If you have issues viewing or accessing this file contact us at NCJRS.gov.

DANIEL YANKELOVICH, INC.

82989

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by
Public Domain/LEAA
U.S. Dept. of Justice
to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

PHASE I

STUDY OF CAMPUS UNREST AMONG LEADERSHIP GROUPS IN THE UNIVERSITY AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Prepared for

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Department of Justice

Contract Number J-LEAA-008-70

September, 1970

DANIEL YANKELOVICH
INCORPORATED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	5
DETAILED FINDINGS	
Part I - The University Community: Administration, Faculty Members, and Students	16
Part II - The Local Community: Local Government Leaders and Businessmen	40
ISSUES OF SIGNIFICANCE TO BLACK STUDENTS	59
CONCLUSIONS	71
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
Section I: Background Analysis of Student Activism	i
Section II: Survey Research Study on College Students	vi
Section III: Case Studies - Specific College Campuses	xi

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This research project is directed toward two final outputs: (1) the Fall Conference, where university administrators, faculty members, students, business executives and municipal political leaders will consider a series of case studies on conflict situations; and (2) the Policy Handbook which will draw its conclusions from the research on conflict and from observations on the success of the conference as a method for teaching and learning about constructive responses to campus problems and conflicts.

The Phase I research among the university and community leadership reported here contributes to both of these final outputs. It will be used in planning the agenda and selecting participants for the conference; it will aid in focusing attention on critical issues during preparation of the intensive cases for the conference; and it will provide conference members with a uniform background of facts about campus problems. Furthermore, it should be able to stand alone as a report on the perceptions and experiences of those who have been involved in campus conflicts.

The project, and this report as a component, should assist LEAA in making a constructive contribution to easing tensions on the campus and preventing violence and lawlessness. To do this in ways which will be acceptable to the academic community and meaningful in terms of current needs, the present situation in and around universities must be described accurately. This report, therefore, is more descriptive than prescriptive.

Methodology

The six-state New England area serves as the field of observation for this project. In the first research phase, ten college towns having population of 10,000 or more were chosen as sample sites. Variety of location within the area--Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Connecticut--was important, but the basic criterion was the occurrence of disruptive incidents on campus between September 1969, and July, 1970. From among the college towns which met these standards, the sample was chosen to maximize diversity among the colleges on dimensions such as source of support, size, religious affiliation, and type of student body.

In each of the ten sample sites, interviews were conducted with two major segments of the population. A total of 177 interviews

were completed. That number was divided among the following groups of respondents:

Type of Respondent	Number of Interviews
Total	177
Total university community	88
Administration	33
Faculty	29
Students	26
Total local community	89
Chiefs of police	7
City government officials	31
Businessmen	51

Two interviewing instruments were used, a larger form, directed specifically to the dynamics of campus conflict, was used for the university community and the police chiefs. A shorter form, not restricted so closely to campus incidents and more attitudinal than factual in its orientation, was used for municipal officials and businessmen. The interviewing was conducted between July 27 and August 7, 1970.

Interviews were analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative techniques. Tabulations are based on individuals rather than schools or cities, unless another base is specified.

This note should be made about the methodology employed here: only schools where disturbances had occurred were eligible for the sample. The sample does not, therefore, represent a random, or even necessarily a representative sample of New England colleges. Such a design allows comments about how and why things got out of control on campus, but does not give equal attention to explaining situations where control was maintained.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The twelve broad findings discussed below summarize the most important and useful information gained through this phase of the research. A more detailed exposition and discussion of the data is included in the following section entitled "Detailed Findings."

1. The minimal and most common demand students make of universities is for a routinized, legitimatized voice in university decision-making.

2. University administrations are likely to withhold direct action against rising tensions and on student demands until overt moves or threats to move against the university in demonstrations, sit-ins, or strikes are made by students. Preemptive anticipatory responses by the administration are clearly the exception rather than the rule. However, where universities have made anticipatory responses, tensions and disruptions have tended to be less severe. The anticipatory responses most frequently and successfully used have been: (a) to recognize as

legitimate students' rights to present their issue positions and, (b) to specify forms of "due process" according to which the university will work with students in considering these positions.

3. The most inflammatory response made by universities is to deny, apart from the issues central to their demands, that students may legitimately request a voice and a role in university decision-making.

4. The use of municipal police forces to prevent violence is generally seen as constructive and effective. Community and university groups are often found supporting and buttressing police efforts to prevent violence by monitoring and regulating the behavior of group members. Use of these forces after violence has occurred, to stop violence with forceful tactics is thought necessary by townspeople and some university administrators and faculty members. However, such tactics are also acknowledged, among members of the university community, to be somewhat less than constructive in solving the questions at issue

and potentially conducive to increased violence. Ambivalence about use of police to quell campus disruptions is common: violence is deplored, but respondents from both the universities and the communities expressed doubt about how effective municipal police forces are in haulting violence once it has started.

5. Mediators and go-betweens are all but universal actors in efforts to resolve campus conflicts. However, predictions of their success are uncertain, and it is obvious that training for this role, and recognition of who should perform it, are lacking. The personal characteristics of the mediator seem most important, though some other factors are suggested:

   a. A mediator must be seen as neutral and trustworthy in his judgments and confidentiality.

   b. A mediator must be able to assess accurately the relative power, the potential strategies and the self-interest of all parties to the dispute and must also be able to communicate these facts to all parties convincingly.

c. A mediator must work within a fairly stable balance of power between the parties to the dispute; his success is likely to be limited if one party holds predominant power over the other.

6. Faculty members most often were able to serve as mediators or go-betweens. In fewer cases, university administrators and/or community leaders were able to fill this role. It is apparent that decisions by groups involved in campus disturbances to work with a mediator are important preliminary steps in achieving some measure of resolution.

7. The university administrators are central to campus disorders. They tend to define the issues and focus opposing positions. Administrators are necessarily involved in any efforts which are made to resolve the questions at issue. However, about 1 in every 4 respondents who cites involvement by university administrators, also feels that the tactics used by the administration had a divisive effect.

8. Apart from the common, procedural issue of a legitimate voice for students in university decision-making, the most universal substantive issues are the presence and experience of blacks on campus.

9. If any resolution is achieved of issues involved in campus disruptions, the issues most likely to be resolved are those involving blacks. In part this may be explained by the finding that black groups and leaders are said to join and continue in negotiations much more frequently than white "radical" students. Two further conclusions may be drawn from the data:

a. Blacks as a group have achieved a measure of legitimacy and recognition for making demands in society, and this legitimacy and recognition has to some extent transferred to the campus. The efforts of blacks, therefore, can be directed toward substantive issues on the campus, rather than the procedural issue of gaining a legitimate voice.

b. Blacks on campus have, in general, a history of activism in efforts to gain group objectives. Compared to white campus leaders, they are more likely to be:

1. Skilled in the tactics of group cooperation and advocacy,
2. Realistic if not actually cynical about what such efforts can achieve,
3. Informed in their calculations of the consequences of various strategies, and
4. Disciplined in their pursuit of negotiations, with attendant respect for firm leadership, compromise, and the salutary effects of an enforceable deadline.

White activist groups, on the other hand, are often characterized by rejection of leadership norms in preference for trust and consensus as elements of decision-making style.

10. The issues raised by white activist groups are often more difficult for university administrators to deal with and less likely to be resolved, than are issues raised by black groups, for these reasons:

a. White activist demands tend to be general and students are often uncertain of how they should be achieved in a practical sense, e.g., "more relevant education."

b. White activist groups often raise issues whose resolution has not been part of the university's role, e.g., "get out of Vietnam."

c. White activist groups often see opening negotiations with the university as threatening to their ability to be successful advocates of issue positions. In part, this stems from the importance these students ascribe in their catalog of demands to the procedural issue of "gaining a voice." To join ad hoc negotiations without formal recognition for the legitimacy of a voice or role for students seems self-defeating to them. Pursuit of such negotiations appears to have three unacceptable consequences to these students:

1. Bargaining away the only power students feel they have, the resort to further disruption, as a condition of joining negotiations that may fail to recognize the legitimacy of a student voice.

