

*In the original flyer for the conference, I was listed
as having something to say about student development. My topic
in the revised edition of program I appear to have my similarity
original subject. SOME CORRELATES OF STUDENT PROTEST *Examining a woman's
perspective, she
changed my mind.**

K. Patricia Cross

~~The title for my remarks today doesn't appear to bear much similarity~~
~~to the title that appeared in your pre-conference materials.~~ Only a dedi-
cated Pollyanna would claim that student growth and development and student
protest are synonymous. I am not ^{really} that optimistic about the present scene,
nor have I completely forgotten what it's like to be a dean of students.
As a matter of fact as I looked at the familiar buildings of Cornell
University on television and in the press, the forceful message was that
if I were still dean of students on that troubled campus, I am certain that
I would not be greatly concerned with reading or hearing about the theoretical
and research foundations for student development. Nevertheless, I am going
to back off from the immediate crises far enough to maintain that student
protest and student development are not unrelated.

For many, the most urgent question in education today is, How can
we bring an end to the campus confrontations? The polarization of the
bewildered public over this question appears to be growing. Some condemn
the students and the younger generation in general while defending the
institutional status quo. Others condemn society, the colleges, and the
older generation in general while defending ^{all} the protestors against ~~all~~
criticism. Thus some advise us to put down the youthful rebels by force,
and others advise putting our colleges in order by removing all reason

Prepared for the joint NASPA-Center for Research & Development in Higher
Education Conference on "The Student Dean--A Campus Activist?"
June 18-21, 1969, San Diego, California.
June 21, 1969, San Diego, Calif.

for protest. Yet, we know from experience that the show of force radicalizes the moderates and escalates the hostilities, and it is sometimes pretty difficult for institutions to move fast enough to remove all reason for protest. Who would have predicted some months ago, for example, that permitting a plot of university land to lie idle would be poor institutional policy and a tinder box for Berkeley's most recent confrontation?

Like many others who don't know the answer to the question of how to end student protest, I would suggest that it is the wrong question to ask. The question we might better be asking is, What is to be learned from the protests, and in particular, how can students learn from the experience? If we ever wanted student involvement in the learning process, we have it now. Whatever else it may be, a confrontation is undoubtedly a vivid learning experience for many students. In all likelihood, it holds greater potential for student development than does ^{much of the} the traditional classroom ^{may even be} education. ^{lecture.} There ~~is even~~ something a little ironic about the overconcern of those who insist that the protest be put down--by force if necessary--so that those who want to learn can get back to the classroom.

It may be time to forsake our defensive roles of the past and to try to understand not only the implications of the movement for the future of higher education, but also the dynamics of the protests and how and what students are learning from them and perhaps, more importantly, what they could be learning.

In the present climate some students are learning that the use of force and violence is the way to get what they want. Others, hopefully, are learning that individuals can make a difference and that social

reform can be accomplished through united concern and direct social action. Some students today are becoming highly proficient in learning the skills of a ruthless political manipulation in which the game is to see if the enemy can be provoked into an overreaction which will galvanize the onlookers into participants; others may be learning effective yet humane techniques for social reform as they attempt to reconcile the conflicts that result from differing value perspectives. Some students are undoubtedly learning a sensitive concern for the dignity of all men, while others are simply identifying new targets for hate and derision as they remove the yoke from black man only to place it upon the policeman or the college president. I submit that those of us who are concerned with the climate of learning have some responsibility for the lessons that are learned.

There are numerous ways to go about increasing our understanding of the dynamics of protest. The most painful method may be to participate in a confrontation on your own campus. In this workshop, however, we shall attempt to offer more vicarious learning experiences.

Tomorrow you will have the opportunity to analyze with Dr. Henderson the dynamics of the well-documented crises at San Francisco State College. This morning I should like to approach the topic through a synthesis of data from campuses across the country to see if there are any generalizations that can be made about the present protest phenomena. Following the presentation of systematically gathered facts about the protest movement, you will be meeting in smaller discussion sessions to talk about the practical implications for student development and for institutional change.

