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CHAPTER I

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Introduction

This work is an attempt to study the effects of certain independent variables on student activism. The variables to be studied include home town residence, year in school, grade point average, scholastic major field, and a sympathetic attitude toward the strike. The dependent variable to be measured as an indicator of student activism will be actual participation in the strike. The major purpose of the work is to test specific hypotheses about each of the variables and its relationship to student activism. The work is an operationalization of several prevalent propositions concerning student activism. The data is generated from a survey of Ohio State students taken during the disruptions at Ohio State in May, 1970. The thesis will be broken down into the following segments: 1) The theory and generation of propositions, 2) Methodology, 3) Initial tests of propositions, 4) Controlled tests of the propositions and 5) Summary of findings and suggestions for further research.
With the recent developments on campuses across the country, much interest has been concentrated on student activism. Several noted political scientists, psychologists, and sociologists have turned to an investigation of campus activities in order to learn the sources of campus activism. The studies have ranged from investigations of the effect of one independent variable to more intense studies, such as Keniston's thorough investigation of alienated youth at Harvard College. The findings of these studies have led to various generalizations about student activism but several studies have produced findings that are somewhat conflicting as the theory was stated. The purpose of this work is to examine several of these propositions based on the specific instance of Ohio State University. The results will tend to either reinforce existing generalizations or possibly raise some doubts about their validity.

1. The Number of Student Activists

Of all the views about student activism, the one statement that seems to enjoy the most consensus is that student activists are a small minority of the total student population. Seymour Lipset states:

In spite of the impact of these factors, it remains true that the large majority of students in
all countries for which opinion data exist are politically inactive and moderate in their views. Opinion surveys of American student populations indicate that a large majority are within the mainstream of American politics and not sympathetic with radical doctrines and tactics.\(^3\)

Despite the belief that campuses breed radical thought and behavior, the facts seem to indicate otherwise. This excerpt from an article by Lipset gives us an indication of the numbers of student activists:

According to national surveys of student opinion taken by the Harris poll in 1965 and the Gallup poll in 1968, approximately one-fifth of the students have participated in civil rights or political activities (17% in 1964-65, the year of the Berkeley revolt, and 20% in 1967-68, the year of the Kennedy and McCarthy campaigns). The radical activist groups generally have tiny memberships. Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) claims a total membership of about 30,000 out of a national student body of 7 million of which about 6,000 pay national dues. A Harris poll of American students taken in the spring of 1968 estimates that there are about 100,000 radical activists, or somewhere between 1 and 2 percent of the college population.\(^4\)

I therefore would expect to find a small percentage of those surveyed to actually have taken part in the strike.

2. Home Town Residence

The independent variable I will now discuss is the location of the home town residence. The basis of theoretical significance of this variable is primarily psychological. Basically, the student who resides far away from school will feel more lonely and insecure. Lipset
sums up the basis of this theoretical argument:

Mobility undercuts the social supports of the old belief system and increases the need to join new groups. Therefore, college communities, particularly those in which students live considerable distances from home, contain more people who should be recruited. Students form and join all sorts of groups in order to reduce their initial loneliness, and dynamic activist groups can fulfill these social needs.5

I will assume from this that those students living further away from home will be more lonely and more likely to identify with student movements. Similarly, those students who live close to school will be less likely to seek out the security of student movements and more likely to be independent of student activity. I am also assuming that student activity offers a sense of security to those students who find themselves lonely or insecure. The major thrust of these assumptions is that students whose home residence is quite remote will be much more susceptible to student activities and students whose home residence is quite close to the campus will find themselves with various ties of family, friends, and social organizations and will thus be quite less likely to be recruited into activist organizations.

3. Year in School

Another question that may be posed concerning the student activist is "What year in school precipitates the
maximum propensity for student activism?" Solomon and Fishman found that the average age of peace demonstrators was quite young (18-1/2) and that 41% of the demonstrators were college freshmen or below. However, David Nasatir in a study of Argentine students found that the longer a student was on campus, the more likely he was to have liberal activist tendencies. I believe the former finding is more consistent with our previous assumptions dealing with home town residence and therefore that students are more susceptible to recruitment to activist organizations in their initial years of college. Lipset states:

"Studies of student activism in America indicate that new students, either underclassmen or recent transfers are more likely to be active than those who have been in the social system for longer periods."

The stress placed on new students seems to be more intense and they are therefore more susceptible to recruitment to activist organizations. Joseph Katz reports that "the freshman year is a particularly stressful one... for entering freshmen the sudden impact of academic requirements, homesickness, new living arrangements and peers constitute especially unsettling conditions." Just as I assume that students living a great distance from home were more lonely and insecure, I am similarly assuming that students with little socializing experience (freshmen, for example) will also be more lonely and insecure and therefore more likely to be recruited by activist organizations.
4. Grade Point Average

The majority of studies on student activism find that activists tend to be more intelligent than the average student. Keniston found that as a group, the alienated tended to be more able than their classmates, especially on I. Q. tests that measure "verbal" attitudes. Christian Bay found liberals to be more intelligent and also more political. Selvin and Hangstrom in a study of Berkeley students found that the majority of A students scored "highly" on a libertarian scale. Robert Somers' study of Berkeley students revealed that of students averaging B-plus or better, 45% were militants and 10% conservative when they were classified as to whether they sympathized with the demands of the Free Speech Movement. Similarly, Richard Flacks found that 75% of anti-draft protestors in Chicago averaged B or better in school. The evidence would suggest that student activists generally have better academic records than the average student. This is probably a result of a somewhat overriding theme that activists in general (left or right) are intellectually superior to the average man. However, I will assume that the proposition concerning higher grade averages and student activism may be either refuted or affirmed regardless of right activists.
5. Academic Major

Another variable that is often considered in the profile of the student activist is his academic major. Solomon and Fishman found that 60% of the demonstrators they interviewed had academic majors in the Humanities and Social Sciences and also that these demonstrators had indefinite career plans. Concerning the influence of academic interests Lipset states:

Among faculty and students, there are clear cut correlations between academic discipline and political orientations. On the whole, those involved in the humanities and softer social sciences, or in the more pure theoretical fields of science, are more likely to be on the left than those in the more practical, applied, or experimental fields.