2. Pursuing negotiations (which are realistically expected to take a long time) without having any concrete accomplishment to show to the "rank and file" of group members whose patience is limited by the nine-month school year and the graduation of about one-quarter of the membership each year.

3. For the student negotiators, doubts form about their role and their ties with student group members. This was often expressed as a fear that to negotiate would somehow corrupt the purity of students' positions or diminish students' ability to advocate them.

11. Campus disorders rarely involve only members of the university community. The surrounding local community is sensitive to events on campus and often becomes involved in them. The press was involved in every community studied. Whether or not press coverage had

an effect on the outcome of the conflicts was in doubt, however. More members of the university than the local community observed such an effect. Among those who felt press coverage had impact on the outcome of campus conflict, most described this as a negative effect, heightening tensions or prolonging the conflict.

Most members of the local community feel that the students have well-defined, justifiable goals, such as ending the war in Vietnam, stopping racism or pollution, and changing university curricula or examination procedures. A minority feel the students are only destructive of lives, property, or of traditional values and ways of doing things. Fewer still feel that the students act mostly from confusion and have no purpose or objective. In keeping with this generally tolerant view of students, community members feel that extreme tactics are common in campus disorders because of the frustrations students experience in gaining recognition and change. This general diagnosis assumes a negative aspect when some respondents go on to note that students are <u>too</u> impatient, act irresponsibly

and enjoy the shock value of their actions, or are only engaged in working out some adolescent identity crisis. In general, the attitudes toward students held by those outside the university community are found to be generally positive. However, as expected, most people draw a strict line against violence involving personal injury or widespread property damage.

12. University and local community members find that campus disruptions generally disturb normal routines and levels of performance. Some go so far as to say that the events were personally traumatic. In affective terms, the disruptions do appear to have brought the overt questions which were at issue to the attention of more people inside and outside the university. Concern, alarm, and questioning were common reactions for all concerned, including students. The most common fear raised by disruptions is for the newly understood fragility of universities and of the entire society. The most common benefits are seen to be greater recognition of the need to make changes in

the university and in society. It is interesting to note that a considerable portion of students and faculty members feel that activism and advocacy of issue positions are educational experiences of real value.

DETAILED FINDINGS

Part I

The University Community: Administration, Faculty Members, and Students

Finding #1: Slightly more than half of the university community respondents felt that press coverage of events on their campus had an effect on the outcome.

Discussion

Among those who felt that some effects could be ascribed to press coverage, about 40 per cent said it created additional excitement and prolonged or made more difficult efforts to resolve the conflict. About one-third of the respondents also felt that press coverage affected the outcome because it was biased, with nearly equal numbers who felt it was biased to favor students and to favor the administration.

However, 1 respondent in 3 ascribed a positive effect to press coverage: it let people know each other's positions and kept the conflicting groups in touch with each other.

Finding #2: About 65 per cent of the respondents felt the questions at issue on their campus could have been resolved before disturbances occurred.

Discussion

Listed in order of the frequency with which they were cited, these steps were the ones which might have prevented disturbances.

1. University attitudes toward students should have been less patronizing, less severe, or more communicative. Students should have been given a voice or a role in decision-making.

2. Universities should have formulated and communicated their policies and purposes more clearly.

3. Universities should have enforced their rules and lived up to their promises.

4. Universities should have recognized the nature and seriousness of the problems more quickly and acted more quickly.

Though several said the universities should have recognized sooner that problems existed, a majority of the university community who were interviewed failed to notice signs of developing problems until demands were made in demonstrations.

Finding #3: With respect to specific cases of disruptions on campus or involving universities, nearly all members of the university community felt that the federal government should not bedome involved.

Discussion

Most respondents unequivocally rejected the proposition that the government had any legitimate role to play in such disruptions. These two responses are typical:

> "They must keep out--(their intervention) can only lead to more trouble and resentment."

> "Absolutely not. The university is supposed to be isolated from the rest of society, and free to criticize all."

Where a role was cited for the federal government, it was an indirect and a preventive one. Some suggestions, taken from the interviews are:

> "Provide funds for police overtime spent in dealing with disruptions."

> "The federal government should be sensitive and listen to what students say; realize they are important."

> "Support the universities when they can't afford programs for minority groups."

> "Aid in development of judicial processes for the university, according to which due process and the rights of all groups and individuals would be respected."

Finding #4: Asked if there were any things the federal government, or any of its agencies, might do to help prevent campus disruptions or to help universities and communities deal with them constructively, over 65 per cent could answer with specific proposals. Most frequently mentioned was changing national policies, particularly ending the Vietnam War.

Discussion

In order of the frequency with which they were mentioned, these things were suggested as preventive and constructive steps for the federal government to take:

1. Change national policies.

2. Provide additional resources for use by universities, e.g., give discretionary grants to universities.

3. Provide additional resources for use by communities, e.g., help ghettos, train local police.

4. Take students and student issues seriously; listen to students and respond to issues, not just to demonstrations.

5. Help universities establish rules for protest and standards to govern the use of police or military forces on university campuses.

Finding #5: Nearly half of the university community feels that there is little the local community can do to prevent disruptions or assist the university in dealing with them. Suggestions for improving the training and discipline of local police forces, or for improving cooperation between the university and local police, are most common among that half of the university respondents who feel the local community can do something.

Discussion

In general, the university community feels that the initiative for preventing or dealing with campus disruptions lies with the university. This view does not, however, imply antipathy: only a very small percentage of university respondents gave replies such as this one: "Townspeople do not understand students and university problems or are unwilling to be helpful in a positive way."

Traditional town-gown tensions still exist, but at the same time that new divisive issues arise, such as university expansion into the community, other issues arise, such as antipoverty efforts,

which find the community and the university in agreement and working together.

A distinctive characteristic of many black students and black student groups is their sense of loyalty to, and involvement with, blacks in the local community.

Finding #6: The groups most community involved in campus problems are students, black groups, faculty members, university president or administrators and the press. Very nearly 100 per cent of the respondents at all schools cited these groups as having been involved.

Discussion

In addition, the following groups and individuals were also frequently said to be involved, i.e., by more than half the respondents at more than half the schools. They are listed according to the frequency with which they were said to have been involved:

Local police

Peace groups

Campus police

Local businessmen or business groups

Courts or judges

Board of Trustees, Regents, Overseers, etc.

Organizers or agitators from outside the local community

University alumni or alumni groups

Civil rights groups.

Among those notable for lack of involvement ascribed to them across the ten cases studied were:

The mayor or other municipal officials

High school students

Labor unions or union members

Community welfare groups

Religious leaders and churches.

Comparison of these two lists indicates that groups or individuals directly connected to the university are more likely to be involved with campus conflicts. It also suggests that campus disruptions do not reach deeply into communities and involve in conflict those who have had no prior interest in or connection with the issues or the university.

Finding #7: Black groups and the administration were felt to have held greatest responsibility for defining the issues and focusing opposing objectives. Students in general and faculty were also frequently seen as performing this function.

Discussion

The important role played by black groups is emphasized by this finding. To define and focus the issues is critical to the course and outcome of any conflict. Blacks apparently are able more than any other student group to do this.

In the course of conflict, this ability to define and focus issues accomplishes two things:

1. The questions at issue are kept close to the goals and powers of advocacy of the black groups; and

2. Defining the issues implies eventual negotiation and resolution.

These two accomplishments probably explain in part the success blacks have been able to achieve on campus as contrasted to other student groups.

Finding #8: In attempting to assess which of the involved groups used tactics which were divisive or extreme in their impact, respondents gave answers that were particular to the situations they had experienced. No single group or individual is uniformly cited for divisiveness or extreme position.

Discussion

This finding is interesting because it suggests that the resort to divisive tactics is situationally determined. This is the opposite of finding that, through common goals or a common role in diverse conflicts, particular groups are predictably divisive or extreme. University students, black groups and university administrators are most often mentioned as having divisive impact, in part because they are the groups most frequently involved in the conflict. To extend this line of reasoning, the interesting thing to note is that faculty members, the other university group which is frequently involved, are not so often said to use tactics whose impact is divisive. This is probably associated with their frequent functioning as moderator or go-between.

