. Her belief in the wisdom of the university organization as it stands is substantially that view voiced by her parents, who are hostile to student protests.

Case study #6

Linda is a twenty-two-year-old white senior, majoring in sociology and English, married, but soon to be divorced. She is a transfer student from an expensive midwest liberal arts college. Linda's father is a contractor and land developer, who earns between $25,000 and $30,000 per year. Linda's parents are divorced, and her mother has remarried. Linda stated that intellectual and humanitarian values were predominant in her family. There were a lot of books in her home, and both her parents read widely. Linda's parents belonged to a Unitarian church, and in that church's youth group, as well as in her parents' religious values, there was a strong liberal, humanitarian bent. Linda gets along with both her parents now and considers herself close to both of them.

Linda calls herself a radical, sympathizing with "black demands," "anti-war demands," and "welfare mothers' demands." She responded "it's about time" when queried about student demands within the university. "It's about time," she stated, "that students realize whose school it is." The object, for her, is to make courses and other
curriculum more relevant to society as it is today. She is skeptical, though, of students being able to act together as a power bloc to achieve such objectives, though she believes that's still the only hope. The urban education program at the university, as she understands it, is in the right kind of direction: education relevant to social problems. Linda would be an activist if circumstances permitted, but "survival is more important" to her now. Despite her major sympathies, Linda is wary of what she terms a "tyranny of student power." A system of checks and balances must operate, she argued, with faculty and students sharing power. Linda's primary concern is with the university's role vis-a-vis the community, with an engaged university.

Linda, self-admittedly, takes very seriously the intellectual and humanitarian values in which she was raised. She takes academic work very seriously, but at the same time she fears lest the university be separated from the problems of people. She still talks highly of her old Unitarian youth group and thinks STP (Serving the People), an activist organization on the university campus, is a step toward the realization of her humanitarian values. She seems one of those for whom taking seriously and living out the values of her parents is an enterprise worthy of her time.
Case study #7

Joan, a white twenty-one-year-old senior majoring in religion, comes from New York state. Her father, an electrical engineer, was a careerist in the service for over twenty years, until his specialty was no longer needed; he now earns between $10,000 and $15,000 per year. Joan takes pride in the intelligence and open-mindedness of her parents. Though her father is much more conservative than she, she stated that he is not the "typical redneck," and she indicated that he is "fairly open." Her mother, a Catholic Democrat who has supported and worked for the Kennedys in state and national politics, is especially intellectually oriented. Joan stated that there were "bookcases in every room of the house," and that the children, of whom there were four, were all encouraged, though not pressured, to read. Though neither of Joan's older sisters has yet completed college, that is not because of a lack of intellectual interests. Joan's mother and father encouraged Joan and her sisters to attend college, though no pressure was applied. Joan considers her parents especially open, intelligent, and tolerant.

Joan is very critical, though, of the university she attends. "Ninety-five percent of its graduates are uneducated," she complained. For the most part, education at the university serves the function of "vocational training," not "critical thinking" as it should, she argued.
While she realizes that the university president "must mediate between state and university," she finds this no excuse for the condition of the educational institution. Though Joan believes that students should share in university authority, she does not believe that that will change the university, not by itself anyway. Her major department has students on all its committees, and too often, she finds, students do not do their homework, remaining uninformed, unorganized, unaware of the issues involved. But such cooperation of students and faculty remains an ideal to be taken seriously. Though a stern opponent of violence and obscenity, she nevertheless believes that peaceful student protests are an avenue to institutional change.

Joan's major department, religion, significantly affects her own beliefs and values. She takes pride in that department, which she considers the best at the university, and the departmental faculty and majors seem to form a closely knit, intellectually oriented group. Joan is committed to the idealistic family value-pattern of her family, and her interest in religious studies and in possible college teaching certainly do not run counter to that family tradition. Her major criticism of the university, its alleged failure to educate its students, would seem to stem from this orientation. Here, again, the investigator finds a notable continuity in values between
parents and student.

Case study #8

Jim, a white nineteen-year-old sophomore, undecided on a major, is the son of a big-city policeman earning between $10,000 and $15,000 per year. Jim feels very close to his family, and he has a special respect for his father, who has had a strong influence on his thinking and action. As might be expected, Jim stated that law and order were strongly emphasized in his family, while the importance of money and a good job were also emphasized.

While Jim did indicate that he thought students should have more power in the university, he stands firmly against any of the "demonstration-type" tactics which students have been using at various universities. He believes that any reforms needed can be achieved through the democratic process. Jim contended that most students do not care about having a stronger voice in the decision-making process of the university, and he indicated that greater power was not one of his major concerns. His main reason for attending college, he stated, was so that he could get a better job than otherwise and also earn more money.

A similarity between the materialistic value-pattern of Jim's family and Jim's own instrumental attitude toward the university seems quite evident. As indicated above, Jim is very close with his parents and perceives no
generation gap within his family. All evidence here points
to generational continuity with the son living out the val-
ues of his parents.

Case study #9

Mary, a white nineteen-year-old sophomore majoring
in sociology and art, is the daughter of a semi-retired
land developer who earns about $30,000 per year. Although
Mary is on fairly good terms with her family, she is quite
independent of her parents at the present time. Mary's
parents are very strict Catholics and emphasized Catholi-
cism and its tenets, but Mary is not a Catholic. Also,
both of Mary's parents read considerably and have a spe-
cial appreciation for literature, which Mary picked up as
a child. Mary still shares books with her parents and
recently "turned them on" to Herman Hesse. Mary's parents
are not concerned with politics, and politics and religion
have become two touchy issues between Mary and her mother
and father.

Mary stated that students should have a much greater
involvement in university decision-making than they cur-
rently have, and she feels that established democratic
means for student initiative are inadequate and not useful.
While she can sympathize with those who resort to violence,
she resolutely prefers non-violent demonstrations. Mary's
major interests are aesthetic in nature, and she takes
education very seriously (her parents also emphasized the intrinsic importance of a good college education). But she admitted being disappointed a little by her education at the university.

While the characteristics of Mary's family, in general, do not fit the model described by the early Flacks and by Keniston (Catholic families with no political interests are unlikely to breed radicals), the indications are that Mary shares with her parents the idealistic value-pattern, represented in this case by the intellectual orientation of Mary's parents and by Mary's self-professed interest in art and in the intellect. The salience of Hesse's work to her is indicative of that orientation. Thus, between Mary and her parents, the investigator finds both a noticeable continuity and, with respect to politics and religion, an equally noticeable discontinuity in values.

Case study #10

Jean is a white nineteen-year-old sophomore majoring in special education. Her father, a high school graduate now self-employed as a soapmaker, earns between $15,000 and $20,000 per year. Both of Jean's parents are of the Catholic faith, and religion was of much importance in the family. Jean's parents also emphasized the importance of money and of finding and holding a good job. Jean
characterizes her parents' political views as "middle of the road," and she admitted that she doesn't discuss politics with them because, in her words, "they don't understand."

Jean feels that students in the university should have "at least as much power as teachers and administrators." She prefers that this be achieved without the use of demonstrations, though non-violent demonstrations are legitimate as a last resort. Jean reacts strongly against any use of violence. Despite her major in special education, Jean's major interest in the university is personal and philosophical. She admitted that she believes that she can find out "who she is" through a college education. She later stated, "I wasn't interested in politics until I came here, and I guess I'm just trying to find out what I believe in and what I don't." Her biggest commitment in life she hopes to make to the "people of the world." She is now an active member of STP (Serving the People).

Jean shares her parents' Catholicism and seems to get along well with them, so long as politics is forgotten. But, as is noted above, while Jean's family value-pattern is materialistic, Jean herself does not seem to share those values, and she is a fairly strong advocate of increased student power in university affairs. Here is a student power advocate coming from a family with a materialistic value-pattern, yet with apparently little
accompanying overt generational strife. Jean freely admitted, though, that she has undergone very significant changes in values since she came to college.