Most of the research and writing about student protest has been directed toward describing the protestors, and I think that the earlier findings about the student activists of the 1964 Berkeley Free Speech era are fairly well known by student personnel administrators. As yet we have little research data about the personal characteristics of some of the more recent protestors. Tentatively I will advance the thesis that we have two distinct groups of campus dissidents now. In some ways they are similar and in other ways they are opposites. Both groups are sharply critical of the present society, but for quite different reasons. On the one hand, we have the affluent children of suburbia who have nothing left to work for in a materialistic society. They have most of what money can buy. Their cry seems to be that money and its power in America today have been idolized at the expense of love, honesty, and human decency.

In vivid contrast to the privileged youth from the suburbs are the disadvantaged youth of the inner city. They, too, find something lacking in society, but for them it is a fair share of the tangible benefits of a wealthy society. On a continuum of materialism, we find extreme dissatisfaction on the part of those who have had too much and those who have had too little of the economic benefits of our society. Viewed in this way, perhaps it is logical that the criticism should be directed toward "middleclass" values. The middle classes may have more reason to defend a society which has given them something to work for and a fair chance to attain the goal.

I want to talk this morning not about research on the students but about the institutions involved in protest. ~~For most of the data, I shall~~

draw upon the research of Dr. Richard Peterson, Research Psychologist at Educational Testing Service in Berkeley.

Peterson's data come from two surveys--one conducted in 1965 and one in 1968 (4,5). Some of you undoubtedly participated in the studies, since he sent questionnaires to the top student personnel administrators at all accredited 4-year degree-granting institutions in the United States. The questionnaire listed 27 protest issues and asked the respondent to check which had been the subject for organized student protest on his campus during the year 1964-65 or 1967-68. I shall concentrate on the correlates of the later survey, using the earlier one occasionally for comparisons and trends. Thanks to the cooperative spirit and interest of student personnel administrators, Peterson received a rather remarkable 86% return which provides protest data for 859 four-year colleges and universities.

Nationally, the most common issues for student protest in 1967-68 were, ^{the} the Vietnam war (38%), dormitory and other living group regulations, e.g., womens' hours (34%), civil rights (29%), and insufficient student participation in establishing campus policy (27%). Close runner-ups for protest were food service (25%), the draft (25%), on-campus recruiting by the armed forces (25%), or by Dow, CIA, etc., (20%), and dress regulations (20%). Half of these top issues for protest are off-campus issues concerned with national policies, while the other half relate to on-campus policies and practices. Peterson's study included other protest issues, such as the quality of instruction, faculty freedom and tenure, campus policies concerning controversial speakers and censorship of publications,

but the incidence of protest as well as the number of people involved turned out to be rather small for these issues. Hence I shall confine my attention to two primary clusters of issues: 1) those concerned primarily with on-campus regulations of a paternalistic nature, and 2) those off-campus issues generally related to protest of broad social problems.

The social protest cluster includes 6 specific issues: U. S. policies regarding Vietnam, the draft, on-campus recruiting by the armed services, on-campus recruiting by other agencies such as Dow, CIA and the like, and civil rights protests off campus but in the local community. The major campus leadership for protests of these issues has come from the SDS and other New Left groups. The second cluster consists of the on-campus paternalism issues including the following: dormitory and living regulations such as womens' hours, drinking regulations, food service, and dress regulations. It is of considerable interest to note that there is no correlation ($r=.05$) between these two clusters. This means that the presence of one type of protest doesn't predict anything about the other. If two kinds of protest can be distinguished for the year 1967-68, it is instructive to see what kinds of campuses had which kinds of protest. ETS researchers have attempted to relate the protest issues to two measures of the campus environment, the College and University Environment scales (CUES) (3) and the Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI) (7).

The IFI is a new instrument consisting of 132 items grouped into 11 scales which purport to measure various aspects of the campus functioning as faculty members perceive it. (See Table 1 for scale definitions).