Finding #9: The groups most frequently involved in campus conflicts are also most frequently involved in resolving them: students, black groups, faculty and administration.

Discussion

To test the proposition set forth in the discussion of Finding #7, we can look at black groups and university administrators to see if these two groups, which most often define the issues, are also most frequently involved in resolving them. The results confirm this; in 2 out of 3 universities black groups and university administrators were most frequently said to be involved in the resolution efforts.

That university students in general were also frequently involved in resolution efforts should indicate that demands made as "non-negotiable" were often, in fact, negotiated, even if this did not succeed in resolving all conflicts.

Finding #10: Over 40 per cent of the respondents said that during the period of conflict, there were changes in the leadership of some of the groups which were involved.

Discussion

The impact of leadership changes was said by one-half of those who noted such changes to have prolonged the conflict or made resolution more difficult, and by the other half, to have had no notable effect in the involvement or position taken by the group.

Thus, in a majority of cases, leadership changes either do not occur or do not appear to have any effect if they do occur.

Finding #11: Fully 82 per cent of the respondents could say that at least some of the questions at issue were resolved. When some success in resolving the issues was noted, the specific issues most often mentioned were:

1. Improvement in facilities for, or recognition of, the needs and preferences of black students on campus (37%).

2. Increased enrollment or employment of blacks by the university (30%).

Discussion

Following these two black issues in frequency of mention were these issues where some success in resolution was indicated:

- Administrative or judicial issues connected with attendance requirements, grades, credits, suspensions, etc. (29%).

- Issues related to university policies regarding community affairs or universities' involvement and responsibility in the community (23%).

- Issues related to a greater role or voice for students in university affairs and decision-making (13%).

Finding #12: Not all issues were resolved, however, even in places where some resolutions were achieved. A majority, 73 per cent, of the respondents felt that all issues had not, in fact, been resolved.

Discussion

The unresolved issues, in order of frequency mentioned, were these:

1. Change in university position on the Vietnam war, military research, ROTC, or the draft (31% of those who said not all issues were resolved).

2. Plans for the future of the university: reorganization, expansion, etc. (28%).

3. Role of students or faculty in making university decisions or in the operating structure of the university (25%).

4. Policies of the federal government such as the move into Cambodia, fair employment standards, antipoverty funds (25%).

5. Role of blacks on campus and provision of facilities or services to fill their needs (23%).

6. Relationships between the university and the community; the university's responsibilities in the community (13%).

There is considerable overlap between the lists of resolved and unresolved issues. The same issues appear on both lists because the history of their development was different and the dynamics of resolution were different on different campuses. It is apparent that the issues raised are real and difficult, and none were solved in every case where they arose. However, some were solved more often than others, notably those made by blacks, and to observe why this occurred is instructive. The succeeding findings cover conclusions about the dynamics of resolving campus conflicts.

Finding #13: Where resolution had not been achieved for the questions at issue, firm disagreement from opposing issue positions was most frequently mentioned as the obstacle. The second most frequently cited obstacle was that the issues could not be resolved in or by the university, but required action by others outside the university or should be allowed to evolve seemingly toward a solution. Procedural, legal, or financial restraints on the university were the third most frequently mentioned obstacle.

Discussion

The obstacles cited in the finding above all echo a sense of pessimism on the part of the university community about their ability to resolve further the issues which divide their schools. In part, this is surely realistic, but it also reflects a passive attitude. University administrators, in particular, often expressed a sense of impotence and fatalism about disruptions, feeling they were likely to continue and that satisfactory solutions to the issues raised were not likely to be achieved in the near future.

Finding #14: One of the important keys to resolving the issues in campus disruptions appears to be the ability of each opposing constellation of groups and individuals to coordinate its issue positions and tactics and to act in a unified way.

Discussion

Of all respondents interviewed in the universities, 68 per cent had been involved personally in resolution efforts on their own campuses. Of those who were involved, all felt that coordination, cooperation, and disciplined unity among those on opposing sides of the issues were highly constructive in achieving resolutions. Two particular benefits were said to come from unity in the opposing camps:

1. Better selection and definition of issues so that accepting compromise, on less critical issues at least, is eased.

2. Cooperation gives support or added strength to an individual or group playing a key role in the resolution efforts.

Finding #15: A second important feature of situations from which resolutions emerge is that the groups involved maintain close contact and perceive accurately the positions, views and limitations of the opposing groups. To achieve this contact and understanding, mediators or go-betweens were often quite useful.

Discussion

In the order of the frequency in which they were mentioned as go-betweens or mediators, those who filled this role were:

1. Faculty members

2. University administrators

3. People from outside the university, particularly local black leaders or leaders of local community welfare groups

4. Students.

Of those personally involved in resolution efforts, 77 per cent report that at least one person functioned as a go-between or

mediator on their campus. This position, was, however, a highly informal one and the go-betweens functioned more on the basis of access to both sides and the trust of both sides, than upon any powers or sanctions to recommend or enforce a settlement.

Finding #16: In the view of nearly half of the respondents who were involved in resolution efforts, there were groups or individuals who avoided or boycotted the attempts to resolve the issues. The group most often cited was white radical students. Black students were mentioned less than half as often.

Discussion

The pattern of success in achieving some of their goals is partly explained by this finding about black groups: they do negotiate; they maintain contact more often than white radical groups. The reasons for this are puzzling, but these can be suggested:

1. At least some measure of recognition has been granted at most universities for blacks to act as a group in affecting university decisions about life on campus.

2. Blacks who enroll in college have more experience in negotiation, in working with those who ostensibly oppose their demands to achieve those very demands. As a result, they fear negotiations less, and understand that to negotiate is not to capitulate.

3. White radical students, emphasizing the procedural point of gaining a role for students in university decision-making, have formulated their issue positions in such a way that joining negotiations appears to deny the legitimacy of their position as well as to fortify the legitimacy of the position taken by the university.

4. White radical students often call upon the university to forge new powers or to execute traditional powers in non-traditional ways. Black students more often call for different applications of traditional powers used in traditional ways. In any organization the former is much more difficult to achieve than the latter. White radicals who make such demands may quite accurately sense that the university is not prepared to seek new powers or use its power in untraditional ways, and so they give up on negotiations before they start.

Part II

The Local Community: Local Government Leaders and Businessmen

Finding #1: Only 1 in 4 respondents from the local community felt that the press coverage of disturbances in their city had had any noticeable effect on the outcome of the campus events studied. In contrast, better than 2 in 4 university respondents noted such an effect.

Discussion:

Campus disruptions proved to be salient disturbances for the citizens of all the cities included. However, events on campus were, predictably, more salient to the university community than the local community, and the university community was more sensitive to the impact of press coverage than the local community.

Among those local community respondents who noted some effect, that effect was, in nearly all cases, described as negative: coverage was biased to favor the demonstrators and it prolonged the conflict. In greater proportion, university respondents saw some positive effects of press coverage.

Finding #2: Just over half (55 per cent) of the local community felt that the questions at issue could not have been resolved before disturbances occurred.

Discussion:

To compare, only 35 per cent of the university respondents felt that no solutions were possible before the disruptions occurred.

This difference between the local and the university communities demonstrates the extent to which the local community feels that the initiative for dealing with student issues and demonstrations lies within the university.

To underscore the lack of local initiative, the respondents in the local community who felt something could have been done to forestall disruptions felt that faster or different actions should have been taken by the university. They fault the university for failing to recognize the problem earlier, and feel that by enforcing its rules and keeping its promises, or by taking students seriously and adopting a more communicative attitude, universities could have prevented large scale disruptions.

Finding #3: The local community was similar to the university community in its perceptions of the issues behind campus unrest. In the order of the frequency they were mentioned, the following issues were seen by the local community to be central in disturbances both on and off campus:

1. Racial problems and minority demands.
2. United States involvement in Indochina and the role of universities in military activities.
3. Student representation and power within the university.
4. Dissatisfaction over the quality of life in the United States.
5. Need for redefinition of role or purpose of the university.