The direction of this relationship, however, seems to be somewhat unclear. Morris Rosenberg states that this relationship may be more a consequence of self-selection of certain fields of study by students who are already liberal or conservative. Similarly, Samuel Lubbell finds that a student's career plans and orientations affect his choice of study. My purpose will be merely to show a relationship between academic major and student activism. The actual direction of the relationship would require a longitudinal study to measure any change in attitude due to the influence of academic studies.

The basic thrust of the argument requires several assumptions. Students in humanities and social sciences
are exposed to more liberalizing and politically activating experiences than those in other fields. Also, students in physical sciences and professional courses are more definite about their future career plans and less susceptible to joining activist movements. In short these students are more content with academic life and are less likely to advocate change through active measures. On the other hand, students in the social sciences and humanities are relatively indefinite about career plans and are more likely to back movements that advocate change through student activism. Thus, these students are not as content with the status quo and are not as stable in their ideologies.

6. Attitudes versus Actions

The final step of my analysis will be an investigation of attitudes toward the strike compared to actual participation. I am going to make the assumption here that reported overt behavior (picketing) is equivalent to the actual overt behavior. Several reasons including the timing of the survey (during the disruptions) make this a valid maneuver. Under the circumstances, I feel that this reported behavior is the closest indicator of actual behavior. I will consider reported picketing as actual picketing since it is the closest measure I have available for participation.

It is often considered that there is a direct relationship between attitude and behavior. However, the findings
in this area make this assumption somewhat questionable at least to the extent of the relationship. Allan Wicker reviewed several studies concerning attitudes and behavior and concluded:

Taken as a whole, these studies suggest that it is considerably more likely that attitude will be unrelated or slightly related to overt behavior than that attitude will be closely related to actions.\textsuperscript{20}

Weissburg refers to an attitude as only one term in a complex regression formula used to predict behavior and therefore it cannot be expected to predict much about the overt behavior.\textsuperscript{21}

If attitudes do not completely predict overt behavior, I would then expect some intervening variable such as social pressure to enter into the actual behavior. Hyman suggests that group pressures and the responsibility to justify actions may moderate overt behavior.\textsuperscript{22} Similarly, Kutner et al., showed that the possibility of legal prosecution in racial discrimination caused attitude-overt behavior inconsistencies.\textsuperscript{23} On the campus, Linn found that attitudes reflect norms of a university sub-culture while overt behavior reflected a more strongly reinforced and tested norm of the broader society.\textsuperscript{24} Newsweek found that latent attitudes on the campus were favorable to public protest even when personal action was not contemplated.\textsuperscript{25}

From these findings, I would postulate some difference between attitudes and behavior. Since I have already stated
that certain students feel more pressure than others, I can postulate that this pressure intervenes between attitudes and actual behavior. I shall discuss methodology in the next chapter but for now postulate that an intervening variable (social or academic pressure) diminishes the actual amount of student activism.

The basis of the propositions concerns the need to be accepted for those students who find themselves lonely and insecure. There seems to be a tendency for students who feel lonely and insecure to identify with liberal movements and activities. Robert Lane presents this argument in terms of a frustration anxiety model:

Here we have suggested that a certain type of person, the introspective, socially anxious, intellectually oriented, person is likely to be liberal in the sense described for certain reasons. 1) His intellectuality helps him to penetrate the social problems to which he addresses himself. 2) His interpersonal insecurity is exacerbated by the personal styles of the integrated dominant behavior of elite members of his milieu. 3) His tolerance and egalitarianism are symbolic bids for the friendship of distant groups. 26

This student similarly finds it difficult to sustain goal-directed activity. 27 A profile of the activist reflects a lonely, insecure, anxious, intelligent person who engages in very little goal-directed activity. This profile leads to several propositions concerning student activists.
C. Summary

I have previously reviewed research on student activism concerning the effect of certain independent variables. Now I will summarize these findings in the form of the propositions I intend to test in this paper.

Proposition 1.

A. People tend to behave in a manner that is acceptable and rewarded and avoid behavior that is not rewarded.

B. Student activism is behavior that is not rewarded and moderate behavior is behavior that is rewarded.

Therefore--The great majority of behavior will tend to be moderate behavior and student activism will constitute a proportionately small percentage of behavior patterns.

Proposition 2.

A. Students who feel lonely and insecure are more likely to become involved with demonstrations.

B. Students who live further away from home are more likely to become lonely and insecure.

Therefore--Students who live further away from home are more likely to become involved in demonstrations and thus become activists.

Proposition 3.

A. Underclassmen are generally more lonely and insecure and thus will be more likely to seek means of identifying with others.

B. Participation in demonstrations offers a means of identifying with others.
Therefore—Underclassmen are more likely to participate in demonstrations and thus be able to identify with others.

Proposition 4.

A. The above average student is generally bored with the status quo and existing means of administration.

B. The bored and disconcerted student is more likely to change through active measures.

Therefore—The above average student is more likely to change the present system through active measures.

Proposition 5.

A. Students in the humanities and social sciences are subject to more liberalizing and politically activating experiences than those in other fields.

B. Students exposed to more liberalizing and politically activating experiences are more likely to be involved in activist organizations.

Therefore—Students in the social sciences and humanities are more likely to become student activists.

Proposition 6.