**Case study #11**

Diane is a white twenty-one-year-old junior majoring in art and psychology. Both her mother and father have master's degrees; her father works as an experimental engineer and her mother as a professional dietician. Diane has four sisters and one brother, and the family income is estimated at about $15,000 per year. Diane stated that there was a great deal of "surveillance" of her when she was a child and that her parents were, and remain, devout Methodists. Diane's parents are conservative Republicans, but politics was not stressed as much as religion and the value of art, music, and literature. While Diane describes her relationship with her parents as "not great, but okay," she especially avoids talking with them about political issues and drug use. And her parents have frowned on her participation in peace demonstrations.

Diane believes that students should share power equally with faculty and administrators. Though she would prefer that students work through the democratic process to achieve these goals, she suggested that students use strikes and demonstrations if the democratic channels are
closed. Diane is not opposed to student violence, as long as it is only a last resort. Diane still has an interest in the "artistic side of life," but since entering college, her interest in politics, and her distrust of politicians, have been magnified. At the present time, she is unsure of what she would like to do later in life and now is more concerned with her education.

Diane's case might seem anomalous. Having parents who are conservative Republicans, she describes herself now as "almost a revolutionary," which, in an era of radical rhetoric, indicates, if nothing else, that she is ideologically far removed from her parents' political stance. Coming from a strict family, she now believes that "children should be treated as adults as soon as they are born." Yet Diane shares her parents' affinity for art, music, and literature and is still able to communicate with them.

While Diane's parents did emphasize the idealistic family value-pattern, as it has been defined for this thesis, in other respects her parents are unlike those of the "young radicals" that Keston and the early Flacks described in their works. Those parents are likely to have no religious preference, or a very liberal one (e.g., Unitarian), and be liberal Democrats. Likewise, the constellation of values is likely to include humanitarian values, which were apparently not salient in Diane's family. Thus, while the idealistic family value-pattern is present in Diane's
family, it coexists with other values which might dampen its possible "radical" impact. But Diane has still become a student power advocate, something she attributes largely to the political influence of her college friends; she admitted to being politically conservative before she entered college. Perhaps the idealistic family value-pattern in Diane's family made it likely that she would associate in those college circles where left-radical values were emphasized.

Case study #12

Ed, a white nineteen-year-old sophomore, undecided in major, is from a small rural Michigan community. His father, who did not finish high school, works as a foreman in a factory; his mother attended college for two years. The family income is between $15,000 and $20,000 per year. Ed stated that his parents' religion, Catholicism, was the most salient issue in his family; Ed still practices the Catholic faith. His parents also emphasized the importance of going to college "so I could get a good job." Ed stated that both of his parents are "establishment-oriented," but his mother is to a lesser extent. He cannot now communicate with his father, but he can talk with his mother. Both parents are Republicans, though not vigorously so.

Although Ed indicated that students should have much more power than they now have, in general he seems to be
content with the educational process as it now is and thus, for the purposes of this thesis, he cannot be considered a student power advocate. Ed believes that students should work through the democratic process, using non-violent demonstrations as a last resort. He indicated that, though he had participated in demonstrations in the past, he preferred not to get involved in such activities and in university affairs generally. Ed's wider political views are, self-professedly, "in a state of transition," and though he thinks that he is becoming "more liberal," he's not certain where he stands on major political issues.

Ed is one of those who finds that in college he must come to terms with much that did not challenge him before. Ed himself stated, "They [other students] challenge a lot of ideas that I never thought about before." It seems that Ed, at present, is trying to make sense of communism ("the more I read about communists, the more I'm tolerant of them") and revolutionaries (he sympathizes with their goals but not their tactics). Ed indicated that he had not given much thought to the question of the nature of the university. It seems that he is more concerned with keeping his head above water in the university than he is in using the university as a means to vocational advancement. But most important is what Ed might be thinking and doing in a year or two, when he has had more time to come to terms with the old and the new. At that time, compar-
isons of Ed's values with those of his parents might be an important task.

Case study #13

Bill is a white nineteen-year-old sophomore, undecided in major by leaning toward marketing. Bill comes from a very small town in Michigan, and his father, a high school graduate, works for the railroad and earns about $13,000 per year. Bill gets along well with his parents and other adults. He stated, "I always try to fit in and not cause any trouble." His parents, he indicated, are "very conservative," and he claimed that his own views were about the same as his parents. Neither politics nor religion was particularly important in Bill's family. On the other hand, Bill stated that both financial security and the importance of education were stressed.

Though Bill believes that students should "probably" have more voice in university policy, he is very much against any demonstration-type tactics. The university, he stated, is a "place where students should get an education, not protest." Bill indicated that he doesn't get along well with anyone he has met at the university, and he has few friends at the university. He's beginning to feel that he doesn't know himself any more, and he would like to leave college so that he can straighten himself out. "College hasn't done anything except upset me," he
Apparentlly Bill has found that the values in which he was raised don't fit in particularly well at the university. His political conservatism leaves him outside the "youth culture," he indicated, and he has difficulty understanding other students. In the interview, a definite continuity between Bill's values (including materialism) and those of his parents became apparent. And it is those values which, Bill thinks, few others at the university espouse. In the case of Bill, this continuity seems to be breeding a certain apathy and alienation.

Case study #14

Bob is a nineteen-year-old sophomore majoring in engineering. His father quit school in the eighth grade and works as an inspector for a large corporation. His mother did not finish high school and works as a cook in a cafeteria. Their combined income is between $10,000 and $15,000 per year. Bob comes from a very closely knit family, and he stated that he has an excellent relationship with his parents. He freely communicates with them, and he perceives "no generation gap whatever." Bob's parents are conservative Republicans and devout in the Catholic faith. Though politics was not important in the family, religion was, and Bob still professes the Catholic faith. The most salient value in Bob's family was the importance
of the family, and Bob feels that he can always fall back on his family if he needs help. Finally, his parents emphasized, though not as strongly as religion and the family, the importance of getting a college education as a means of assuring himself of a good job.

Bob feels that students should have little say in university policy and that the faculty and administration should have almost complete control of the university. He stated, "Students are here to get an education, not to demonstrate." He is strongly against any type of demonstrations, especially violent ones. Bob's own view of the university is basically instrumental.

Little more need be said about the continuity between Bob's values and those of his parents. But most important, it appears to the investigator, is the whole complex of values which Bob took up from his parents. The materialistic value-pattern is only one aspect of a broader conservative value cluster in Bob's family to which Bob remains loyal.

Secondary Case Studies

The following are case studies of those five student power advocates not included in the above analysis and of two students who have not been classified as student power advocates. An attempt here is made to relate other family value-patterns and relevant other factors to advocacy of
student power in university affairs. While similarities are present here, uniformities are not. The significance of these findings will be discussed in the concluding section of this chapter.

Case study #15

Barb is a white nineteen-year-old freshman, engaged to a Vietnam veteran and majoring in art. Her father is the owner and president of a small corporation, and he earns between $20,000 and $25,000 per year. Barb's parents are staunch Republicans and enthusiasts of nature; a love and respect for nature was one value that Barb's parents greatly emphasized. Barb has one older brother and two older sisters, and only one of those is a Republican. But Barb sees no generation gap between herself or her siblings and her parents despite sometimes vociferous political disagreements. She finds her parents quite cosmopolitan (they have travelled a lot, especially in the last few years), and they are much more open than other adults she knows. Barb's parents were not strict; the mother understood and took care of the children, while the father had primary say on other matters. Barb's brother is very radical (she calls him a Weatherman), and his radicalism has affected the family.