Discussion:

Minority demands were recognized as paramount within the local community as well as within the university. Student representation and power, while recognized as important by local government

officials and businessmen, seems more important on campus, perhaps because its consequences have been more sharply defined there.

This finding suggests that, in this one respect, the "communications" gap has been overrated. The local community perceives the questions at issue in a way similar to that on campus; and for the most part, the local community appears willing to credit most students with serious purposes, even when officials and businessmen cannot agree with their aims nor, especially, with their tactics.

Finding #4: Fully 59 per cent of the local community feel that officially or unofficially, things have been done to minimize the possibility that disruptions will be repeated.

Discussion:

Despite the feeling that the initiative for preventing the outbreak of disruptions lies with the university, the local community cites most frequently its own efforts to anticipate and understand disruptions as minimizing the possibility of their recurrence.

Second most frequently mentioned are changes in the attitude of university administrators toward faculty and students: becoming more permissive, more communicative, and allowing greater participation for these two groups in making decisions.

Cited with third highest frequency is deterrent action which has been taken: tightening enforcement policies for municipal and university regulations.

Finding #5: Not only were campus disruptions the most salient of disruptions, they were quite frequently the only disruptions municipal officials and businessmen could recall. Asked "Have you seen any signs that disruptions are occurring now in other local institutions such as business or local government?" only 1 of 3 respondents answered "yes."

Discussion

Where disturbances were said to have occurred in other institutions, trouble in the city educational system and drug problems were most often mentioned.

With the exception of 1 of the 10 sample sites where local drug problems were said to involve university students, respondents almost unanimously rejected the notion that student unrest was encouraging disruption in other local institutions.

Finding #6: Half of the local officials and businessmen felt that the federal government had no role to play with respect to specific incidents of campus disruptions.

Discussion

On this point, the local community is in less agreement than the university community which was virtually unanimous in rejecting any role for the federal government.

When those in the local community saw a federal role, they mentioned with equal frequency that the role should consist of providing control when local authorities had lost it, and of taking punitive steps against universities, such as withdrawal of funds.

A very few mentioned that the federal government should develop and provide mediation services, act as a clearinghouse for information, or as an advisor to communities and universities experiencing unrest.

Finding #7: In preventing campus disruptions or making it easier for universities and communities to deal with them constructively, only about 15 per cent of the local community felt the federal government had no role to play. The majority felt the proper federal role was to prevent disruptions or to provide assistance for municipal and university authorities before disruptions occurred.

Discussion

The specific actions which were suggested follow in the order of their frequency:

1. Set rules for protest, set standards for use of federal forces on campus; and establish procedures for safeguarding the lives, property, and civil rights of all those involved in campus disruptions.

2. Change national policies: end the Vietnam war, emphasize domestic needs, rationalize national policymaking procedures.

3. Provide additional resources for use by universities in solving problems or dealing with unrest.

4. Provide additional resources for use by local communities in solving problems or dealing with unrest.

The university community differed in deemphasizing the rule-making role mentioned most often by municipal officials and local businessmen.

Finding #8: While looking to the university for specific action in response to unrest, the local community feels it can play a preventive, ameliorative role. Seven out of eight officials and businessmen felt the local community could and should be active in this way.

Discussion

Bringing about closer cooperation between the university and the community was seen as primary. These are examples of the particular suggestions made:

> "We need to build confidence in our city government among the students."
>
> "Students should be employed by the city government. They need jobs, we could use them as interns or to help in community type programs, and we'd probably all learn a lot."

Another view of the role of the community called for fair and strict enforcement of local laws by an improved police department.

A third view suggested that disruptions on campus might be prevented or handled more constructively if the local government

were more responsive to the needs of its citizens and were able to handle these needs more competently. Presumably this means that eliminating problems within the community would deprive students of some major issues or potential allies.

Finding #9: Attitudes toward today's active college students are not as hostile off-campus as might be supposed. The local community tends rather to view activists as an intense manifestation of a natural urgency for change and as the products of problems existing throughout society.

Discussion

We asked community respondents to tell us which, if any, of the following labels they felt to be accurate descriptions of today's active college students. The items are ordered, high to low, based on the percentage answering "yes." (Percentages do not sum to 100% because of residual "don't know" and "no answer" categories.)

Labels to Describe Today's Active College Students	Yes %	No %
Result of problems within society as a whole	82	15
Natural thing--youth always wants change	66	32
Wantonly destructive without purpose	39	60
Communist directed	39	54
Modern day Robin Hoods	33	65
Spoiled brats	32	65

A small minority mentioned reasons for distress of quite a different sort:

- "Apathy, lack of activism shown by many students."
- "Students' inability to bring about necessary fundamental changes."

Finding #10: People in the local community tend to be most bothered and upset by college students' disdain for and challenge of traditional educational opportunities and methods. Other sources of antagonism between students and the local community include:

- Use of drugs
- Personal untidiness and rudeness
- Resort to violent or destructive tactics
- Abandonment of respect for authority and for traditional values.

Discussion

These are familiar perceptions, prototypes of the current journalistic coverage of youth and the problems of young people. Nevertheless, these antagonisms are deeply felt.

Though specific statements mentioning abandonment of respect for authority and for traditional values did not head the list, they seem to underlie or summarize most of the responses.

Finding #11: Question: Why are extreme tactics so commonly used today by students?

Answer: "Extreme tactics are common because students have seen that they worked elsewhere, such as in labor disputes."

Answer: "Students have found that an impression can be made by shouting."

Answer: "Students' motives and tactics are not extreme given the insensitivity and unresponsiveness of the establishment and university administrators."

Responses such as these were given in answer to the question twice as often as all others combined.

Discussion

These responses from businessmen and municipal officials express two things about student activism:

1. A certain foundation of basic agreement with student aims and positions is widespread in the local community. Feelings of being ineffectual and unheard are common both on and off campus, and few would argue with wishes for a peaceful, pollution-free world, for example.

2. The local community senses the frustration and cynicism among students, and can connect this perception with the violence common among them. Without condoning violence, its motivations are understood with a certain sympathy. At the same time, the local community seems to feel that students are too impatient and lack control or commitment for the sustained effort required by conventional political action.

Finding #12: Asked directly whether they felt students were making some valid points--methods aside--fully 94 per cent of the municipal officials and businessmen answered affirmatively.

Discussion

Below are the points the local community thought valid. The percentage mentioning each point, based on those who said they had some sympathy with students' positions, follows in parentheses.

1. Ending the Vietnam war, world peace, changing or ending the draft (73%).
2. Eliminating racism and poverty (52%).
3. Protecting the environment; curbing pollution (40%).
4. Concern over values and priorities in the United States (29%).
5. Changes in the university (24%).

Finding #13: In the future, most members of the local community expect those who are now student activists to continue to pursue their goals but change their methods and work more conventionally within the system. A smaller number expect activists to abandon their goals and cease to be active. A much smaller number, more often businessmen than municipal officials, expect today's radicals will remain radical, neither abandoning their goals nor changing their tactics.

Discussion

While 30 per cent feel that student activism is just a phase and students will outgrow it, abandoning their goals and ceasing to be active, the remainder feel that student activism should be taken more seriously. Students themselves feel this way, and cite the vivid impact of activism in their lives along with the feeling that return to disinterestedness and noninvolvement are impossible for them.

Finding #14: A majority of the local community respondents felt that disruptions on campuses in their city had had a noticeable effect within the community. The effect most frequently mentioned was deterioration in university-community relations. Others were: increased fear and tension (particularly racial tension) in the community, development of citizen programs to parallel or counter student groups, and destruction of property or financial loss for the community.

Discussion

Town-gown tension has long been present, and increasing activism and unrest on campus only exacerbates it. In New England, with many private schools, which have traditionally been more ambivalent about their community role than state schools and which consciously seek a diverse student body, these tensions are maximized.