Since both protest and IFI data were available for 50 institutions, it was possible to compute correlations between ^{protest} ~~the intensity of protest~~ (weighted from 1 through 4 on a scale from "no protest" through "repeated and prolonged protest") and ~~faculty perceptions of the campus environment~~ ^{and} the IFI scales (6). Some very interesting findings emerged. Campuses having a high intensity of protest over the social issues also had high IFI scores on the following: ^{describing the campus dimensions} concern of students and faculty for the improvement of society ($r=.61$), attitudinal diversity among students and faculty ($r=.59$), ~~concern for the advancement of knowledge, i.e.,~~ faculty research orientation ($r=.43$), faculty and student academic and personal freedom ($r=.42$), and an extracurriculum offering intellectual and aesthetic stimulation ($r=.34$). In addition to these IFI relationships, Peterson has reported significant correlations between social protest issues and the proportion of faculty holding doctorates and--not surprisingly--the proportion of student body estimated to belong to New Left organizations (5).

In an earlier ETS project using 1965 protest data and CUES as a measure of student perceptions of campus environment (8), the findings were consistent with those reported for the IFI. Many of you are familiar with the five CUES scales measuring the press of the college environment for Practicality, Community, Awareness, Propriety, and Scholarship. You can probably guess from what has already been said which ones showed high relationship to war-related and civil rights issues. Awareness, which is a measure of student concern for political and social issues was highly related to civil rights protest ($r=.57$) and to protest about

U. S. military policies (~~r=.54~~). Scholarship, which is a measure of the extent to which knowledge, ideas, and scholarship are valued on the campus, was more moderately related (~~r=.37~~) to both protest issues.

From these statistical relationships, it is possible to draw a profile of the type of institution that was highly likely to have organized demonstrations about social issues during 1967-68, and as any newspaper reader or TV watcher could testify, these characteristics of the protest-prone institution would seem equally appropriate for 1968-69.

- 1) Students and faculty at the institution are concerned about national and international affairs and are interested in bringing about social change in America, i.e., activist people are present on the campus.
- 2) Students and faculty represent a diversity of backgrounds and attitudes.
- 3) There is a strong emphasis on research and scholarship with a high proportion of PhD's on the faculty.
- 4) Academic and personal freedoms are valued for both students and faculty.

These characteristics describe the Berkeleys, the Columbias, the Harvards, and the Cornells. They are large, selective, affluent, institutions that attract a scholarly faculty and ^{primarily} the bright activist children of liberal, well-educated, affluent parents. Given this set of characteristics for the social protest-prone institution, it's pretty hard to come up with any answer to a question that states the problem as how to end the protests. Be less selective? Give up faculty research? Try for greater homogeneity? Look for students and faculty less interested in social reform? These traits are at the very heart of many of our great universities, and few would advocate their total reorientation.

If we concede that in a society beset with problems, socially concerned people are going to seek ways to bring about reform, then the important question is not whether protest occurs but how it is conducted. Surely the academic community--radicals and establishmentarians alike--must devise more creative methods to tackle the enormous problems involved in social change. I believe that we are beginning to see some more constructive approaches and I'll say more about recent trends later.

I'd like to turn now to an analysis of the correlates of the second cluster of protest issues--those which are related to campus regulations. Although women's hours, liquor regulations, rules about dress, and complaints about the food service seem like old stuff to deans, it is worth noting that in 1967-68, the number of campuses experiencing organized protest about living group regulations (34%) was second only to the number protesting U. S. policies in Vietnam (39%), and there were as many protests regarding food service (25%) as there were regarding the draft or on-campus recruiting by the armed services. Furthermore, protests about ^{campus} regulations were more widespread geographically and they involved larger percentages of the student body (5) than did the widely publicized social protests. Whereas the deans estimated that roughly 5% of the student body were involved in organized protest for off-campus issues, they estimated just about double this number for the campus paternalism issues. While a few students are deeply involved in the social problems of our times, regulations regarding personal behavior affect virtually all students, and it is not surprising that when such issues become the focus of attention, large numbers of students are moved to express their feelings