Barb is strongly favorable to student power demands within the university. She believes that the young should
have a sizeable say on college policy, and she hopes that
that might carry over into participation by the young out-
side the university. Like most, Barb is opposed to vio-
 lent tactics by students, though she approves of the sit-in.
She finds that the younger faculty she has taken courses
from are quite open to change and are genuinely concerned
about the system's failure to educate students. Many
faculty, she believes, would not line up with the adminis-
tration were there to be a showdown.

Barb was politically knowledgeable in high school,
especially with the political arguments between her father
and older brother. At the time of the Kent State incident,
she was very dismayed, and the people she associated with
in high school were similarly inclined. Barb's criticism
of the university she explicitly tied to her own (and her
future husband's) disgruntlement with a lot of things
(including pollution, the war, and political repression).
And she has a special respect and affection for her "Weath-
erman" brother. Though perhaps few of the values of Barb's
parents are held by Barb herself, the broader family sit-
uation is of much relevance to her political attitudes.

Case study #16

Carl is a white twenty-one-year-old of senior status,
a speech major, who has just dropped out of school. Carl's
father has a master's degree in chemistry and works as a
chemist at a local corporation. His father earns an estimated $12,000 to $15,000 per year. Carl characterized his parents as middle-class, "politically moderate to liberal, with faith in the political and economic system." Foremost for Carl's parents is that he and his siblings share in the fruits of that society. Carl sees his parents, especially his mother, as being very protective, and he views himself as reacting against that protectiveness. He also sees his mother as having given him little chance to be responsible; if something that needed to be done wasn't done by him, it was done for him.

Carl was a political conservative and a Vietnam hawk in high school; he saw himself as an "administration" spokesman. Carl sees his own conversion away from that position, and from "faith in the American political and economic system," coming about as a result of his immersion in the literature about the Vietnam war after he came to college; this reading became an introduction to what he calls "the cold facts and statistics" of Vietnam, as well as of the race situation and capitalism in the United States. Carl was a debater at that time when there was a debate team at the university, and this, he stated, gave him the opportunity and encouragement to "get the facts straight." Thus, in college, he underwent "a cultural awakening," a rejection of the cultural values of America, an awakening strengthened by his relationships with "counter-
culture" people. It is within this over-all context, he argued, that his views on the university should be understood. For him, faculty should share power equally with students in a college or university community; administrators are irrelevant to the decision-making process. The university is now an institution of training; it needs to be converted back into an institution of education. The military, for example, has no place on campus if that principle is seriously adhered to. Carl considers himself an activist.

Carl reacts strongly against "middle America" and the silent majority of which he sees his parents as representative. He is "alienated" from the values of the older generation, but he is an activist by choice. The description that Carl gives of his family seems, to this investigator, to resemble significantly the typical family of Keniston's non-activist, uncommitted student. The mother is overly protective, and the father is seen as "selling out" to the system. Yet, quite clearly, Carl is not uncommitted; the moderation of the uncommitted, Carl might argue, is too much like the acquiescence of the silent majority. Carl's case lends credence to those who believe that radicalism is most pronounced in those students vigorously reacting against the older generation.
Case study #17

George is a white twenty-year-old sophomore with a major in psychology. Both his mother and father attended college, though neither is a college graduate. George's father is now an insurance salesman, earning between $20,000 and $25,000 per year. George claims that he was always allowed to make his own decisions and that he has only depended on his family for material things; he seldom discussed or now discusses things with his parents. Although his parents are of the Unitarian faith, they only mildly emphasized religion, and George claims no religious affiliation. George's parents did have very high educational aspirations for him, though he stated that his parents were never really interested in what he thought, only how well he did. They offered him money to do well in school. Politically, George's father is very liberal, and his mother is "middle-of-the-road."

George feels that teachers and administrators should have more of a passive role in the decision-making process of the university. And he thinks that students working through the democratic process are "too little, too late." He favors confrontation politics, as long as it is not violent. At the present time, George has difficulty taking the university seriously, and he is considering quitting school. For him, the university as it exists now is too
structured and doesn't allow him sufficient freedom. He believes now that one can get a good education without going through the university. George indicated that he has participated in political demonstrations in the past.

George seems ambivalent toward politics. While he presently considers himself apolitical, he does feel "a strong obligation to do something for society." While he has been very much interested in student-initiated university reform in the near past, he now seems on the verge of dropping out, and the rock and drug cultures draw most of his interests. He seems to be verging toward the uncommitted. Perhaps the case of George lends some justification to the claims that the confusion of youth is a reflection of the over-permissiveness and absence of love in the American family.

Case study #18

Ann is a white nineteen-year-old sophomore majoring in English. Her father, now deceased, was a physical education teacher in a public school. Her mother is now a secretary. Ann is from a very close Irish-Catholic family. "Roll with the punch" is the phrase which came to her mind when she was asked about what was emphasized in her family. She and her two older brothers were encouraged to do as well as they could and that was all that was expected of them. The family was not at all loathe to help out its
other members in times of difficulty. Ann's family has a very strong ethnic identification, and this leads them to support, generally, the Democratic party. The family is very open to political and other discussions.

Ann is sympathetic to activism generally (she is an Irish "fighter"), but she has found that activists at the university don't have their "stuff together," and this has dulled her enthusiasm. Students, she believes, should be on university committees, and their participation in faculty evaluation is especially needed. She is opposed to violence, but favors the use of boycotts and sit-ins; she participated in one last year. She indicated that students' participation is one way to get things done at the university, and she firmly believes that much needs to be done. Over-all, one finds her activist stance as much practical as ideological.

Ann finds that she has become more tolerant as a result of the college experience; she used to be pretty set in her ways, but she has learned to listen to others. But she insisted that one must "to thine own self be true," and she indicated that that motto was and remains the guiding spirit of her fight against discrimination against women and her struggle for other causes to which she gives her time and sympathy. Perhaps, here, what may best be called an ethnic radicalism has intruded on the calm of the campus.
Case study #19

Chuck is a white nineteen-year-old freshman, planning to major in political science. His father is a computer programmer and his mother a distributor for a large corporation; both attended, but did not finish, college. Chuck estimates his family income to be between $15,000 and $20,000 per year. Chuck claims that he was and is completely independent of his family and has always made his own decisions. His parents, he stated, are conservative Democrats and are against "all" of his values. Chuck stated, "They feel that many of the things I do are deviant." While Chuck perceives a sizeable generation gap within his family, he claims that they do try to listen to him, and he can talk with them. According to Chuck, both the virtue of honesty and the political views of his parents were strongly emphasized in his family.

Chuck believes that students should have a much bigger voice in university policy. Since he does not believe that working through democratic channels will bring results, he suggests, "To get things done, I would resort to violence." In general, Chuck seems interested in education for its intellectual, rather than its pragmatic, worth. He appears quite disillusioned with the entire educational process.

Chuck has been involved in radical causes since high school. He talks of being beaten during the Chicago riots
in 1968, when he became an advocate of "effective violence." Now he states that the "only way to change things is through a revolution," preferably every ten years. Chuck is one of those minority who show significant independence, ideological and otherwise, from their parents early in high school. Given that fact, it may not at all be surprising that he has become an advocate of increased power for the student in university affairs.

Case study #20

June is a white twenty-year-old junior majoring in elementary education, creative arts, and English. Her father is a machinist-engineer who has completed some training school, while her mother is a housewife with a high school education. Family income is estimated at between $10,000 and $15,000. June is very close with her parents, though she recognizes a generation gap of sorts between herself and them, with differences primarily in morals and religion. But June talks glowingly of her parents' tolerance; personal decisions were always her own. She was never "grounded" in high school, and her parents, though very devout religiously, did not impose their religion on her. Likewise, the decision to attend college was her own. June still talks with her parents once a week, though she returns home only infrequently. She feels that her parents really care about her and have
given her the love and acceptance that many of today's young lack. She feels free to talk with her parents about everything. Politically, June's parents, who live in a conservative small town in northern Michigan, are Republicans.