Changes in the thinking of universities about their role and position in the local community has been an important issue. If the general climate of town-gown relations can be improved and stable methods of cooperation established, then perhaps disruptions will have fewer negative consequences within the local community.

ISSUES OF SIGNIFICANCE TO BLACK STUDENTS

Introduction

Early in the data-gathering stage of this research it became obvious that, in the highly diverse universities under study and in the highly idiosyncratic events on these ten campuses, there was an element remarkable for its consistency: the importance of minority group issues, particularly those significant for blacks.

Having made this observation, we decided to give special attention during analysis to any data which emerged on these issues or on the dynamics of the conflicts in which they were involved. The following section represents a first effort to describe the regularity with which these issues emerged and to explain why and how they became central to so many campus disruptions.

Much more remains to be learned if our original observation is to be fully described and explained. But having made the observation in the first research phase, we can go on to ask more specifically about it in the second phase.

The student body at the ten New England colleges and universities studied totals about 68,000. Black students represent about 4

per cent of the total student body. Although their representation ranges from about 1 to 14 per cent across the sample, in 7 of the 10 New England colleges and universities studied, black students represent 3 per cent or less of the student body.

Interestingly, there appears to be no correlation between the number of black students enrolled and the intensity or number of issues of special significance to blacks which were found to be the central issues of campus unrest.

Specific Issues

The issues having special significance to black students and their frequency of occurrence as central issues are tabulated below:

Specific Issue	Per Cent of Schools Where Issue Was Significant
Racism and repression in the society	60
Afro-American studies program/department	40
Increase in black student enrollment	30
Employment of blacks in nonfaculty jobs	30
Federal government priorities	30
War in Vietnam and Cambodia	30
Afro-American cultural center/society	20
More black faculty	20
Control of black studies program	20
Universities' commitments to needs of black community	10

A careful review of the above issues strongly suggests that attitudinal changes have taken place in recent years among black college students.

Unlike their predecessors, who focused upon white middle class values, the orientation of these current black students tends to be black awareness and black cultural heritage.

As one black student stated it:

> "We need to become more knowledgeable about our own cultural heritage and the black experience, in order for us to be more relevant to the needs of the black community."

The interest in black studies programs, cultural centers, increased black student enrollment and more black faculty, all reflect this basic motivation.

A black student upperclassman stated it as follows:

> "At college, we should have the opportunity to study the black experience and to apply the intellectual resources of the college to the solution of black community problems."

The issue of racism and repression in the society was found to be broad and related to a number of other issues. Specifically, resistance by school administrators and faculty to the establishment of black studies departments and cultural centers, the

hiring of blacks for nonfaculty jobs on campus, the attitudes of whites about the Black Panther Party, and existent university and government priorities, were problems considered by many of the black respondents to result from racism and repression in the society.

The war in Vietnam and Cambodia, an issue that all black respondents recognized, was clearly not the issue of central importance to them. A black administrator pointed out:

> "The war issue is too remote and even if the war stopped tomorrow the problems of blacks in this country would not lessen to any measurable degree."

A black student said:

> "We have to do our own thing; white students seem unable to get beyond the rhetoric and what we want is change now."

<u>Black Students Methodology--Development and Presentation of Issues</u>

In most instances, black students are found to be opposed to alliances with white students in conflicts over campus issues. More often black students work to establish alliances with individuals or groups in the local or nearest black community.

The reasons for this practice are suggested in the following verbatim quotations:

> "You have to realize that very few white students really understand black problems and even the most radical white student can change his behavior, get a shave and haircut and once again be a member of good standing in the Establishment."
>
> A Black Student

> "The issues raised by black students tend to be specific and within the limits of the authority and powers of the school. Issues raised by white students tend to be less specific and removed from our sphere of authority."
>
> A White College Administrator

The following direct quotes relate to still another aspect of black student methodology.

> "The antiwar students should not try to intimidate the faculty, their argument must be made to the administration."
>
> White Faculty Member

> "At their request, I met with the black students and cautioned them to fully understand what they were demanding and communicate their demands to the right authority."
>
> Black Community Leader

> "About four of us (black faculty) met with the black students at their request and we advised them to think carefully about their demands, state them clearly in writing and hand deliver them to the top, appropriate school authority."
>
> Black Faculty Member

A white university administrator described the following incident:

> "At the initial meeting, the black students read their list of demands to the chancellor. The dean of students and two other lesser administrators were present. The chancellor agreed to meet with the students again one week hence. Unexpectedly, the chancellor had to go out of town for important university business and was not available for the second meeting. When the black students arrived, they were informed by the dean of students that he had been authorized by the chancellor to continue the discussion of student demands, the student spokesman told the dean that if the chancellor were not there in twelve hours there would be no further basis for discussion. The black student group walked out of the room. The chancellor was informed of the crises by phone and he arranged with difficulty for an early return flight."

The refusal of the black students to discuss their demands with anyone other than the top school authority is the point of the incident detailed above. This characteristic of the black student methodology exists in sharp contrast to their white student counterpart.

In summary, the specific issues and the methods for defining, presenting and negotiating them for the black students in the New England schools surveyed tend to be different from those of the white students. Our findings do not show that there are no

areas of mutual support between blacks and white students, but they do clearly indicate that the initial development of issues of special significance to black students and the strategies for presentation and negotiation are done exclusively by blacks.

Characteristics of the Black Students

The majority of black students on the ten white college campuses studied can generally be characterized as urban-ghetto residents from low to lower middle income families, who tend to be somewhat ambivalent in their middle class orientation, emotionally and philosophically reflecting varying degrees of commitment to the new concepts of black pride and self-determinism. In most instances their primary and secondary education has been poorer in quality than that of their white counterparts.

The majority of black students on New England campuses are not activist and at best only identify emotionally with the issues but do not take part in any specific action. They tend to be similar in their behavior on campus to the average white student.

As a group, the black students enrolled as "special students" (partial or full subsidy of college expenses by means other than conventional academic scholarships) tend to be more actively

involved in black issue confrontations on campus than other black students (conventional scholarships and tuition paying students).

Possibly a meaningful classification of black students enrolled in New England white colleges and universities might be the following:

a. Conventional Students

In attendance because they and/or their parent or sponsors believe that they will receive a better quality education in the white college or university than they would get in a predominantly black, southern college or university. Their single major course of study is customarily in one of the conventional fields or professions such as education, humanities, physical sciences, or medicine, dentistry or law.

b. Dual Major Students

In attendance because they believe a better quality education is obtainable; but they are also concerned about the relevancy of their academic preparation to their interest in participating personally in the

"process to improve the quality of life of black community residents." They tend to be activist in campus confrontations. They carry two majors, one from the conventional fields and the second one from the college or universities Afro-American Studies Department.

c. Afro-Culturist Students

Likely to be enrolled as a special student and has a basic interest in receiving quality academic preparation. If the choice were his he would major in African Culture and/or Afro-American Studies only. A strong supporter of the concept for a campus based or connected Afro-American Cultural Center. Emotionally and philosophically he is a separatist and he believes that the new and evolving concept of the all black university (not the traditional Negro university or college) is the only place that blacks can receive relevant higher education.

Black Faculty and Administrators

The lines of communication appear open between black faculty and activist black students at the New England colleges studied.

This pattern contrasts sharply with that of the typical relationship between white faculty and activist white students, where lines of communication usually do not exist.

Black administrators at the New England schools studied were also found to have reasonably good relationships with the activist black students.

The gradual increase of black faculty and administrators at the white New England colleges studied has close correlation with the increasing enrollment of black students and the content of the black student demands at these schools.

The new black faculty and administrators at the colleges in our sample more often than not are involved in student counseling, some phase of the school's Black Studies Program, or its efforts to establish such a program. Being able to relate to black students has enabled them to influence the student's life on campus and at the same time to be helpful to white college administrators and faculty in terms of their better understanding of present day black attitudes.

Resolution Efforts by College Administrators

Relatively speaking, the issues raised by black students at the ten New England colleges and universities studied have had more success in terms of negotiation and partial resolution than issues raised by white students.