A. The majority of people will tend to behavior that is rewarded rather than punished.

B. Active participation in demonstrations is behavior that is punished.

Therefore—The majority of students (despite their attitudes) will refrain from active participation in demonstrations.

Proposition 7.

A. Students more aware of academic pressures are less likely to participate in demonstrations even though they may sympathize with the cause.
B. Students with intense career goals (professional, business, and so forth) are more likely to envision themselves as academically pressured.

Therefore--Students with more intense career goals are more likely not to participate actively in the demonstrations despite a favorable attitude toward the demands of the strikers.
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CHAPTER II

METHODS

A. Introduction

Initially, I will look at the composition of the survey and then deal with operationalizing the variables that I intend to employ in order to test the hypotheses. I will present each variable to be studied and describe what questions were asked in the survey. A rationale for the use of each question will be presented along with a corresponding justification for the collapsing of certain responses. Each proposition will then be described in operational terms and the type of analysis for each proposition will be discussed in the final section of the chapter.

B. Methods

1. The Survey

A major disruption broke out on the campus of Ohio State in April, 1970. After disturbances sufficient enough to close the campus for eleven days, violence again broke out after the re-opening in May. During the second
disruption, a survey of students concerning their opinions about the issues was conducted.¹

Respondents were asked various questions about their attitudes toward various issues, groups involved in the conflict, and their own participation in the disorders. A final series of demographic questions augmented this analysis of the profile of the student activist. A simple random sample of the students was drawn from the student directory and students were contacted by phone to meet for the questionnaire in a neutral area. Of those contacted, about 41% (N=205) completed the questionnaire. Although this is a low response rate, conditions on the campus make it incomparable to other surveys.

2. Student Activism

The first variable I discuss is the dependent variable—student activism. Several items on the questionnaire were indicators of activism. Items came from the question: "Did you ever undergo any of the following in the University Crisis?". The following items were contained: picket, heckle police, throw missiles at police, break windows, block streets, block buildings, get arrested. Although all of these items indicate a degree of participation in the disruptions, I was looking for the item most representative of participation for the purpose of change. For
that reason, I decided to use the item "picket" as the indicator of student activism. This is the only item that genuinely represents a degree of commitment to the cause of the strike. Although picketing may have been spontaneous, I feel that this is the item most likely to reflect a student's involvement in the strike. I am also interested in using this variable as a measure of overt behavior and feel that this item is such that it is the least likely to elicit a hesitancy to respond truthfully. The purpose of the study is to isolate those students actively involved in the strike and picketing is the best measure of active participation. The question involved a simple "yes" or "no" response. I will then group the respondents who answered "yes" to this question into our category of student activists.

3. Home Town Residence

The first independent variable I will analyze is home town residence. As originally stated, the question had four possible responses: 1) in Franklin County, 2) outside Franklin County but inside Ohio, 3) in the United States but outside Ohio and 4) outside the United States. Since the propositions involve potential influence of family, I decided to dichotomize the response into groups either living at home or in the same county as the family
and those living away from home. The students whose home residences were inside Franklin County are in one group and all others are in the second group.

4. Year in School

The second variable I will investigate is the respondent's year in school. Originally, the question called for one of six possible responses: 1) Freshman, 2) Sophomore, 3) Junior, 4) Senior, 5) Graduate and 6) Professional. The aim of the proposition is to isolate those students less socialized to the campus and I believe this goal is best achieved by collapsing freshmen and sophomores into one group (less socialized) and combining all other respondents into the other group.

5. Grade Point Average

The third independent variable I will investigate is the grade point average. The response to this item was originally grouped into five categories: 1) 3.5-4.0, 2) 3.0-3.49, 3) 2.5-2.99, 4) 2.0-2.49 and 5) under 1.9. I believe it is in keeping with the basic reasoning of the proposition to collapse these categories into two major groups: 1) 3.0-4.0, and 2) under 3.0. The propositions stated that the above average student is more likely to be a student activist and I believe that 3.0 is the best
place to make the cut-off between the above average student and the average student.

6. Academic Major

The fourth independent variable I will measure is academic major. The questionnaire simply calls for a fill-in the blank type response to this question. This necessitated the coding of these responses into a somewhat arbitrary division. In keeping with the proposition, I felt that a distinction could be made on the undergraduate level between goal-oriented academic endeavors and areas which I have shown in the first chapter to attract less goal-oriented students. Examples of goal-oriented majors were the physical sciences (Chemistry, Physics, Biology, and so forth), engineering, nursing, pre-professional, and computer science. Examples of majors which attract less goal-oriented students were humanities, social science, philosophy, and general undeclared majors (those students responding by answering University College). Approximately 11 respondents failed to answer this question and were left out of this aspect of the analysis. I did not feel justified in including these respondents because of their number and the possibility of confusion rather than assuming no declared major.
7. Attitude Toward the Strike

The last independent variable is attitude toward the strike. Although many questions dealt with specific attitudes toward groups and issues, I felt that one item in particular reflected best an overriding approval or rejection of the strike. This question asked "Everything taken into consideration, to what degree do you think the student strike was justified?" Responses were classified into six components: 1) very justified, 2) justified, 3) undecided, 4) unjustified, 5) very unjustified, 6) don't know. I collapsed the responses into two groups: 1) those who responded "very justified" or "justified" and 2) all other responses. The proposition stated in Chapter I is aimed at contrasting those who sympathized with the strike to those who actually took an active part in the strike. Thus, respondents who answered anything but "justified" or "very justified" can reasonably be assumed to at least not positively thought the strike was justified.

8. Testing the Propositions

In this section, I will show briefly how each proposition will be tested using the operationalized variables. The actual data and specific statistical analyses will be presented in the following chapters.