While, with respect to elementary education, June is an educational radical ("schools stifle creativity"), this radicalism is not evident when she talks about political radicalism or student demands for power. While sympathetic to today's rebelling students, she does not identify with them, and she is angered by their irrationality. For example, she does believe that students should have some voice in the matter of faculty retention and dismissal ("after all, students have to put up with them"), but primary responsibility for hiring and retaining faculty should be with the faculty itself. She stands firmly against any violence and is opposed to what she considers the destructiveness of many of the protests. She seems to have had enough of the radical "fad." "They cut down this, they cut down that, why can't they leave things alone for a moment?" Generally, she is satisfied with her own university education and finds few basic changes in structure required (only the dismissal of some "old fogies" in her major department). Politically, she preaches moderation, respects President Nixon, and hopes that he's reelected.

June does see a generation gap between herself and
her parents as was mentioned earlier, but only with respect to religion and sexual morality. In terms of style, though, she is substantially in accord with her parents. No generational hostility is present here. Instead, there exists a respect for and acceptance of others, the tolerance which seems to be one of the few values whose importance was genuinely stressed in June's family. June seems to be one of those for whom a concern for others does not become transformed into radical politics. Perhaps the calm which she practices and preaches is out of place in the milieu of radical politics. June's own statements about others, as well as her own example, give some justification to those who would claim that personal hostility and parental apathy are at the roots of student protest.

Case study #21

Alan is a white nineteen-year-old freshman, majoring in mathematics. His father is an electrician and his mother a secretary, and both have high school educations. Family income is between $15,000 and $20,000 per year. Alan's parents are very religious, though "not fanatical." Their religious orientation is a fundamentalism of the Baptist variety. Alan himself talks of closeness to the Bible and to Christ, and he is very close with his parents, with whom he shares many attitudes. Politically, Alan's parents are basically liberal, opposed to the Vietnam war.
and racial discrimination, and with working-class leanings toward the Democratic party. Alan does not think his parents were particularly protective of him or of his three siblings, all younger. He has had little pressure to succeed, and he now talks of his relationship with his parents as of equal to equal. Alan comes from a college town, and his high school subculture was heavily influenced by the university, which is known to have a liberal influence. And he enjoyed that influence.

Alan does sympathize with some of the political demands of students, especially with the demands of black students, but he's firmly committed to non-violence. Peaceful picketing and negotiation he believes can be helpful in achieving such power. Alan also sides with students on the general issue of student self-control of private life, complaining especially about the paternalism of dormitory policies and the like. But he is not especially concerned about any fundamental changes in the nature of university governance, insisting only on what might be called "liberalization" of the university. Alan is politically liberal, as well, and sympathetic to the Kennedy tradition. He is especially opposed to the war in Vietnam and is very concerned with the problems of minority groups in America.

Alan is a calm and serious fellow, obviously very reflective. His values are those of his parents, religiously and politically. Like them, he is more angered by
the status of Blacks in this country and by the war that continues than by university-centered issues. His is a religious-centered "idealism," not the sort defined as idealism for this thesis, but an idealism committed to living the ideals of Jesus Christ. Alan does so tolerantly, however, and he is not the proselytizing type. As is evident, value-continuity is obviously the case here.

Further Analysis and Summary of Findings

In the foregoing twenty-one case studies, family value-patterns, especially those termed materialistic and idealistic, have been examined with relation to student advocacy of student power. As should be evident from a perusal of these brief summaries, no single theme stands out in the families of all student power advocates, nor in the families of those students who are not student power advocates. The use of analytic induction to find commonalities in the families of student power advocates would seem to lead nowhere. Some student power advocates are from idealistic families, others from materialistic families; some come from religious families, others from secular families; some come from families best described as authoritarian, while others come from families that are more permissive and non-authoritarian. And while all four students from idealistic families are student power advocates, the investigator has already commented that
even these findings are somewhat ambiguous, especially as support for the primary hypotheses set out in Chapter I. In the pages that follow, the findings presented in the case studies are further analyzed in the hopes of gaining additional insights about the relationship between family value-patterns and student power advocacy; both the major hypotheses of this study and other hypotheses suggested in the review of literature are examined in light of these case studies. This analysis is in the main limited to an examination of the relationship between family value-patterns and student power advocacy; though other possible salient factors relevant to the understanding of student power advocacy will be briefly discussed in this chapter, more attention is given to other factors in the concluding chapter.

As has been noted, it is true that in this small sample idealistic families were more likely to spawn student power advocates than materialistic families. Thus, the data obtained do conform to expectations based upon Hypothesis 1. But the purpose of these case studies has been to look beneath the superficial statistical correlations, based upon such a limited sample, for the underlying significance of these findings. Thus, the case studies as written up are addressed to such questions as: Is it true, as is implied in Hypothesis 2, that student power advocates from idealistic families are living out
the values of their parents? Is generational continuity, rather than discontinuity, the rule among these student power advocates, as it was for the "typical" radical in the early theory of Flacks? And by asking these questions, it is hoped that the more significant question for sociological theory might also be addressed: Is a particular family value-pattern, antithetical to the values of the multiversity, the primary force for social change in higher education, by virtue of the fact that radical youth take up this value-pattern from their parents? A careful analysis of the findings in these case studies reveals that such a clearcut understanding does not do justice to the ambivalent relationships between students from idealistic families and their parents. Also, it is to be noted that only four of the eleven student power advocates are from idealistic families; and these are by no means the most militant of the student power advocates, those whose demands are most likely to change the academic system. Thus, the data presented do not support Hypothesis 3.

A review of the case studies of those students from families with idealistic family value-patterns will highlight some of the ways in which the families and the parent-student relationships differ from those expectations based on the theory of the early Flacks. In the first place, Flacks points to families which embrace a cluster of "liberal" values as those from which student radicals
are likely to come. The idealistic families described in the four case studies do not embrace this cluster of "liberal" values, with one—or possibly two—exceptions. For example, the families described by Flacks were both secular and politically liberal. But the heads of two of the families, those of Mary (CS #9) and Diane (CS #11), are devoutly religious; Mary’s parents are Catholic and Diane’s parents Methodist. Nor are Mary’s and Diane’s parents politically liberal; Diane’s parents are conservative Republicans, while Mary’s are politically unconcerned and opposed to Mary’s more radical political stance. In neither of these two cases are the parents particularly pleased with the radical proclivities of their offspring. The parents of the radicals that Flacks describes both praise and encourage the activist zeal of their children. Also, it might again be noted that Diane’s parents were quite strict in their upbringing of Diane, and her family’s child-rearing practices seem a far cry from the egalitarian, democratic, and non-punitive atmosphere which Flacks found in the families of radical students. Thus, while the fathers of both Mary and Diane are of high occupational status and of high income and while Diane’s father and mother are highly educated, in other respects these families deviate significantly from the ideal type presented by the early Flacks. The emphasis on art, literature, and/or the intellect in these
families is not an accurate indicator of other family value-patterns in these two cases.

The families of Linda (CS #6) and Joan (CS #7) correspond more closely to the ideal typical family described by the early Flacks. Linda's parents, now divorced, are of a liberal, action-oriented religious bent, and they emphasized both liberal and humanitarian values over material success. Both her parents are highly educated, and her father is financially well off, now earning between $25,000 and $30,000 a year. But Linda, it must be noted, transferred to the university from a small liberal arts college only because of her husband's obligations and thus is somewhat atypical of the students at the non-elite university.

Joan's parents are not typical in terms of objective status characteristics. Family income is only moderate, and Joan's father was a careerist in the service for over twenty years. Also, Joan's mother is a very devout Catholic. But these objective status characteristics belie the family values in Joan's home. All the children in the family were encouraged, though not forced, to read, indicating both an emphasis on intellectual values and an aversion to parental authoritarianism. Joan's mother is a liberal Democrat, who has been involved in substantial political activity and who reads considerably. Surprisingly, she has only a high school education. In this
case, then, the values that Flacks singles out as important are present, but without the objective family status, which is often the basis for such values.