College administrators in our sample feel that the issues raised by black students tend to be specific and within their authority to handle and this is apparently the main reason for the resolution efforts being more successful.

In reviewing the incidence of campus unrest relative to the demands and actions of the black students at the ten New England colleges and universities studied, we note the absence of violence and destruction of school property, even though black students engaged in building take-overs.

To the extent that the results of our study of the ten New England colleges and universities relate directly to issues of special significance to black students, we suggest the following as the key findings:

a. College administrators are willing to discuss and negotiate student demands which are specific and within the realm of the administrator's authority.

b. Black faculty and administrators, in addition to their functions in teaching and administration and counseling, are very effective mediators, who provide valuable assistance to both black students and white faculty and administrators.

c. The current thinking and attitudes of many black college students leads them to seek black awareness and knowledge of their own cultural heritage, while obtaining a college degree, instead of white middle class values, as did their predecessors. It is primarily for this reason that the establishment of black studies programs or departments and Afro-American Cultural Centers, increased black student enrollment, more black faculty, and the diminution of racism and repression in the society are issues of key importance to them.

CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS

This concluding section centers on two themes which have been common to much of the preceding discussion of the findings:

1. The issues raised in campus disruptions, and

2. The dynamics of conflicts concerning these issues.

Types of Issues Raised in Campus Disruptions

Many of the issues raised in campus disruptions can be roughly divided among three categories which are based on where the issues have their impact. These three categories are described below with examples of the kinds of issues which arose classified according to the locus of their impact.

1. Issues having their main focus inside the university, such as grading and examination policies, tenure decisions, courses of study to be offered, and a voice for students in governing the university.

2. Issues having their main focus outside the university, such as the war in Southeast Asia, fair trials for Black Panthers, and protection of the environment.

them than the students; if the issues are strictly university matters, authority to resolve them properly belongs to the administration.

Lack of interest and acceptance of the authority of the administration within the local community prevent students from finding support for their positions on campus issues outside the university.

Within the university the students have similar difficulty in gaining power by recruiting allies. Many faculty members feel it is professionally risky to join actively with students in protests directed specifically and exclusively at the administration. Furthermore, the faculty may be included along with the administration in students' complaints and demands for changes in university policies. When this happens, faculty members tend to identify their interests, as a group, with the administration rather than with students.

The administration is likely to have control in dealing with campus-bound issues because they have power in the problem areas which are at issue. This minimizes cross pressures on the administration. It also allows the administration to negotiate because they are able both to make concessions and to enforce sanctions.

The success black students have had in negotiating campus issues with top administration officials exemplifies the points made above about issues having their primary impact within the university.

Issues Having Their Main Focus Outside the University

Issues having their main focus outside the university tend to have a unifying effect on campus, though they may inspire demonstrations and other expressive forms of activism. The lines of cleavage on these broader issues, having an indirect impact on the university, do not cut through and divide the university. Despite its internal fractionalization, the intellectually and socially elite group, which is a university, displays more commonality of interest and more similarities than differences in terms of society as a whole. For example, on most campuses included in the sample, the movement into Cambodia created unity and changed the focus from the campus to the White House. Such results were spoken of as having "saved" universities from increasingly fierce divisions over more local, university matters.

In contrast to the campus issues discussed before, students find that on noncampus issues their positions agree with those held by

substantial portions of the faculty, administrators, and townspeople. But common interests do not necessarily forge group organization or effective action.

The potential for disruption carried by these issues focusing outside the university exists almost entirely in the target chosen for the expressive forms of activism the issues inspire. If the university as a group can maximize its common interests and agree on tactics, disruptions are unlikely to occur. If, on the other hand, students choose to make the university administrators the target for their demonstrations, despite a measure of sympathy among administrators for student positions, disruptions do become likely.

Demonstrations directed at university authorities on noncampus issues such as the war are extremely frustrating for university administrators. Administrators understand that they cannot produce, on demand, an end to the war, and so they may deal harshly with the tactics used by students for lack of power to affect the substantive issues raised. But swift and forceful action against demonstrations is difficult when the administrators feel sympathy for the positions being advocated. The result is often to wait until tensions have risen on both sides and disruption is so severe that it can be dealt with only by force.

Cross pressures on administrators in these situations are great. Because the issues do involve the community outside the university, demands for preemptive and then disciplinary action to maintain control flow in upon the administration from groups whose support is critical to the university's well-being.

The most effective leadership which college administrators can provide in such situations is to help retarget the expressions of opinion into more appropriate areas and use the educational resources of the university to teach about the restraints and methods of operating in these areas outside the university. This was successfully done by at least one university in our sample. The refusal of another university to do this was cited as the major cause of problems on that campus.

Issues Combining Direct Implications for Life On and Off Campus

Those issues having impact within the university and in the local community proved to be most volatile. This appears to be true because of the way features of conflict over campus and noncampus issues are combined when these dual focus questions are at issue.

As with off-campus issues, students have good chances for recruiting allies to their side. These issues with impact on and off campus do inspire interest and opinions within the local community. Furthermore, the groups whose opinions coincide with student opinions tend to lack spokesmen and public visibility; for example, poor people concerned about expansion of the university and destruction of cheap housing, minority groups eager to see freer university enrollment and employment policies, housewives hoping to see pollution curbed, and high school students anxious about the draft.

On these issues, university students have both allies and an advocacy, leadership role to play. Thus, they have power to balance against that of the university administration.

In addition, they have issues on which they can separate themselves from more traditional, if also liberal, bodies of opinion existing within the university. This feature of conflict over these dual-focus issues is similar to the division created within the university by campus issues, except that here students have good chances for finding some allies within the university.

Those within the university supporting the students' issue positions feel freer to be actively engaged with them on these issues than they do on campus issues because the university administration is not the exclusive target. Also, these more substantive and less procedural issues inspire reliance on concepts of academic freedom as opposed to employer-employee loyalty, particularly among faculty members.

In contrast to off-campus issues, university administrators cannot deal with demonstrations over these issues by retargeting them. The university does have some power to affect the substance of the demands being made, whether or not it chooses to exercise it.

As with disruptions arising over off-campus issues, disruptions over dual-focus issues are less amenable to control by university administrators than disruptions over campus issues. The university can seek to control students but can do less to control the students' allies.

Cross pressures are increased beyond those which administrators experience on off-campus issues. While some groups outside the university demand controlling action, on these issues other

groups blame the university, saying only acquiescence to substantive demands can resolve the problems.

The combined effect of these features, some of which are common to on-campus issues, others common to off-campus issues, is to improve the chances for strenuous, prolonged conflict. At the point when students might be able to negotiate and compromise, having achieved a more balanced power relationship with the university, the university is paralized and cannot negotiate, retarget, or control the disruptions with traditional means.

Student frustrations in this situation mount quickly, and two responses are predictable. The first possibility: tactics are escalated with the hope of overbalancing the administration and winning concessions that were not granted. The second possibility: issue positions are expressed in increasingly doctrinaire ways until the students have alienated many of their allies.

Both of these responses tend to eliminate possibilities of negotiation and compromise because, in pursuing them, students dissipate their power. The resolution mechanism which is furthered by these two possibilities is the establishment of control by forceful means. Either the students invite retaliation by their

own increasingly extreme tactics, or their diminishing power and increasing shrillness make a preemptive use of forceful tactics attractive.

In such situations violence becomes likely to a degree and for reasons which do not apply when the two other kinds of questions are at issue.

In this discussion of issues, a connection has been made between the kinds of questions at issue and the dynamics involved in conflicts over them. A critical concept has been the different lines of cleavage imposed by different kinds of issues. These different lines of cleavage affect the likelihood of students:

1. Finding allies to join them, and
2. Marking out issue positions that split the university and separate them from other groups within the university.

Issues having impact both inside and outside the university were seen as being particularly volatile because they increased both of the possibilities listed above and minimized the opportunities for control and resolution except by forceful means. Other

kinds of issues, with impact primarily on or off campus, did not maximize both possibilities for students gaining power and did not limit the methods of control and resolution so severely.