The first proposition deals with the actual number of
student activists. The proposition states that the number of student activists will be a relatively small percentage of the sample. To test this, I will merely need to compute the percentage of respondents answering "yes" in response to whether or not they picketed in the strike.

The second proposition refers to the home residence of the respondent and states that those living further from home will be more likely to be student activists than those living near home. As previously stated, the two part division will give a two by two contingency table with home residence the independent variable and student activism the dependent variable.

The third proposition states that underclassmen are more likely to be student activists than upperclassmen. Again I will have a two by two contingency table with student class as the independent variable and student activism the dependent variable. From the proposition, I would expect higher percentages of freshmen and sophomores to be activists than those students who are juniors or above.

The fourth proposition deals with the student's grade ratio and states that students with higher grade averages are more likely to be activists. The grade ratio will be the independent variable and student activism will be the dependent variable. I would expect to find higher
percentages of above average students to be activists than the other students.

Proposition five refers to the academic major of the student. The proposition states that students in the less goal-oriented areas will be more likely to be activists than those students in goal-oriented fields. Academic major will be the independent variable and student activism will be the dependent variable. From the proposition I would expect this table to yield higher percentages of activists from the less goal-oriented areas.

Proposition six states that despite attitude toward the strike, the majority of students will not be activists. Here, a table with attitude toward the strike as the independent variable and activism the dependent variable will be constructed. The proposition leads us to expect a small percentage of those sympathetic with the strike to actually have participated in the strike.

The last proposition states that intervening variables may diminish the number of activists from the number of those who are sympathetic to the strike. Again I will have attitude toward the strike the independent variable and activism the dependent variable but I will control for academic major. I previously postulated that certain pressures (such as a goal-oriented major) will diminish activism in those students sympathetic to the strike. I
would expect students with goal-oriented majors and sympathetic to the strike to have a smaller number of activists than those sympathetic to the strike who have a less-goal-oriented major. The other variables also will be controlled to see which variable exerts the most pressure.

Similarly, through the use of controls, I will control for other variables to see if our propositions reinforce each other in an effort to get an accurate profile of the student activist. Thus, I will test whether a student who lives away from home, has a low goal-oriented major, and is an underclassman is more likely to be active than a student with only one of those characteristics. If all the propositions hold up then I would expect a reinforcing effect. However, if one is not a good indicator of student activism, I will be able to pinpoint that variable through the use of controls. Thus, through the use of controls, I will be able to pick out the relative strength of our indicators of student activism.

C. Summary

In this chapter, I have first of all pointed out the distinctive nature of the survey and data I am using. Next, I illustrated the operationalizing of each variable. I further justified the regrouping of the variables based on the nature and purpose of the work. Finally, I described
how I will test each proposition initially and with controls. The next two chapters will consist of 1) making the initial test of the propositions and 2) making the controlled tests.
1 Many students and faculty members of various disciplines collected the data. The group was coordinated by Wallace Fotheringham and faculty members in the group included Joseph Foley, Henry Quarantelli, Russell Dynes, and G. Richard Hofstetter.

2 Not all responses fell into these categories but the majority did. The author is responsible for any questionable decisions. One such example is Mathematics which we classified as a member of goal-oriented group because of its proximity to the physical sciences.

3 The bulk of the questionnaire deals with attitudes toward groups, faculty, administration, ROTC, police, and issues; I believe one item best reflected overall attitude toward the strike.
CHAPTER III

INITIAL TESTS

A. Introduction

In this chapter, the initial test of the effect of the independent variables on student activism will be conducted. The effect of home residence, year in school, grade ratio, and academic major will be tested. Each independent variable will provide the basis of a contingency table with student activism the dependent variable. Each table then will be analyzed in the framework of the propositions. Each analysis will consist in the use of certain measures of association. I will initiate this chapter with a brief discussion of the specific measures of association to be used in the analysis.

B. Initial Tests

1. Measures of Association

Because of the nature of the data (two by two tables), I will initially look at the percentage differences as a measure of association. This measure is easy to calculate and will help make the analysis conceptually clear.
Basically, it is the comparison of the percentages in different columns of the same row category, or in different rows of the same column category. Robert Weiss sums up the obvious benefits of the use of this measure:

When working with a table in which there are only two categories in each of the two variables of classification, and when concerned with one-way implications, there is much to recommend the percentage difference. It is easy to calculate and easy to understand, sensitive, norms properly, and captures directly an important, if not fundamental, intuitive idea of the nature of association.\(^1\)

I feel the obvious benefits of the use of this measure warrant its use in this analysis.

The second measure of association I will use is the Goodman-Kruskal gamma (the same as Q on a two-by-two table). This statistic measures association in terms of the number of pairs that may be assessed as positive or negative. This measure is scaled from 1 to -1 and it treats pairs in which there is the same value on either attribute (ties) as irrelevant. Although the statistic is symmetric, it is also sensitive to one-way association. One drawback in using this statistic is that it reaches a maximum (+1.0) without necessarily affording maximum predictability.\(^2\) This is the case in which any of the cell entries is zero. One of the major reasons for the use of gamma is that small marginal frequencies will not affect the statistic. Since we do not expect a high number of activists, but are
primarily interested in the proportions within specific categories, I believe that gamma will give the best measure of this relationship.

I will also use Kendall's tau-b as a measure of mutual association between the two variables. This statistic is useful when, as in this case, the number of rows and columns is equal. The maximum value of tau-b is less than 1 except when there are the same number of rows and columns and when the marginal values of the rows and columns are the same. This is not the case in this study but I will use tau-b as a means of comparing mutual association between variables.

I will use Chi-Square as a measure of significance of the findings. Since I am hypothesizing that association exists, Chi-Square will give an indication of the significance of the findings. Chi-Square uses independence as the null hypothesis and may be used on a two by two table if the total number in the table exceeds 40.