But while the idealistic families of the aforementioned students are not homogeneous, the political values of the offspring of such families are much more homogeneous than are those of the students coming from families emphasizing a materialistic value-pattern. Four of the ten students from materialistic families are, on the one hand, resolutely hostile to student power demands. Thus, Judy (CS #5), Jim (CS #8), Bill (CS #13), and Bob (CS #14) think it illegitimate that the university, a place for education, be converted into a forum for protest. All four seem to share more values in common with their families than with their peers in the so-called youth culture. It should be noted, too, that the parents of each of these four students are conservative politically. Two of the fathers, in fact, occupy salient "establishment" roles; Judy's father is the head of a local draft board, and Jim's father is a policeman. It should not be surprising that those students most hostile to demands for student power come from materialistic and politically conservative families, rather than from those emphasizing idealistic and/or politically liberal values. These four students, hostile to student power, want more of a share of the system's wealth and status, rather than basic
changes in the system itself; turmoil in the university is only an obstacle to their quests.

But these four do not exhaust the category of students from families emphasizing the materialistic family value-pattern. A type representing the other extreme is Carol (CS #3), who comes from a Catholic, "very patriotic," and materialistic family. Carol's brothers and sisters, if one can believe her description, are ideologically similar to the four students described immediately above, but she has broken away from that ideological "strangle hold" of what she disparagingly calls the "American way." She is one of the most, if not the most, radical of the students interviewed, both with respect to politics generally and with respect to the demand for student power. Her "awakening," occurring at college, resulted in rebellion against family and ultimately in a temporary ostracism from the home of her parents. The family values, which Carol finds prevalent in society as well, have become the focus of her rebellion. In this case, Carol's closeness and familiarity with her parents' values, coupled with her realization of the realities they veiled, may have given Carol's radicalism an even stronger thrust. Political and cultural conflict became a very personal struggle between Carol and her parents, which makes her own decisions that much more momentous.

The rebellion of Jean (CS #10) against family is
less pronounced, though she shares Carol's radical proclivities. An active member of the group STP and committed to serving "the people of the world," she has come a long way from her high school apoliticism. Though Jean does not share her parents "middle-of-the-road" political views (resulting in a moratorium on political discussion when she is at home) or her parents' belief in the high importance of money and in finding a secure job (preferring, instead, a commitment to humanitarianism and a search for self-understanding), it is interesting to note that she does very sincerely share her parents' Catholicism, and in other respects she and her parents get along amicably. Thus, radical political commitments need not lead to family schism, and, in this case, that Jean shares her parents' Catholicism may be significant in moderating what gap may exist between parent and student and values.

Of the remaining student power advocates (CS #15 through CS #19), Barb (CS #15) and Chuck (CS #19) are the only two of the student power advocates whose radical "roots" have definite moorings in high school or earlier. Their cases reveal not so much political socialization within the family as the influence of other factors in the development of student radicalism. It is significant that both of these students are only freshmen, and they may herald a future change in the source of student radicalism, as the so-called youth culture gravitates down to the
high school level and lower. Perhaps the most salient factor for Barb is her older brother, who for several years has been a hard-core radical. Barb looks up to him, and undoubtedly her familiarity with him and his acquaintances substantially speeded her political awareness of selected aspects of American governmental policy. Barb also talks of her high school circle of friends who were similarly inclined against the Vietnam war and other governmental policies. Chuck also seems to have developed his stance independently of his parents, who, he claims, think him "deviant" and who are against "all" of his values. As a high school student, Chuck became involved in the Chicago convention demonstrations in 1968, and that event became critical for him, accelerating a turn to the left which put forward "effective violence" to encounter what he called "the violence of the Establishment."

Friends, both high school and college, and the political literature that Chuck has read have been, in Chuck's own mind, most important in his political development.

While, as is indicated above, the organization of the findings of this research according to materialistic and idealistic family value-patterns proved both feasible and somewhat helpful, the same could not be said with respect to data gathered on two other possibly salient family variables for which information was sought: child-rearing practices and the extent of the generation gap.
between student and parent. For the most part, it turned out to be extremely difficult to grade child-rearing practices on an authoritarianism-permissiveness continuum. Most of the interviewees indicated that their parents were substantially permissive, though there were several who characterized their parents as more strict or authoritarian. However, the comparability of similar responses seemed problematic. Thus, Carol (CS #3) and Diane (CS #10), two of the student power advocates in substantial disagreement with their parents' values, gave responses which, on face value, would indicate that their parents were as authoritarian as any of the parents of the students interviewed. On the other hand, such harsh responses were not forthcoming from the less radical students. It is likely that the evaluation of their upbringing and the facts about their upbringing became confused in the students' descriptions, and that the comparability of similar responses would prove misleading. Ideally, data with respect to child-rearing practices would have been gathered from parents and students alike, and then the parental data would have provided an excellent check upon those student responses. These parental data might also have brought in some clearcut distinctions which were missing from the often vague and ambiguous responses of students. However, from the responses that were received, however inadequate, student power advocates came from families on all points of the continuum.
Data with respect to generation gaps within the family were equally difficult to evaluate. Perhaps most troublesome was finding some one single meaning of the term "generation gap" to which all of the students would relate. Unfortunately, the answers and explanations of the interviewees revealed that they understood quite differently similarly phrased questions. On the one hand, some thought of the generation gap as indicative of interpersonal compatibility within the family and responded accordingly. Others talked of the generation gap as indicative of major differences in values between themselves and their parents and responded with that in mind. As is indicated by and in the case studies, most of the student power advocates, even some from idealistic families, found significant value cleavages between themselves and their parents, and they saw a generation gap of values, especially with respect to political values, oftentimes with respect to sexual morality, and sometimes with respect to religious belief. But significant value differences are not limited to the relationships in the families of student power advocates. As is indicated in the case studies, several of the students from materialistic families who are not classified as student power advocates find their values significantly different from those of their parents. On the other hand, several of the students hostile to student power advocacy indicated both implicitly
and in explicit responses an ideological kinship with their parents. Generally speaking, however, the student power advocates indicated a wider breach between their own and their parents' political values than did those not classified as student power advocates; and this would seem to indicate that these student power advocates are not merely living out the political values of their parents. Students like Carol, Chuck, Barb, Diane, Mary, Jean, Carl, and George have far different visions of an ideal political future than do their parents, and their advocacy of student power, as one manifestation of these visions, seems not to be the result of a political socialization within the family which opposes the values prevailing in the occupational and educational realms of society.

Finally, the factor of family religion must be mentioned. The early studies of Flacks and those whom he draws upon indicate that the families of student radicals are secular or, if they do have formal religious membership, they are Unitarian, Reformed Jewish, or Quaker. The case studies herein summarized do not corroborate those earlier findings. Earlier it was pointed out that two of the four idealist families were also Catholic families, a third was Methodist, and a fourth, more as expected, Unitarian. And while only one of the four continues in the same religion as her parents, a more indirect influence of the religiosity of these families may be present. For
example, Joan's mother, a Catholic, found her religious aspirations confirmed in the liberal politics of the Kennedys for whom she did political work. Joan, who looks up very much to her mother, was similarly liberal politically in high school and oriented to the politics of the Kennedys. The cases of Mary and Diane are somewhat more problematic, though perhaps not less important. It will be recalled that the parents of both were devoutly religious, though were not politically liberal. On the other hand, both Mary and Diane have forsaken the organized religion of their parents and have become politically liberal, if not radical. One might postulate, in these cases, though any verification would be difficult if not impossible, the transformation of the "religious idealism" of the family to the secular idealism of the maturing student. Though Diane's and Mary's early religious commitments were not explored, what may well have been sincere religious commitments when they were young became secular, activistic commitments with the added impact of the college experience. As the interviewers did not probe into changes in religious belief or disbelief, at this point such a claim can be only speculative, but the claim may merit further investigation.