on the matter. Despite the number of incidents and the number of protestors involved, the correlates of protest for on-campus issues present a more complex picture than that for the off-campus social issues. One might predict that colleges with a lot of rules and regulations would be a perfect target for protests about paternalism. This is not the case, and it undoubtedly hinges on the fact that students who object to regulations don't go to colleges emphasizing them. The CUES Practicality scale measuring the extent to which the environment is structured and orderly, governed by rules and regulations, is negatively correlated with protests about college paternalism. This indicates that there are few student protests on campuses that define appropriate behavior by the use of regulations.

Thus, it appears from the research that there are two kinds of campuses relatively free of protest about college paternalism--those with many regulations and those with few. Colleges with numerous regulations tend to attract students who aren't likely to be upset by the restrictions. Colleges with few regulations lack in loco parentis as a potential issue for protest even though activist students may be attracted to the college. It seems, however, that there comes a time when the institution has to catch up to changes taking place in society. For example, dress regulations, probably the most anachronistic of all college regulations, are likely to be a subject for protest at church-related colleges, especially Catholic colleges. About one-third of the Catholic colleges had protests about dress in 1968, compared with only 15% of the public liberal arts colleges (5).

The distinctions between the correlates of social protest and the protest of regulations can be seen in table 2. This chart lists the 27

11-27
issues for protest and their correlations with the 11 scales of the IFI.

I want to concentrate on only four of the IFI scales because in an analysis of these lies the heart of my message this morning. Note that all of the correlations in the IS (Concern for the Improvement of Society) column are positive. The IS scale is a pretty good measure of student and faculty social activism, and the fact that all correlations are positive simply means that if there are activist people on campus, there are likely to be protests. As would be expected the correlations are especially large for the six social protest issues numbered 22-27. In contrast to this scale, note that all of the correlations in the UL (Concern for Undergraduate Learning) scale are negative. This means that institutions scoring high on UL are unlikely to have protests. From other data about colleges scoring high on UL we know that they are small and not ^{especially} very selective; they have a high faculty-student ratio and few outside research contracts. For example, there is little protest about classified research (item 27) or Dow recruiters on campus (item 25) because neither situation exists on high UL campuses. Generally speaking, high UL colleges are not noted for attracting activist students. In these two columns lie much of the research information supporting the public stereotype of activist and non-activist campuses. It is the research basis for the implications of the news media as to why President Nixon selected General Beadle College in South Dakota instead of Berkeley to present his views on campus unrest. But between the protest-prone campuses and the tranquil campuses lie the campuses that tend to be selective about their issues for protest, and they are perhaps the most interesting of all. Referring to Table 2, observe that the DG (Democratic Governance)

scale and the CI (Concern for Innovation) scale are the only two scales to have consistently positive correlations for off-campus social protest issues (items 22-27) and negative correlations for on-campus ~~paternalism~~ issues (items 1-21). This pattern indicates that colleges emphasizing democratic governance and educational innovations attract activist students who protest the social issues, but not campus ^{practices} regulations.

From the standpoint of the liberal administrator, it would appear desirable to attract students who were concerned about social problems but who, at the same time, are satisfied with the practices of the college. Lest we conclude too hastily that democratic governance and innovation are the recipes for preventing protest directly threatening to the institution, let us look a little more closely at the correlations. I suspect that the negative correlations of DG and CI with Alleged Censorship (Item 9) and Dress Regulations (item 15) are largely a result of the fact that neither censorship nor dress regulations are likely to exist on democratically governed campuses concerned with innovation. It's not quite so easy to dismiss the correlations for item 20, Student-administration Communication. The negative correlation here indicates that students are not likely to express dissatisfaction or frustration about the lack of opportunity to communicate with administrators. This is especially interesting since institutions scoring high on DG and CI are not necessarily small colleges where it is assumed that communication is an easier process. As a matter of fact, from other information we know that there is almost no correlation between enrollment and democratic governance. This would indicate that both large and small institutions can give the feeling that true democratic