2. The Number of Activists

When all respondents were asked whether they picketed or not, out of 205 respondents only 29 answered that they picketed (approximately 9.5%). This basically substantiates the original proposition that states that only a small number of students will be activists. Although this was a
major disruption that caused the closing of classes, less than 10% of the students were actively involved. This finding coincides with most studies concerning student activism and also with the literature dealing with political activism in general. Keeping in mind that the number of activists is quite small, I will now look at the profile of these students who were active in the strike.

3. Home Residence

Table 1 shows a significant relationship between

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME TOWN RESIDENCE AND STUDENT ACTIVISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Franklin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picket Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 6.089 (p is less than .01)
Gamma = -.62
Tau-b = -.172

home town residence and student activism. The structure of the table makes this relationship negative but it is in agreement with the proposition. The proposition stated that students who live further away from home are more
likely to be activists and this is indeed the case. Using percent difference, there is a 13% difference between students whose home residence is outside Franklin County and students whose home residence is inside Franklin County. Similarly, there is a strong one-way relationship between home residence and student activism (Gamma =-.620). Thus, despite the skewed marginals because of the small number of student activists, gamma allows us to see the proportional strength of the relationship between home residence and student activism. Among activists, there is an overwhelming proportion of students whose home residence is outside Franklin County (90%). If a student is active, he is quite likely to have a home residence outside Franklin County. Table 1 also shows a mutual relationship between home residence and activism with a Tau-b of -.172. I also found a Chi-Square of 6.089 which is significant at the .01 level. This would lead me to accept the second proposition which stated that students living further from home are more likely to be activists. I am talking only of activists and do indeed find that most activists have a home residence outside Franklin County. The direction of the relationship does not detract from the accepting of the proposition since the nature of the table makes a negative relationship in line with the proposition. Thus, the further a student lives from the campus, the more likely he is to be an activist.
4. Year in School

Proposition three states that underclassmen are more likely to be student activists. Table 2 shows the relationship between year in school and student activism.

TABLE 2
YEAR IN SCHOOL AND STUDENT ACTIVISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picket</th>
<th>Underclassmen</th>
<th>Other Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=94)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=111)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N-204) Chi-Square 2.315 (p is less than .12)
Gamma, .297
Tau-b, .107

There is a greater tendency for underclassmen to be activists than the other students. There is 7% difference between underclassmen and other students. There is a one-way relationship between year in school and student activism (Gamma, .297) but this relationship is not as strong as the relationship between home residence and student activism. There is also a two-way association between year in school and student activism (Tau-b, .107) and, similarly, I found that this relationship is not as strong as the relationship between home residence and
student activism. Among activists, 59% (Row percentage) are underclassmen. Although the measure of significance would not lead us to accept the proposition unhesitatingly, I would nevertheless suggest that there is some relationship between year in school and student activism.

5. Grade Ratio

The fourth proposition states that the above average student is more likely to be an activist than the average student. Table 3 shows that the relationship between grade ratio and student activism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
<th>GRADE RATIO AND STUDENT ACTIVISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=205)</td>
<td>Chi-Square .079 (p is less than .78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma, .057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tau-b, .02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ratio and student activism. It is found that the percent difference between above average students and average students is only 1%. Similarly, there is a very small one-way relationship between grade ratio and student
activism (Gamma, .057). There is an even smaller two-way relationship between grade ratio and student activism (Tau-b .02). These findings show that there is very little association between grade ratio and student activism. The measure of significance (Chi-Square is .079) shows that there is substantially no relationship between grade ratio and student activism. Thus, in the case of the strike at Ohio State, it is found that there is no relationship between grade ratio and student activism. It seems fairly evident that traditional assumptions of an above average group of activists does not hold true for the strike at Ohio State. Therefore I will reject the fourth proposition concerning the effect of grade ratio on student activism. I will now look at academic major as an indicator of student activism.

6. Academic Major

Proposition five states that students in the humanities and social sciences are more likely to be activists than students in the more goal-oriented academic endeavors such as engineering, business, pre-professional, and the physical sciences. Table 4 shows the relationship between academic major and student activism. This table has eliminated those students who did not list an academic major (11). From Table 4 there is an 11% difference between students in low goal-oriented majors and students
with high goal-oriented majors. There is a one-way association between academic major and student activism (Gamma .449). This finding suggests that there is indeed a relationship between academic major and student activism. Among activists who gave an academic major (two gave no major), 74% had majors that were classified as low goal-oriented. There is also a two-way association between academic major and student activism (Tau-b .153). These variables are significantly related (p is less than .03). Thus I will accept the fifth proposition that stated that students with low goal oriented majors are more likely to be student activists. Whether a student chooses these because of a certain predisposition or whether these areas are more conducive to the development of activism is not of concern in this specific work. I previously

**TABLE 4**

**ACADEMIC MAJOR AND STUDENT ACTIVISM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Goal-Oriented</th>
<th>High Goal-Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picket Yes</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picket No</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=107)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-194)</td>
<td>Chi-Square 4.54 (p is less than .03)</td>
<td>Gamma .449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tau-b .153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mentioned that this type of analysis would require a longitudinal study which is beyond our means at the present time. I am only interested here in whether or not a relationship exists between academic major and student activism. Table 4 shows significant support for the fifth proposition that students with academic majors that are less goal-oriented are more likely to be student activists. Before moving on the control tests, I will first summarize the findings of this chapter.

C. Summary

Table 5 gives a convenient summary of the findings concerning the relationship between these four independent variables and student activism.