The testimony of others might lend credence to a theoretical development in this direction. Lynn (CS #2), who is not a student power advocate, is another girl from a
Catholic family who has forsaken the organized religion of her parents, though she has taken on no new formal religious commitment. But she does trace her own humanitarian concerns, expressed primarily with respect to the race issue and the war in Vietnam, to the Catholic faith in which she no longer participates. In the past she found the political idealism of the Kennedys a natural concomitant of a firm commitment to the Catholic Church. But she does not now see the church fulfilling that liberal or radical commitment. There is also the case of Jean (CS #10), who comes from a family emphasizing both materialistic values and the importance of the Catholic faith. Jean, it will be recalled, no longer accepts the materialism of her parents, but she remains a practicing Catholic. That religious commitment on her part may not be unimportant. And, finally, there is the case of Alan (CS #21), who shares with his parents a firm commitment to a Baptist fundamentalist belief. Both the status of Blacks in this country and the continuation of the war in Vietnam he and his parents find antithetical to the teachings of the Bible, and Alan talked of this political commitment demanded if one is to live the ideals of Jesus Christ. All these cases point to an importance of a religious upbringing as a possible springboard to a political liberalism or even radicalism, which may or may not include the advocacy of student power.
Yet, on the other hand, formal religious membership does not have this same radicalizing effect in other cases. Students from religious families are also well represented among those students with more conventional political attitudes. While some of these students do not share the religious beliefs of their parents, others—like Bob (CS #14)—do, and the investigator does not wish to neglect those for whom formal religious membership or religious belief and a non-liberal or non-radical political stance are part of a common belief system. But still the findings with respect to religious belief and political commitment do suggest the possibility that religious commitments of youth and political commitments are not necessarily at cross-purposes; and they may indicate that some of the secular idealism attributed to young student radicals may have its roots in an earlier religious idealism.

In conclusion, then, the results of this exploratory study, with respect to the importance of factors in the family, are seemingly ambiguous and not at all clear cut. Thus, the data assembled here do not suggest that radical students are merely living out the political values of their parents, as the original hypothesis of value continuity would suggest. Conflict with respect to political values is especially salient in the families of student power advocates. While students from idealistic families were all student power advocates, the exact nature of the
value-patterns in these families did not necessarily con-
form to those in the model of the early Flacks. And seven
of the student power advocates did not come from idealis-
tic families. Finally, contrary to expectations based
upon the studies of the early Flacks, religion was a sali-
ent factor in many of the families of radical students and
continues to be a personal factor for some students. Thus,
the findings by early investigators about student radicals
at elite colleges differ considerably from the findings of
this investigator, examining students at a non-elite uni-
versity.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Further Comments on the Findings

The analysis of the findings in Chapter III, based solely upon the influence of family value-patterns on student power advocacy, has not been found to serve as an entirely useful explanation of student power advocacy. Thus, while all four of the students from idealistic families have been classified as student power advocates, there are significant value divergences between two of these students and their parents. Also, seven of the eleven student power advocates do not come from idealistic families. In other words, the hypotheses suggested by the early writings of Flacks have not proved to be very descriptive of students who espouse greater power for themselves in their student roles. Further research to test the early hypotheses of Flacks would probably not be profitable if the findings in Chapter III are to be heeded. Thus, further theoretical development is needed.

However, as is indicated in the review of literature, even Flacks himself has seen the need for a theoretical updating. In a recent article with Mankoff, "The Changing Social Base of the American Student Movement," Flacks points to the increasingly middle-class character of the student
movement, making it much more representative of the college student body as a whole than in the movement's early days when its composition was more of elite origins. The student movement, he contends, has begun to take on some of the characteristics of a traditional class and has become a self-perpetuating group. In the study of the student movement on a non-elite campus, as exemplified by this study, where a lesser percentage of the student body is presumably of the elite origin suggested in Flacks' earlier works, the line of thinking suggested by the later writings of Flacks might be very appropriate. That the student movement would even spread to non-elite campuses indicates a widening of the base of the student movement and suggests the need for new theoretical formulations to accommodate this change. Hopefully, some modest contributions are made in the following.

An examination of the case studies in Chapter III indicates one salient factor left relatively undiscussed up to this point: the advocacy of student power and the political leftism which generally accompanies it are late-blooming stances taken by the student power advocates interviewed for this thesis. For the most part, these students did not come to the university already equipped with an ideological arsenal of dissent. On the contrary, several were apolitical or conservative at the time of entry into college. The two notable exceptions, Barb
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(CS #15) and Chuck (CS #19), are, significantly, both freshmen. The presumption of the predominant importance of political socialization in the home, as Flacks’s early work indicates, would suggest as an hypothesis that student radicals were dissenters when they entered college and that the university provided only a stage for them to play out their political or other stances which were developed earlier. Such does not seem to be the case at the non-elite university from which students were selected for this study. On the contrary, the university experiences seem to have been significantly momentous for several of the students interviewed for this study and especially for the student power advocates.

Several examples will illustrate the extent of the experience of "conversion" suggested by the analysis of the case studies already recorded. First there is Carol (CS #3), whose pre-college education was spent exclusively in Catholic schools; she admits to having a very "uncritical" attitude at that time, just as did and do her brothers and sisters who still accept this country and its policies uncritically. However, her faith in "success--the American way," received a rather rude shock when she worked in a multiracial summer camp for underprivileged children after her freshman year. She then began to realize the extent of racial discrimination in American society, and this, she thinks, spurred her on to further criticism of that society
whose institutions, she believes, further racism. Eventually, the logic of her struggle carried her even to ostracism from her family over very personal issues related to race. Carol talks not only of the influence of the camp experience on her change, but also of the influence of self-selected friends made at the university and of her outside reading which has helped her to define the issues. The university, then, provided the setting for the development of a very critical attitude toward prevailing cultural and political values in America.

Carl (CS #16) underwent a similar ideological transformation during his first years of college. In high school, Carl was a debater and a self-professed spokesman for administration policies, and he had much faith in the American political and economic system; now, Carl is about as far from that stance as is imaginable. He contends that his outside reading about the war in Vietnam, done in preparation for college debates, led him to the "cold facts and statistics" which, in his mind, undeniably indict American foreign policy in Southeast Asia. Further reading led him "to get the facts straight" on other policy issues, specifically the race situation and capitalism; and eventually he underwent what he calls a "cultural awakening," involving a full-fledged rejection of the cultural values of America, especially those entwined with American capitalism. This cultural awakening was especially facilitated
by his constant contact with those whom he calls "counter-culture people." Eventually, the logic of this rebellion led him to reject the organization of the contemporary university, as it became apparent that it served as an institution for training in the prevailing cultural values, rather than as a setting for education and critical thinking. Carl, it may be noted, resembles the ideal typical student power advocate, as defined earlier in this study, more than any of the students interviewed. So again, a case might certainly be made for the importance of the university environment as a springboard for criticism of the political, economic, and even educational system.

Ann (CS #18) is a third for whom the university has provided the ground for significant changes in personal philosophy and ideology, though in several respects there is a continuity not found in the cases of Carl and Carol. Ann comes from a local Irish Catholic family, with the traditional Irish Democratic leanings, and her family is very close-knit. But while still remaining quite close to her family, Ann admits to becoming much more tolerant of others and their opinions than when she first came to the university. The "Irish" in her has also found expression in political activities on campus and off, and she has participated in political and campus demonstrations in the past and would still be quite active if there were others around who "had their stuff together." Especially salient among
her political views is a militant stance against the discrimination women find in American society, and she has even found it prevalent on the campus, where several times she has had to fight for privileges limited to males. This struggle and others reflect her own slogan, "to thine own self be true." It is significant that while Ann could live cheaply at her own house, she prefers to live on campus and immerse herself in college activities. She is a joiner who enjoys becoming involved with others in shared activities; her best friend now, very significantly for her, is a Jew, reflecting an increased respect and tolerance she has developed for others of different religions, creeds, and races. Certainly, here, the university environment as experienced by Ann is a prominent force in her own development toward a more tolerant and liberal political stance.