governance exists. The fact that students on democratic campuses tend not to protest communication gaps between students and administrators indicate that they, too, feel a part of the governing process. Antioch College is the prototype of the highly democratic, highly innovative college. As I was formulating the research conclusion that students who have a voice in college policy are less likely to protest it, the following newspaper comment caught my attention. "If students are given a meaningful role in the governance of a college or university, are they less likely to tear the place apart? The answer from Antioch College, a pioneer in the student participation movement, is a tentative yes" (9). Obviously the research indicates a tentative yes also. One thing we are beginning to hear is that the hard-core radicals do not want to see the dilution of their impact by the seating of students on university committees. Such participation, they argue, takes the heart out of the revolution by co-opting the moderates and diverting the radical activists from the cause of the revolution.

Revolutionaries to the contrary for the moment, let's take a closer look at some of the research on democratic governance. As the IFI defines the scales, there is a very high relationship between Democratic Governance and Concern for Innovation ($r=.70$). If one seeks interpretations beyond the correlations, three possible explanations could be posed:

- 1) that democratic institutions tend to be innovative because of the different perspectives and ideas that are fed into the system through wide participation,
- 2) that innovative colleges tend to be democratic because democratic governance is a popular innovation today, or

3) that faculty respondents to the IFI perceive the institution as innovative when they feel they have an active part in the decision-making process.

However you choose to interpret the relationship, most people seem to think that democratic governance is probably a "good thing." According to the research, students and deans of students are overwhelmingly in favor of greater student participation in institutional governance. In a recent study at the Center for Higher Education at Berkeley, it was found that one thing that all students--conservative, moderate, and radical--agreed upon was that there should be greater student involvement in setting campus policy (1). *Dallup claims 86% ✓ for it, CSE Exam, June '74* In a recent survey of deans of students conducted by College Management Magazine, 90% of the university deans and 70% of the four-year college deans said they had had student requests this year for a larger role in the governance of the institution (2). Furthermore, over half of the four-year college and university deans said that in their opinion, students did not participate enough at present and that administrators, faculty, and trustees were more receptive to proposals for increased student participation this year than they were a year ago. As if to support this perception of receptivity, 80% of the deans predicted that student participation in college governance would be greater 5 years from now than it is today.

With this seemingly overwhelming sentiment from students and deans, why aren't we moving faster to implement these desires? According to the deans, it is the faculty who are resisting. In the College Management survey 55% of deans identified the faculty as the most resistant group, while 21% said it was the trustees, and only 19% blamed the administration.

The deans may be right, but it depends largely on what kind of student participation is advocated. As deans of students well know, faculty are ordinarily quite generous about sharing the traditional powers of the administration with students. But they are considerably more cautious when it comes to sharing their own prerogatives with students. Robert C. Wilson and Jerry Gaff (10) of Center research staff found that two-thirds of the faculty sample in their study were in favor of students having a vote at least equal to that exercised by faculty and administration in the formulation of social regulations, but only 9% were willing to grant students equal power in the determination of academic policies. Students can probably take some hope from the fact that another 36% of the faculty are willing to give some vote to students (although not equal to that of the faculty) even in the sacrosanct areas of academic policy. I think there is little question that faculty authority will change just as administrative authority on the campus has changed.

In closing let me look briefly at the directions of the protest movement and the implications for the future. In analyzing trends, I can speak from research data for the changes from 1965-1968. For the past year, I'll have to rely on my interpretations of news media reports and descriptions for what's happening. The greatest change from 1965-68 was in the number of campuses experiencing protest over the war in Vietnam. In 1965, 21% of the deans reported Vietnam protests, whereas three years later, the percentage had jumped to 38%. Protests over the lack of student participation in campus governance increased from 19% to 27% and protests about living group regulations increased from 28% to 34%. Most dramatic

of all was the increase in the percentage of deans reporting New Left groups on their campuses; whereas 26% had local SDS or other leftist chapters in 1965, 46% said they had them by 1968; thus, the number of New Left chapters just about doubled in three years. *How many more?*