This concluding section has sought to describe the issues and dynamics of campus conflict and make its course more predictable and therefore more subject to analysis.

In Phase II of this study research will center on three instructive cases of conflict and the attempts made at conflict resolution. From Phase I research, some guidelines for concentrating on conflict resolution can be derived.

Three conditions appear to be necessary, if not sufficient, prerequisites for resolving campus conflicts. These are:

1. A balance of power in which both students and the university can exercise some sanctions and can afford to make some concessions in negotiations. The weight of the balance should be on the side of orderly and civil resolution without eliminating possibilities for change.

2. A recognized, legitimate voice and role for students in the resolution procedures.

3. Some "rules of the game" which would define as unambiguously as possible limits on the tactics appropriate in disagreements on campus, the enforcement procedures for maintaining these limits, and the kinds of actions which remain immune from control.

Phase II research will look at the conditions under which such preresolution conditions appear, and at the methods and consequences of trying to achieve them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SECTION I: BACKGROUND ANALYSIS OF STUDENT ACTIVISM

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SECTION I: BACKGROUND ANALYSIS OF STUDENT ACTIVISM

Altbach, P: Student Politics and Higher Education in the United States - Center for International Affairs, Harvard, 1967. Bibliography and comment.

Axelrod, Joseph et al: Search for Relevance, the Campus in Crisis: Jossey Bass Inc., 1969 (San Francisco).

Bell, Daniel and Kristol, Irving: Confrontation: The Student Rebellion and the Universities - New York, Basic Books, 1969. Compilation of articles from "The Public Interest."

Brown, Michael: The Politics and Anti-Politics of the Young - Glencoe Press (Berkeley Hills, California) 1969. General analysis of political views.

Cohen, Mitchell and Hale, Dennis: The New Student Left - Boston, Beacon Press, 1966. An anthology of "The New Left."

Cornell, Richard: Youth and Communism - Walker Publishing - New York, 1965.

Douglas, Bruce: Reflections on Protest - John Knox Press (Richmond, Virginia) - 1967.

Draper, Hal: The Student Movement of the Thirties - University of Illinois Press - 1967. Background on the Thirties.

Eisenstadt, Shmuel: From Generation to Generation - Glencoe Free Press - 1956.

Erikson, Eric H. (ed): The Challenge of Youth - Doubleday (Garden City) - 1965.

Feuer, Lewis, S: The Conflict of Generations, the Character and Significance of Student Movements - Basic Books, New York, 1969. History and analysis of student dissent. Special chapter on Berkeley (1964-1966).

Foster, Julian and Long, Durward: Protest Student Activism in America - 1970, William Murrow, New York. Scenes of Conflict - Case Histories - Analysis of Student Unrest.

Glazer, Nathan: "Student Politics in a Democratic Society" - American Scholar 36 (Spring 1967) pp. 202-217.

Gordon, Davis M: "Rebellion in Context" in Robert Morrison (ed) - The Contemporary University, U.S.A. - Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966 - pp. 294-314. A study of student activism.

Howe, Irving: Student Activism - Bobbs-Merrill Company - 1967 (Indianapolis). General analysis of student activism.

Jacobs, James: "SDS: Between Reform and Revolution" - The Nation - Volume 206 (June 10, 1968) pg. 853-756.

Jacobs, Paul and Landau, Saul (ed): The New Radical - Vintage - (New York) - 1966.

Katope, Christopher G. and Zolbrod, Paul G: Beyond Berkeley - World Publishing Company (Cleveland) - 1966.

Kavlos, Vytantes: "Post Modern Man - Psycho-Cultural Responses" - Social Problems #17 - Spring 1970 (435-448). Youth Culture.

Kennan, George F: Democracy and the Student Left - Bantam Books, November, 1968.
Speech at Swarthmore College on Student Left; Agreement and Dissent from Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, Yale, University of California and students at other universities.

Kenniston, Kenneth: Young Radicals, Notes on Committed Youth - Harcourt Brace and World, Inc., New York, 1968. Case Studies of Individual Radicals.
The Uncommitted - Alienated Youth in American Society, Delta-Dell, (New York) - 1965. Psychological analysis. "Student Activism, Moral Development and Morality" - American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 47:577, July, 1970.

Kirtley, Donald and Harkless, Richard: "Student and Political Activity in Relation to Personal and Social Adjustment" - Journal of Psychology 75 - July 1970 (pages 253 and ff.).

Lipset, Seymour Martin and Philip G. Altbach: Students in Revolt - Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1969.

Lipset, Seymour Martin and Earl Raab - "The Non-Generation" - Commentary Magazine, 1970 - 35-39.

Lipset, Seymour Martin: The Politics of Unreason: Right Wing Extremism in the United States - 1790-1970. Harper & Row - New York (to be published 1970). Includes chapters on history of student rebellions.

Lipset, Seymour Martin (ed) - Student Politics - New York - 1967.

Lipsky, Michael: "Protest as a Political Resource," - American Political Science Review - Volume 62, No. 4 (December 1968) pg. 1144-1158. Study of protest action, strategy, tactics, predictive behavior.

Luce, Philip Abbott: The New Left - New York, David McKay Company, 1966. Includes Chapters on the student left.

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

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

McEvoy, James and Miller, Abraham: Black Power and Student Rebellion, Belmond, Wadworth, 1969.

Mead, Margaret: Culture and Commitment - A Study of the Generation Gap - Natural History Press, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1970 (Garden City, New York). "Generation gap" explanation of student revolt.

Pauls, Frederick: Political Attitudes of Youth, 1968. Survey of literature and studies.

Pelligram, Daniel: "Dissent in the University" - Social Action - 35:16 - 1969. Analysis of dissent.

Peterson, Richard E. "The Student Left in American Higher Education" - Daedulus Volume 97 I - Winter, 1968 - Review of New Left on American Campus.

Riesman, David and Christopher Jencks: The Academic Revolution - Doubleday and Company, Garden City, New York - 1968. Analysis.

Roszak, Theodore: The Making of a Counter Culture - Anchor Books, Garden City, 1969. Analysis of the impact of major writers of the counter culture (Marcuse, Brown, Ginsberg, Goodman).

Sampson, Edward T (Ed): "Stirrings Out of Apathy" - Student Activism and the Decade of Protest - Journal of Social Sciences - (Volume 23 #3) July, 1967.

Schwab, Joseph J: College Curriculum and Student Protest - Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1969. College curriculum and its role in student protest.

Sanford, Nevitt (Ed): The American College - John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1964). A psychological and social interpretation of higher learning.

Schwartz, Edward (Ed): Student Power - Philoscphy, Program and Tactics - (Washington, D.C.) - National Student Association, 1969. Review and analysis.

Shoben, Edward J: "Toward Remedies for Restlessness, Issues in Student Unrest"- Liberal Education, 51 May, 1968 (pg. 221-230).

Spender, Stephen: The Year of the Young Rebels - New York, Vintage Books, 1969.

Urban Research Corporation: Student Protests, 1969. Review of student protests, 1969 - issues, colleges, tactics.

Yamanto, Kaoru: The College Student and His Culture - Houghton, Mifflin Company, Boston, 1968. Analysis.

SECTION II: SURVEY RESEARCH STUDY ON COLLEGE STUDENTS

SECTION II: SURVEY RESEARCH STUDY ON COLLEGE STUDENTS

Astin, Alexander: Campus Disruption, 1968-1969 - An Analysis of Causal Factors - sample stratified national sample of 427 colleges and universities reports incidence of protest; correlation between issues and tactics.

Bayer, Alan E. and Alexander Astin: Violence and Disruption on the U. S. Campus, 1968-1969. Sample 382 institutions replied to questionnaires of which 62 per cent experienced violent demonstrations.

Bayer, Alan and Alexander Astin: Social Issue and Protest Activity Recent Student Trends - February, 1970: 250,000 college freshmen responded to questionnaires: Attitudes re: family, population control, citizens' rights, campus, draft, etc.