Other cases could, of course, be cited to illustrate the discontinuity between high school attitudes and stances and college attitudes and stances, especially within the group of student power advocates interviewed for this study. Two of the students from idealistic families, Diane and Mary, have admittedly taken about-turns; and Joan, also from an idealistic family, now admires radical political leaders as opposed to the more conventional liberal politicians she admired in high school. And other cases could, of course, bring the force of numbers behind the contention that things do change significantly for some students in college.
But a vague attribution of efficacy to the "college experience" by itself clarifies matters very little. Why, for example, are some students affected but not others? One cannot explain differences on the basis of an experience which is similar for all of the principles involved. Yet it must be noted that students are quite different when they come to college, and the college experience is hardly homogeneous for students. In fact, it might be possible that pre-college experiences (e.g., family value-patterns) significantly prefigure the kinds of college experiences students seek out, the kinds of friends they might make, the kinds of courses they will take. Thus, family value-patterns may predispose students to act in certain ways after leaving home for college that have a later impact upon the development of the political stances of students. In this way, then, family value-patterns would have an indirect effect upon the movement leftward of student political attitudes.

Choice of major subject may be one way in which this influence is manifested. Earlier, in the discussion of factors associated with student power demands, it was noted that ten of the eleven student power advocates major in either the social sciences or humanities. While one might interpret these data to mean that those who are already student power advocates choose not to major in other fields, it is also quite possible that the "milieu" in which the
student circulates by virtue of majoring in a certain field has gradual and very definite effects. Thus, it may be that certain family value-patterns influence the student toward an interest in one field or another and that this milieu in which the student becomes involved then has its own independent effect upon his political attitudes. It was noted, for example, that all of the students from idealistic families major in either the social sciences or humanities, and three of these students have double majors, each having one major in the social sciences and the other in the humanities. May it be that the humanitarianism and/or intellectualism and/or emphasis on the aesthetic within the families of each of these students was an important factor contributing to their eventual college major? And then, especially for those two students whose parents were not politically liberal, the milieu in which they found themselves as a result of this choice became a factor in the undercutting of others of their parents' values.

Many of the statements of the student power advocates do indicate the influence of such factors. For example, Joan is very involved with both other students and faculty in the religion department. The department is apparently very closely knit, oriented significantly toward sophisticated intellectual issues, and it has students participating in departmental decision-making. This, perhaps,
is an exceptional case in which an undergraduate department provides the primary focus for a student's intellectual and social life in ways that certainly are important to the student. Most certainly, the milieu in which other students participate would be far less structured. But aspects of the milieu in which the students circulate must certainly not be neglected: acquaintances that the student makes as a result of similar classes; roommates; classes themselves; book exchanges among friends; extra-curricular activities may become causally efficacious parts of a college experience; and any theory seeking to come to grips with the contemporary student movement cannot afford to ignore such experience. Obviously, such experiences point to an importance of the peer group which may be more salient than the socialization within the family.

This thesis would remain incomplete, however, without both mention of and emphasis upon the knowledge of issues and events themselves, which are a product of higher education. Oftentimes, sociological accounts of student political stances can be construed as attempts to explain away these student stances as mere by-product of certain family value-patterns or certain college experiences. It is hoped that this thesis is not so construed. For, on the contrary, the attitudes described above often are the product of considerable reflection upon experience and are far from an uncritical acceptance of books read or opinions heard.
Very real personal experiences, too, often underlie the ideological turn leftward described above: Carol's experience with black children at a summer camp, pointing out vividly the effects of racism in this country; the special concern of such students as Lynn, Joan, and Alan, as well, for the situation in which black Americans find themselves; Carl's wrestling with the legitimacy of and underlying reason behind American involvement in southeast Asia; and Ann's experience of discrimination against women in the university. It would be intellectually disreputable for a sociologist to overlook the very real issues to which the young students described above have addressed themselves; for the rebellion of the young has as its objects policies, issues, etc. whose presence cannot be denied or overlooked.

Furthermore, it may be that experiences as described above are momentous by virtue of the fact that they challenge beliefs, values, and even facts that they had much earlier taken for granted. The realizations resulting from these experiences may make for what social psychologists have called cognitive dissonance; thus, in order to integrate new perceptions or concepts into their cognitive structures, students must challenge notions previously taken on faith. The frank recognition of the horrors of the Vietnam war or of the omnipresence of racial discrimination may well undercut the cherished and presumed
perfection of the American political system and the assumption of continued American virtue and innocence; and these same events may jar the religious student out of a previous complacency. While these realities can eventually be changed, they cannot be denied or ignored; and the student must come to terms with political and cultural realities of which he was ignorant only a few years before.

In sum, then, the college experience may indeed spur on changes in values, political stance, and ideology of today's college student. Knowledge gained through courses which speak to the contemporary social, political, and cultural reality may well become catalysts to serious reflection on contemporary social issues, reflection that is shared with others. It is to be expected that such experiences are most prominent among students in the social sciences and humanities; and then it might be expected, as is the case, that almost all of the student power advocates interviewed for this thesis would major in either the social sciences or humanities.

Implications for Further Research

Any appraisal of the findings set forth in this thesis and of their implications for future research must involve the recognition of the limits placed upon the findings by the small number of students drawn upon in this research. No claim, of course, can be made that is anything close to
definitiveness. Rather, this thesis is above all exploratory, primarily seeking themes to develop in later research. One salient problem encountered when random sampling is not employed is with respect to the representativeness of those individuals studied. To what extent do these thirty-two students represent the population of the university studied, let alone all large, midwestern non-elite universities? The answer to that question, of course, cannot be resolved by this thesis, but instead demands further research. But if the hypothesis put forward in the first chapter were to be obviously true, one would expect it to hold for the entire population of radical students, short of some group deliberately selected for its unrepsentativeness. Actually, the findings herein presented are not those which would contravene reason, and they are foreshadowed to some extent in the recent writings of both Flacks and Laufer. In addition, one would doubt that a larger and/or a representative sample of a university would have served much better for the purposes of this research. However, that is not to deny that further research using survey designs is needed to substantiate and elaborate on the findings reported in these case studies.

Second, it certainly would be valuable for generalization if, in further verification studies, the information gathered from students could be gathered in a way so as to insure the accuracy of student reports. The problem,
this investigator finds, is not primarily with respect to reports of student power advocacy, of which only the student himself is competent to report, even though it is possible for him to distort his answer. More significant is the collection of data regarding primary family value-patterns. The data that were collected for this thesis on family value-patterns represent the remembrances by students of parental practices, and it might be expected that these remembrances would be less than fully accurate. Thus, forgetfulness may be a factor producing distortion, and hostility toward the student's parents might shape, consciously or unconsciously, his responses. The extent to which the student's responses are an accurate indication of family value-pattern is, at this point, a moot question. Perhaps, in further research, parents might be interviewed or be given questionnaires concerning their value-patterns, child-rearing practices, etc. Such parental responses, though having shortcomings of their own, would strengthen the case for the validity or invalidity of student reports on their family backgrounds.

A third problem posed for future researchers is that of clarifying the relationship between student radicalism and one of its supposed components, student power advocacy. Throughout the early phases of this study, it was assumed that student power advocates are almost coterminous with student left-radicals, and thus that a theory framed to
explain student left-radicalism would apply to student power advocates. This assumption is based, to a certain extent, on the hypothesis in the early writings of Flacks (questioned by the findings in this thesis) concerning the incompatibility between family value-patterns and the values of the multiversity. The findings of this thesis certainly seem to support the assumption that student power advocates are those who are in other respects left-oriented political radicals. However, it could be argued that student power advocacy is by no means an essential aspect of left-radicalism and is only peripheral to the radical commitment. Obviously, to resolve this issue would involve much more extensive data than was appropriate for this thesis, given its limited aims.