It is my impression that the off-campus and on-campus protest issues are merging now. From the off-campus civil rights activities of voter registration in the South and the picketing of local barbers and merchants that characterized social protest in 1965, we are moving toward confrontations regarding specific campus policies. New demands are being made regarding admissions policies and practices. At CCNY it was the admissions policy that brought the university to a standstill. At Berkeley and elsewhere, academic programs for Third World students has been a ^{critical} burning issue. Special housing for minority groups have also been a bone of contention. The civil rights issues that I have been talking about as off-campus social protest are now very much on-campus. *and directed toward how the college handles social problems.*

On the war-related issues, we've moved dramatically from the more general "peace" and "ban-the-bomb" marches to protests of campus policies regarding defense research, ROTC, college cooperation with war-related recruiters and the like. Even the language seems to reflect the more direct confrontation of college practices as opposed to the earlier protests about the problems of the larger society. The tendency over the last year to bring the New Left issues into campus confrontations has made a much more threatening situation for college administrators who are increasingly faced by mediating the clashes of value perspectives between radical students, divided faculties, conservative trustees, nervous legislators, and an

increasingly hostile public. To this observer, it ^{sometimes} looks as though the revolutionaries are more articulate and goal-directed than are institutions of higher education. If higher education does not wish to move in the directions advocated by the revolutionaries, then it would seem to me that we should increase the rate at which we launch our own programs for institutional reform. ^{we should ourselves become activists.} What do we in the colleges and universities propose to do about education for ^{black students} ~~ghetto youth~~ for example? Are students and faculty working actively to implement institutional goals? Do they identify with them as their goals? Have we thought through a position on the university's role on war-related research--or is it something that just grew? Do grades and credit hours and courses broken into chunks and disciplines that don't exist in the real world provide the kind of education that we need in these times? There is plenty to protest about, it seems to me, and if we want to work on the things that we regard as critical instead of spending our time fending off the attacks of others, isn't it about time that we launched programs and reforms with the same enthusiasm and involvement that have characterized the student protest movement. One of the great strengths of the dissidents, after all, is that they earnestly solicit participation and involvement. This is in rather vivid contrast to higher education's traditional manner of reluctantly granting students the privilege of working for the cause. It could well be that the most challenging learning lessons on the campus are to be found in the solution of real problems. How much "learning" would be sacrificed if everyone on the campus--students, faculty and administrators--really had to think about their own concrete proposals for "relevant" education? The real learning experiences for students most

surely lie in active planning and not in unquestioning acceptance of either the status quo or the latest "cause" of a campus confrontation. The planning can go on as community activity or the protestors can meet to plot their strategy while the establishment meets to plan their defense. In either situation, students probably learn more than in traditional classroom education. What they learn, however, may be quite different.

From my vantage point of the over-30's, I cannot buy the notion that youth has all the answers for an improved society. I think they are quite likely to benefit from the more disciplined experienced perspective of faculty and administration. Likewise, the energy, idealism and fresh perspectives of youth bring contributions that we can ill-afford to ignore.

Unless deans of students in cooperation with faculty and other administrators are willing to become campus activists in educational reform and to open legitimate channels for student initiative, then it appears probable that a house divided against itself cannot stand and we will be easy prey for the extremists of the far left and the far right. Thus, I end where I began, people learn and develop when they are tackling problems that are real to them. Student development and student protest and student participation in educational reform are not synonymous but they are surely related.