Centra, John A: College Freshmen Attitudes Toward Cheating - 1969 sample 1,500 entering freshmen in 37 colleges.

Attitudes toward academic cheating compared to attitudes about cheating in government and industry.

Gallup, George: The Self Inventory as a Part of a Program for Individualizing Higher Education at Macalester - Fall, 1968.

Inventory given to 89 students at Princeton; 89 at Macalester; 66 Radcliffe: Religion, personality, food, smoking, drinking, grades, etc.

Gallup Opinion Index: College students' attitudes: April 24/May 3, 1970; November, 1969; April 23/May 17, 1969.

Gilbert Survey: National Survey - 1969 - drug use sample 5,868 on national basis.

Drug use in high school, college, out of school.

Harris, Louis and Assoc.: A Summary of College Seniors and the Peace Corps - 1967 sample 1,005 seniors on 50 campuses.

Traces attitudes and trends of attitudes on college seniors' feelings re: the Peace Corps.

Harris, Louis: A study of 820 college students - attitudes and views - May 20, 1970.

Hartnett, Rodney: Differences in Selected Attitudes and College Orientations Between Black Students Attending Traditionally Negro and Traditionally White Institutions - July, 1969.

Sample 3,104 black students at 9 black schools and 323 blacks from "integrated" schools: family background, political views and attitudes toward issues.

Hassenger, Robert: Protest on the Catholic Colleges - 1967-1968 - sample 196 Catholic schools responding.

Kerpelman, L. C.: "Student Political Activism and Ideology: Comparative Characteristics of Activists and Nonactivists," Journal of Counseling Psychology, in press.

McCain, Minta: Marijuana Use in the Small College: A Midwest Example.

500 college enrollees - 12 per cent blacks - co-ed liberal arts church related schools.

Mizner, MD: Patterns of Drug Use Among College Students - May, 1969 sample 41,587 undergrads and grad students from 9 schools.

National Student Association: Survey of Campus Demonstrations During Fall, 1967 - sample 38,911 participants, 101 schools and 221 demonstrations.

Reasons, forms, arrests, characteristics.

Opinion Research Corporation: The Adult and Teen-Age Publics Appraise College Student Demonstrations.

Sample 1,084 adults (18 years and over) 979 whites, 105 nonwhites, and 610 teen-agers (12-17 years) 535 whites, 75 nonwhites.

How demonstrations are handled; handling of demonstrators; causes of student demonstrations, etc.

Orbell, John: "Protest Participation Among Southern Negro College Students," American Political Science Review, Vol. 61 (June, 1967), pp. 446-456.

Peterson, Richard E.: "The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964-1965," Princeton, New Jersey, Educational Testing Service, 1966.

Peterson, Richard and John Centra: Organized Student Protest and Institutional Functioning, September, 1969.

Sample administrators of 50 colleges, June, 1968 relevant to the student protest activity on their campuses during 1967-1968.

Psychology Today: 2,000 college seniors - mail survey.

"Profile of a Nonconformist Youth Culture: A Study of the Berkeley Nonstudents," Sociology of Education, Vol. 41 (Spring, 1968), pp. 178-200.

"Some Sociological Differences Between Highly Committed Members of the Free Speech Movement and the Student Population at Berkeley," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 1 (January-March, 1965).

Research Information Center: Attitudes of College Students Toward Business Careers.

Sample 19,963 males who were graduating seniors at 135 colleges. A longitudinal study involving these people's responses for 3 years.

Roper Research Assoc.: A Study of the Beliefs and Attitudes of Male College Seniors, Freshmen and Alumni - May, 1969.

Sample 1,000 male seniors, 500 male freshmen, 673 alumni interviewed. Attitude toward institutions, morals, ethics, life style.

Sasajima, Masu and Davis, J. A.: "Organized Student Protest and Institutional Climate," American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 5 (1968), pp. 291-304.

Simon, William, et al Student Politics: Continuities in Political Socialization - sample 1,200 students at colleges and universities.

Political categorization of family and self; generation gap; political comparison between self and other students and professors.

Solomon, Frederic: Youth and Peace: A Psychosocial Study of Student Peace Demonstrators in Washington, D. C.

Sample 247 students interviewed for one and one-half hours each.

Solomon, F. and Fishman, J. R.: "Youth and Peace: A Psychosocial Study of Peace Demonstrators.

Watley, Donivan: Career or Marriage: A Longitudinal Study of Able Young Women.

Sample 883 women National Merit Scholars studied from 1956-1960 on longitudinal basis looks at career plans, aspirations and reality.

Wertz, Charles: Career Changes in College.

Sample 30,000 male freshmen students - survey done by mail - follow up the changes in career plans.

Westby, D. L. and Braungart, R. G.: "Class and Politics in the Family Background of Student Political Activists," American Sociological Review, Vol. 31 (1966), pp. 690-692.

Yankelovich, Inc. Daniel: "Profile of a Generation" Columbia Broadcasting System, April, 1969.

A study of the college and noncollege population/and their parents.

Yankelovich, Inc. Daniel: "A New Kind of Rebellion" Fortune Magazine, 1968 - Forerunner versus Practical-Minded Students.

Yankelovich, Inc. Daniel: "Youth Update" (not released) April, 1970.

SECTION III: CASE STUDIES - SPECIFIC COLLEGE CAMPUSES

SECTION III: CASE STUDIES - SPECIFIC COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Avorn, Jerry L. et al: Up Against the Ivy Wall - A History of the Columbia Crisis - Atheneum, 1968, New York.

Barton, Allen H.: The Columbia Crisis: Campus, Vietnam and the Ghetto - Columbia University, 1968.

Bell, Daniel: "Columbia and the New Left" - Public Interest #13 - Fall, 1968.

Bunzel, John H.: "Black Studies at San Francisco State" - Public Interest #13 - Fall, 1968.

Christie, Richard, Friedman, Lucy and Ross, Alice: "The New Left and Its Ideology" - Ongoing study at Columbia University.

Cox Commission Report: Crisis at Columbia - Vintage-Random House, New York, April, 1968.

deGraaf, Lawrence B. Howard: The Evolution of a Black Student Revolt - (Included in Protest, Student Activism in America/Fostee/Long).

Donadio, Stephen: "Black Power at Columbia" - Commentary, September, 1968.

Draper, Hal: Berkeley, the New Student Revolution - Grove Press, Inc., New York, 1965.

Duerr, Edwin C.: "Police on the Campus - Crisis at San Francisco State" - Educational Record #2, Vol. 50 pp. 126-130.

Foster, Julian and Long, Durward: Protest-Student Activism in America - William Morrow & Co., 1970.

Feuer, Lewis: "Rebellion at Berkeley" - New Leader 47, December 21, 1964, pp. 3-12.

Glazer, Nathan: "Student Power at Berkeley" - Public Interest #13, Fall, 1968.

Hilberry, Conrad: "Civil Disobedience at Oberlin" - Educational Record, Vol. 49 #2 - Spring, 1968

Hook, Sidney: "Second Thoughts on Berkeley" - Teacher's College Record 2 (1965) pp. 32-63.

Horowitz, David: Student - Ballentine Books, 1962 - Subject: Berkeley.

Kelman, Stephen: Push, Goes to Shove - Harvard.

Kunen, James Simon: The Strawberry Statement (Columbia University) Random House, New York, 1969.

Lipsett, Seymour Martin and Wolin, Sheldon S.: The Berkeley Student Revolt - Anchor, New York, 1965.

Miller, Michael V. and Gilmore, Susan: Revolution at Berkeley - Dell, 1965.

Scimecca, Joseph and Dauriano, Roland: Crisis at St. Johns - Strike and Revolution on the Catholic Campus - Random House, New York, 1967.

Tarcov, Nathan: "The Last Four Years at Cornell" - Public Interest #13 - Fall, 1968.

Warren, Bill (ed): The Middle of the Country - Avon Books, New York, 1970 - The events at Kent State.

Williams, Douglas: Cornell University Survey - Dome for Special Trustee Committee, October, 1969.

END