Concerning the more important question, the construction of a new theory to guide future research regarding student left-radicalism generally and student power advocacy in particular, the findings of this thesis can only provide very abstract and general guidelines. It is noted in Chapters I and II that the primary focus of this thesis is the relationship between selected family value-patterns and student power advocacy. However, the actual investigation indicated that family value-patterns are much less important than was expected and that some kind of college socialization experience is an important determinant of the student's move politically leftward. However, in
focusing only incidentally on this college experience, the empirical evidence gathered with respect to college socialization is only sketchy. As a result, theoretical formulations derived from such evidence resemble speculation more than grounded theory. Had the investigations of this thesis been more directed toward discerning the ways in which college affected political stances, it is likely that more of positive theoretical value would have been obtained. Instead, the findings of this thesis have served more to mark off unprofitable directions for future research than to provide clear theoretical formulations to guide future research. The reader is referred to the first section in Chapter IV for those implications for theory which are suggested by the evidence presented in the case studies.

Yet perhaps even the focus upon the political socialization involved in certain college or university subcultures would not provide or have provided an adequate and promising approach to the problem of understanding the upswing in American left-radicalism. In a world where university students are increasingly making themselves heard politically, the kind of micro-perspective assumed in this thesis may well prove inadequate. Unless it is to be assumed that each student movement is unique, it is imperative that student protest and activism be considered in a cross-national perspective, one likely to generate a
theory revealing the source of student revolt in societal structures shared by several nations. Perhaps a macro-theory developed from such data would lead in the direction of a general theory of student political activism, both left and right. Obviously, intensive interviews of students, as used in this thesis, are not likely to uncover such structural problems. This shortcoming of the approach taken for this thesis is best kept in mind by future researchers in this field.

Summary and Conclusions

The above related findings have indeed illustrated a widening of the base of the student movement and with it the need for new sociological theory to account for this change. It seems apparent from the case studies presented that the typical student power advocate, at least at the non-elite university, has not been directly socialized at home to become a political radical, as the theory of the early Flacks had suggested. On the contrary, for the most part, the student power advocates interviewed have acquired their radicalism after leaving home for college and in opposition to the values of their parents. The student power advocates do not represent the elite stratum suggested in the early works of Flacks; many are very typical in family background, differing only slightly from their non-radical college peers. Several come from very conventional
homes, emphasizing very conventional political, social,
and religious values. Yet, on the other hand, it has been
suggested that these backgrounds are not irrelevant, for
they may influence the initial direction the students take
in the university setting.

It is evident in several of the case studies that the
university has been the setting for what seem to the stu-
dents themselves momentous changes in value or perspective.
Yet many students undergo no such transformation. It is
significant that, among the interviewees, student power
advocacy was confined almost entirely to students majoring
in the social sciences or humanities. From majors in these
fields would seem to come the thrust for significant changes
within the university. Students in other fields, though
having some complaints, seem content with the fundamental
allocation of power within the university. Perhaps many
of those students majoring in the social sciences or human-
ities take part in a self-perpetuating milieu, acting as a
social force that influences new recruits in these fields.
While students who decide to major in the social sciences
or humanities may have some inclination in the direction
of more liberal or radical political values, this milieu
may spur on such changes. The knowledge gained by the
student about the political realities of the contemporary
world may no longer appear congruent with what he has been
told or is still told by political leaders about that
world. Such information may produce cognitive conflicts resulting in valuative or perspectival changes.

The findings of this exploratory inquiry into the sources of student power demands make evident to the investigator that future investigation in this area must take into consideration a much wider spectrum of variables than have been drawn upon by previous investigators. A tidy theory like that in the early work of Flacks no longer corresponds to the results of the complex interaction of student, family, and university setting. Indeed, the case studies of two freshman student power advocates would seem to indicate that the high school is becoming increasingly important as a setting for student revolt, thus suggesting that high school experiences will have to have a place in a new expanded theory. Certainly, further inquiry into peer group influences must be made before a detailed theory can be spelled out.
GENERAL INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONS

1. Of the following, what best describes your father's educational background?
   a. eighth grade or below
   b. did not finish high school
   c. high school graduate
   d. attended college
   e. college graduate
   f. graduate school (specify)

2. Father's occupation (specify)

3. Of the following, what best describes your mother's educational background?
   a. eighth grade or below
   b. did not finish high school
   c. high school graduate
   d. attended college
   e. college graduate
   f. graduate school (specify)

4. Mother's occupation (specify)

5. Family income
   a. below $5,000 per year
   b. between $5,000 and $10,000 per year
   c. between $10,000 and $15,000 per year
   d. between $15,000 and $20,000 per year
   e. between $20,000 and $25,000 per year
   f. between $25,000 and $30,000 per year
   g. over $30,000 per year
6. Sex  
   a. male  
   b. female  

7. Race  
   a. black  
   b. white  
   c. other (specify)  

8. Classification  
   a. freshman  
   b. sophomore  
   c. junior  
   d. senior  
   e. graduate  

9. Age (specify)  

10. Marital status  
    a. single  
    b. married  

11. Major field of study (specify)
QUESTIONS REGARDING FAMILY VALUE-PATTERNS AND STUDENT POWER DEMANDS WHICH GUIDED THE INTERVIEWS

A. Questions concerning the structure of family decision-making

1. Who made the important decisions in your family?
2. What kinds of decisions were within the province of your mother's sphere of influence and what within your father's sphere?
3. How were children treated with respect to family decisions?
4. What kinds of sanctions were used to enforce parental dictates?
5. How were those sanctions used? How often were they used?
6. Would you consider your parents strict as opposed to the parents of your friends?
7. When, if ever, did your parents grant you adult perogatives?

B. Questions concerning predominant family values

1. What kinds of values were most salient in your family?
2. Did your parents belong to a church? If so, what denomination? Did they attend regularly? Was it important to them that you attend church? Was it important to them that you believe in God?
3. Was politics salient in your family? What kinds of political attitudes do your parents have? What kinds of political figures do they respect?
4. Would you consider your parents moralistic? What kinds of morals did they preach, and how important was your obedience?
5. Was it very important that you do well in school? That you do well in college?
6. Was financial success and security important to your family? Did they emphasize its importance to you?
7. Was status important? Do your parents belong to country clubs?

8. Did your parents emphasize the value of intellectual development? Do they read much? What kinds of materials do they read?

9. Was art important? Do your parents attend concerts or plays when the opportunity arises?

10. Were humanitarian values emphasized in your family? Are your parents concerned about poverty in this country? How much so?

11. What other kinds of values were emphasized in your family?

C. Questions regarding the generation gap

1. Is there a generation gap between you and your parents? If so, between you and both your parents?

2. What is the nature of this gap?

3. On what kinds of issues is there generational strife?

4. For how long has this gap existed? How wide is the gap?

D. Questions regarding student power demands

1. How do you respond to recent initiatives by students for greater power in the university?

2. What kinds of power should students have in the university? With respect to academic affairs? With respect to non-academic affairs?

3. How important is it that students participate in such decision-making?

4. Is it a peripheral or central issue in the university?

5. How important do you think is the need for university reform? What kinds of reform, if any, are needed?

6. What is the meaning of a college or university community? Is such a goal one to be strived for?
7. Why are you at the university? For education as an end in itself? For a better job? For another reason? Explain.

8. What tactics do you believe that students should employ in seeking their ends? Do you believe that the university is a proper place for demonstrations? Why or why not?

9. Do you personally think it important to participate in the governance of the university?
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