**TABLE 5**

**SUMMARY OF INITIAL FINDINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Cent Difference</th>
<th>Home Residence</th>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>Grade Ratio</th>
<th>Academic Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma: -620 .297 .057 .449

Tau-b: -.172 .107 .020 .153

In this chapter I have tested the first five
propositions and basically found:

1) The number of student activists is quite small when compared to the entire sample (less than 10%).

2) There is a significant relationship between home residence and student activism with students with home residences inside Franklin County much less likely to be activists than students with home residences outside Franklin County.

3) There was some relationship between year in school and activism but this relationship was not statistically significant.

4) There was no relationship between grade ratio and student activism with above average and average students proportionately represented among the activists.

5) There is a significant relationship between academic major and student activism with students in the low goal-oriented areas more likely to be student activists than students in high goal-oriented areas.

In the next chapter I will test the relationship between attitude toward the strike and participation in the strike. Through the use of controls, I will test whether the postulated indicators of activism reinforce each other.
FOOTNOTES

1 Weiss, Robert, Statistics in Social Research, Wiley and Sons, New York; p. 182.


3 Galtung, ibid., p. 221.


5 Lipset, Seymour, "The Activist; A Profile," Public Interest, p. 45.

6 Significant is meant here to be defined as a Chi-Square in which p is less than .05.

CHAPTER IV

CONTROLLED TESTS

A. Introduction

This chapter will begin with an investigation of the relationship between attitude toward the strike and student activism. After this relationship is investigated, I will control for academic major in an effort to find possible intervening variables. Finally, I will look at several factors combined in order to see whether the various independent variables have a reinforcing effect on the propensity to activism.

B. Controlled Tests

1. Attitudes versus Actions

Proposition six states that the majority of students, despite their attitudes, will refrain from active participation in the strike. Table 6 shows the relationship of the respondent's attitude toward the strike and student activism. This table shows a relationship between attitude toward the strike and student activism but this relationship is quite far from being as highly related as some theorists might expect. In fact, the one way association
TABLE 6

ATTITUDE VERSUS ACTIVISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Non-favorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=113)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 3.0 (p is less than .08)
Gamma, .412
Tau-b, .122

reflected from gamma (.412) is even less than two of the independent variables investigated in the previous chapter (home residence and academic major). From the raw data cells, a majority of the students who responded to this question were sympathetic to the strike (136 of 200 or 68%). The association between attitude and action (tau-b, .122) is also less than two other independent variables (home residence and academic major). The percent difference (9%) is also lower than the percent difference for those two independent variables. Here, the crucial difference is between the column of respondents who are favorable to the strike. It seems evident from this table that although sympathy for the strike was quite high (68%), very few of these respondents actually actively participated
in the strike (17%). I therefore have found agreement with the proposition which stated that despite attitude toward the strike, only a small number of students will actively participate in the strike. From these findings, I would tend to agree with Weissburg's reference to attitude as only one term in a complex regression formula used to predict behavior\(^1\) and question those references to consistency between attitudes and behavior. It should be noted here that although attitudes may be favorable toward a cause, these attitudes may not be used exclusively to predict behavior. I will now investigate the proposition that certain academic pressures tend to moderate overt actions.

2. Academic Major Controlled

I previously postulated that students with goal-oriented majors will be less likely to be student activists. In the previous chapter it was found that this was indeed the case. Similarly, Proposition seven states that academic pressure will moderate overt behavior despite attitudes. Table 7 shows that very few students with goal-oriented academic majors are activists despite their attitude toward the strike. The raw data shows that only 6 students with goal-oriented majors actively participated in the strike. Only 9% of the students with goal-oriented majors and favorable attitudes toward the strike actively participated
TABLE 7
ATTITUDE VERSUS ACTIVISM (GOAL-ORIENTED MAJORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Favorable</th>
<th>Attitude Non-favorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>(N=29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square .99 (p is less than .68)
Gamma, .489
Tau-b, .110

in the strike. These findings tend to confirm the proposition that academic pressures tend to moderate behavior despite their attitude toward the strike. Table 8 shows the relationship between attitude toward the strike and activism controlled for students with low goal-oriented majors. This table reflects the difference between students with low goal-oriented majors and students with high goal-oriented majors. We find that 23% of the students who had favorable attitudes toward the strike and with low goal-oriented majors actually participated in the strike. We see that this reflects a 14% difference from students with high goal-oriented majors. This difference substantiated proposition seven which states that students with
TABLE 8
ATTITUDE VERSUS ACTIVISM (NON GOAL-ORIENTED MAJORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Non-Favorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=107) Chi-Square 3.33 (P is less than .06)
Gamma, .586
Tau-b, .176

goal-oriented majors are more pressured and therefore are less likely to be student activists. From these tables, it is seen that academic major acts as an intervening variable in the step from attitudes to actions.

3. Two Variables Controlled

I will at this point speculate as to the effect that two controlled variables may have on moderating attitudes. Table 9 shows the relationship between attitude toward the strike and student activism for students who are upper-classmen and whose home residence is in Franklin County. Naturally, the use of two controlled variables reduces considerably the number of respondents in this table (N=34). However, this table shows the effect that two variables (which I have already shown to inhibit student
TABLE 9
ATTITUDES VERSUS ACTIONS (UPPERCLASSMEN WHOSE RESIDENCE IS FRANKLIN COUNTY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Non-Favorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-34)</td>
<td>Gamma, 1.00</td>
<td>Tau-b, .149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

activism) have on student activism. Although the number of respondents favorable to the strike (19) is comparable to the number of respondents with a non-favorable attitude toward the strike (15), only one respondent actually participated in the strike. Although this relationship is not statistically significant, we can see the effect of two variables both acting toward non-activism. Thus, out of 34 students whose home residence is in Franklin County and who are not freshmen or sophomores, only one student actively participated in the strike. When two forces act against activism, there is an even greater pressure to non-activism even when the attitude toward the strike is favorable (one student out of 20 actively participated among those favorable to the strike).
4. Controlling Variables versus Activism