References

1. Cross, K. P. The campus confrontations. The Research Reporter, Center for Research & Development in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley, 4 (1), 1969.
2. Governing a college: How much should students have to say? College Management, May, 1969, pp. 29-39.
3. Pace, C. Robert. College and university environment scales technical manual. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1969.
4. Peterson, R. The scope of organized protest in 1964-65. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1966.
5. Peterson, R. The scope of organized protest in 1967-68. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968.
6. Peterson, R., and Centra, J. Organized student protest and institutional functioning. (In preparation)
7. Peterson, R., Centra, J., Hartnett, R., and Linn, R. Institutional functioning inventory technical manual. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service. (In press)
8. Sasajima, M., Davis, J., and Peterson, R. Organized student protest and institutional climate. American Educational Research Journal, 1968, 5 (3), 291-304.
9. San Francisco Chronicle, June 6, 1969.
10. Wilson, R., and Gaff, J. Student voice--faculty response. The Research Reporter, Center for Research & Development in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley, 4 (2), 1969.

ABBREVIATED SCALE DEFINITIONS FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONING INVENTORY

(IAE) Intellectual-Aesthetic Extracurriculum refers to the availability of activities and opportunities for intellectual and aesthetic stimulation outside the classroom.

(F) Freedom has to do with academic freedom for faculty and students as well as freedom in their personal lives for all individuals in the campus community.

(HD) Human Diversity has to do with the degree to which the faculty and student body are heterogeneous in their backgrounds and present attitudes.

(IS) Concern for Improvement of Society refers to a desire among people at the institution to apply their knowledge and skills in solving problems and prompting social change in America.

(UL) Concern for Undergraduate Learning has to do with the degree in which the college--in its structure, function, and professional commitment of faculty--emphasizes undergraduate teaching and learning.

(DG) Democratic Governance has to do with the extent to which individuals in the campus community who are directly affected by a decision have the opportunity to participate in making the decision.

(MLN) Meeting Local Needs refers to an institutional emphasis on providing educational and cultural opportunities for all adults in the surrounding area, as well as meeting needs for trained manpower on the part of local businesses and government agencies.

(SP) Self-Study and Planning has to do with the importance college leaders attach to continuous long-range planning for the total institution, and to institutional research needed in formulating and revising plans.

(AK) Concern for Advancing Knowledge has to do with the degree to which the institution--in its structure, function, and professional commitment of faculty--emphasize research and scholarship aimed at extending the scope of human knowledge.

(CI) Concern for Innovation refers, in its highest form, to an institutionalized commitment to experimentation with new ideas for educational practice.

(IE) Institutional Esprit refers to a sense of shared purposes and high morale among faculty and administrators.

.28 < .05
.38 < .01

Table 2

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN IFI SCALES AND INCIDENCE
OF PROTEST OVER VARIOUS ISSUES (50 institutions)

	<u>IAE</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>HD</u>	<u>IS</u>	<u>UL</u>	<u>DG</u>	<u>MLN</u>	<u>SP</u>	<u>AK</u>	<u>CI</u>	<u>IE</u>
1. Class size	30	20	34	41	-37				51		
2. Senior faculty absent		25	31	32	-43				60		
3. Quality of instruction				22	-40	-24			33		
4. Testing and grading					-37	-25	22		29		
5. Curriculum inflexibility					-23					-21	
6. Academic freedom											
7. Tenure policies		-26				-32				-24	
8. Controversial instructor		24	41	28			23		-22		-32
9. Alleged censorship						(-33)	21			(-29)	-20
10. Rules: controv. visitors		-40									
11. Visits by leftists	23										
12. Visits by rightists	22			28	-23				33		
13. Living group regulations						-25					
14. Food service	-28				-25	-22					
15. Dress regulations		-38	-21			(-39)				(-26)	-26
16. Drinking regulations										-20	
17. Drug regulations		21				20					
18. Disciplinary actions			25		-25						-32
19. Alleged racial discrim.	29	22	32	35	-36				32		
20. Stud-admin. communication					-26	(-22)				(-25)	-25
21. Stud. partic. in governance			26	27	-36				21		-21
22. Civil rights		34	43	50	-20				34	20	
23. The draft	42	36	44	54		40			42	29	
24. Armed services recruiters	20	31	45	29		24					
25. Other recruiters: Dow, etc.		43	61	51	-31	26			40		
26. Vietnam	42	31	50	65		35			41	34	
27. Classified research	33		37	40	-40				55		