In this section I will look at how the independent variables previously postulated to have an effect on student activism will effect activism when they are combined through the use of controls. In making these controlled comparisons, I will primarily be interested in whether the addition of another independent variable reinforces the tendency to student activism. Table 10 shows the

TABLE 10
MAJOR VERSUS ACTIVISM (UNDERCLASSMEN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picket</th>
<th>Low Goal-Oriented</th>
<th>High Goal-Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 23.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 77.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=60)</td>
<td>(N=32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=93)</td>
<td>Gamma, .493</td>
<td>Tau-b, .171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

relationship between academic major and student activism when only underclassmen are considered. I would expect a higher percentage of activists in the low goal-oriented category when only underclassmen are considered. For underclassmen, 23% of the students in low goal-oriented
majors are activists compared to 19% when the entire sample is considered. Thus, we would conclude that year in school increases the tendency to student activism. In building a profile, we would say that knowing these two independent variables is better than knowing just one of the variables. Knowledge that a student is an underclassman adds to the probability of student activism. I would expect a student who is not an underclassman but majoring in a low goal-oriented area to be less likely to be an activist. Table 11 shows that this is the case as 13% of the low goal-oriented major, non-underclassmen are activists compared to 19% in the non-controlled case and 23% in the case of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 11</th>
<th>MAJOR VERSUS ACTIVISM (NON-UNDERCLASSMEN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Goal-Oriented</td>
<td>High Goal-Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picket</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

underclassmen. From these comparisons, it is seen that a combination of these independent variables gives a
better indication of whether a student is likely to be a student activist or not.

Table 12 gives another example of this increased tendency to activism when another dimension is known.

TABLE 12

STUDENT YEAR IN SCHOOL VERSUS ACTIVISM
(STUDENTS OUTSIDE FRANKLIN COUNTY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UnderClassmen</th>
<th>Non-Underclassmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-143) Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma, .244
Tau-b, .096

In this table, student year is the independent variable and activism is the dependent variable. This table is controlled for students living in Franklin County. In the uncontrolled case, 18% of the underclassmen were active in the student strike. In this case for students whose home residence is outside Franklin County, 22% of the underclassmen are activists. Similarly, in the uncontrolled case, 11% of the underclassmen are activists, but, when home residence is outside Franklin County, this figure jumps to 15%. Thus, knowing a student's home residence is outside Franklin County increases the potential
for student activism. Conversely, it would be expected that knowing a student's home residence is inside Franklin County he would be less likely to be an activist. Table 13 shows the relationship between student status and activism for those students whose home residence is inside Franklin County. Again it is seen that for students whose home residence is inside Franklin County, only 8\% of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT YEAR IN SCHOOL VERSUS ACTIVISM (HOME RESIDENCE IN FRANKLIN COUNTY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underclassmen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picket</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gamma</strong>, .505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

underclassmen are activists compared to 18\% for underclassmen in the uncontrolled case and 22\% in the case controlled for underclassmen whose home residence is outside Franklin County. Again it is seen that knowledge of two independent variables increases the ability to predict student activism.

Table 14 shows the relationship between attitude toward
TABLE 14
ATTITUDE VERSUS ACTIVISM (ABOVE AVERAGE GRADE AVERAGES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Non-Favorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picket</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=77)</td>
<td>(N=57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma, .256
Tau-b, .073

the strike and activism for students with above average grade averages. Table 15 shows this same relationship for

TABLE 15
ATTITUDE VERSUS ACTIVISM (GRADE AVERAGES BELOW 3.0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Non-Favorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picket</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=123)</td>
<td>(N=79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma, .493
Gau-b, .151
students with grade averages below 3.0. I found earlier that grade average had no relationship to student activism. These tables show that this is indeed the case. In the uncontrolled case, I found that 17% of the students with favorable attitudes toward the strike actually were active in the strike. From these two tables it is seen that among students with grade averages below 3.0, 18% were activists. Thus, contrary to the original proposition, it is found that grade average is unrelated to student activism. In fact, instead of increasing activism it is seen that when students had a grade point average above 3.0, there is a 1% decrease in activism.

C. Summary

In this chapter, I have shown the relationship between attitudes toward the strike and student activism, shown the effect of intervening variables between attitudes and action, and shown, through the use of controls, that knowledge of more than one independent variable helps the profile of the student activist. Briefly, I found:

1) That attitudes toward the strike were related to activism but that two other independent variables (home residence and academic major) were more highly related to activism than attitude toward the strike.

2) The influence of certain academic pressures (high goal-oriented major) was a substantial factor in reducing activists among those respondents who nevertheless had a favorable attitude toward the strike.
3) When two independent variables were controlled (Home Residence and Year in School) there was an even more substantial reduction in activism among those with favorable attitudes toward the strike.

4) When more than one independent variable was characterized, there was an increase in student activism in the direction indicated by all our propositions except grade average.

5) When grade average was controlled, there was no greater tendency toward activism among above average students.
FOOTNOTES


CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

A. Introduction

In this work, I have investigated the effect of certain independent variables on student activism. Specifically, I have tested the effect of home town residence, year in school, grade average, and academic major on student activism. Finally, the relationship between attitudes and activism was investigated. Intervening variables between attitude and activism also were investigated. The major purpose of this work was to help formulate a profile of the student activist. In the first chapter of this work, seven propositions were outlined for analysis. I will now look at the findings of this paper in light of these seven propositions.

B. Summary of the Findings

1. The Number of Activists

The first proposition in this paper stated that student activism would constitute a proportionately small percentage of behavior. In the case of Ohio State
University, I found that, out of 205 respondents, only 29 answered that they picketed (about 9.5%). This reflects the findings throughout the literature on student activism. The first proposition is therefore substantiated by this percentage of activists. This finding is also consistent with most literature concerning any type of political activity. The image of the average person as uninvolved in political matters is upheld in our study.

2. Home Town Residence

The second proposition of the paper suggested that students whose home town residence was further from the campus would be more likely to become involved in student activism. Of all the independent variables investigated in the study, this variable was most significantly related to student activism. When students were grouped into home town residence in Franklin County and outside Franklin County, those students whose home town residence was outside Franklin County significantly tended to be more active. In the first chapter, I postulated loneliness and insecurity as possible reasons for this phenomena. It is also possible that these students felt themselves further removed from parental sanctions whereas students from Franklin County may have found themselves more involved with other affairs with family, friends, and local
organizations. Nevertheless, this study rather conclusively proves that student activism at Ohio State was primarily the business of students whose home residence was outside Franklin County.

3. Year in School

The third proposition of the paper postulated a relationship between year in school and student activism. I found, after dividing respondents into underclassmen and all others, that there was a slight tendency for underclassmen to be more active than students who had been socialized to the campus atmosphere for a longer period of time. The reasoning of the proposition, much like the previous proposition, was that underclassmen would be more insecure and thus more likely to get involved in activist movements. Although I did not find a statistically significant relationship, I did find that more underclassmen were activists than the other students. One probable reason for this, despite the leadership of the movement by graduate students and upperclassmen involved in different campus organizations, is the bandwagon effect. The sometimes carnival atmosphere of the demonstrations could have been enticing to the younger students. I hesitate to declare the proposition proven conclusively based on this study but there is an indication that the younger are more likely to be activists.
4. Grade Average

The fourth proposition stated that the above average student is more likely to be a student activist. The findings at Ohio State are in conflict with prevailing findings in student activist literature.² The findings reveal no relationship between grade average and student activism when respondents are divided into those students with grade averages above 3.0 and those below 3.0. The literature on the topic indicates that activists are generally more intelligent, somewhat ahead of their time, and overly anxious in waiting for gradual change. I do not believe that the cut-off point was too high and thus eliminated many students who are intelligent but don't place a premium on grades. It is my contention that 3.0 reflects a B average which is generally accepted as good but not inordinately above average. Another more serious question may be raised and that is whether most studies to date reflect profiles of students who were involved in the initial stages of student protest.³ It may be that we are now in the stages of a proliferation of student protest at a much broader level which does not exclude the average student but rather appeals to this type of student. Certainly the findings reflect no indication that grade average is in any way related to student activism.
5. Academic Major

The fifth proposition postulated a relationship between academic major and student activism. The primary basis of this proposition was directed at the presence or absence of a specific goal-orientation. I found a significant relationship between students' academic major and student activism. Basically, I found that students with academic majors in fields with low goal-orientations were more likely to be activists than students with majors in areas with high goal-orientations. The admittedly somewhat arbitrary classification can be drawn into question but the great majority of respondents did fall into the areas mentioned in the first chapter. The primary purpose of this aspect of the investigation was to arrive at a distinction between students with goal orientations and students without goal orientations. The findings support the proposition that students in areas with low goal-orientations are more likely to be activists than students in areas with high goal-orientations.

6. Attitudes versus Actions

The sixth proposition states that, despite attitude toward the strike, students would be still much more likely not to be active. The findings support this proposition with the fact that of those students with a favorable
attitude toward the strike only 17% were actively involved in the strike. To further substantiate this proposition, I found two other variables (home town residence and academic major) which were more highly related to activism than attitude toward the strike. This finding confirms the work in the literature dealing with this topic. Although I was not completely precise in measuring overt activity, I believe the item I chose as the measure was the best possible measure of student activism.

7. Academic Pressure Moderating Activity

The last proposition stated that certain pressures tend to increase the distance between attitude and actions. I found that, when controlled for academic major, those students with majors in the high goal-oriented areas showed a significant decrease in the percentage of activists of those students with favorable attitudes toward the strike. Obviously, this is just one possible reason for the divergence between attitude and actions but the study did show that academic pressure did mitigate student activism when attitudes were favorable to the strike.

C. Suggestions for Further Research

One of the major purposes of this paper was to test the prevalent generalizations about student activism. When
a study of this nature is completed, many questions come
to mind concerning possibilities for further investigations.

One of the findings that conflicts with the majority
of previous findings concerns the grade average of the
activist. I found, contrary to the literature, that there
is no relationship between grade average and student ac-
tivism. It is possible that future investigations of
student activism will reveal a broader appeal to the ranks
of student activists.

Another possibility for future research may be
initiated within the framework of academic major. The
findings revealed a relationship between academic major
and student activism but the direction of this relation-
ship is not certain. It may be that certain types of
students pick academic majors in fields which compliment
their basic attitudes. On the other hand, it is possible
that the major field of academic endeavor alters the
attitude of the students. The precise measurement of the
direction of this relationship would require a longitudi-
inal study of entering freshmen and another measurement
several years later. Another possibility in this area
would be a study of a more comprehensive nature dealing
with specific goal-orientations. It is quite probable
that goal-orientations may be measured in a more precise
manner than academic major.
The area of discrepancies between attitudes and overt actions also offers distinct possibilities for future research. The notion that attitude is merely one element in a complex regression equation predicting overt behavior suggests some possibilities for research in this area through the use of regression analysis. Such a study would integrate theories of all the social sciences. Certainly the area of student activism is ripe for further research and it is my hope that this work may augment research in this area.
FOOTNOTES

1 Lipset, Seymour, "American Student Activism in Comparative Perspective," from Seminar on Manpower Policy and Program, 1968, p. 22.


3 Many early studies are based on data generated from the Berkeley campus.
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