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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

A cursory glance of the local and national news' headlines will quickly divest anyone of the opinion that the university and college campus is isolated from the trials of modern day society. Just the opposite is evident as we stand witness to both students and faculty alike becoming increasingly active and vocal on the social issues of the era; pollution, poverty, drugs, the war in Vietnam, racial discrimination and the military draft. In the minds of many from the campus community, these issues have been the source of motivation which has ignited the sparks of social unrest and upheaval among so much of the campus population. In essence, the obvious discrepancies now existing between the American dream and the real America seem in large part, at least, to be strongly influencing much of the campus turmoil and strife so vividly noted during the later half of the sixties and beginning of the seventies. For college men, though, nothing is hitting closer to home and stirring more common concern than the opportunities, -- or lack of them, -- offered by the Selective Service System and its military draft.
The military draft has long been a point of controversy for debate. For today's college men it is not inappropriate to state that it is a matter of pervading and deep concern. On campus after campus, coast to coast, students have actively participated in debates, sit-ins, and marches of every sort, to call public attention to their disquietude created by the prospect of having to serve in an effort and endeavor to which they feel no commitment. The feeling which exists is aptly captured by the words of Saul Bellows who aligns the situation to that of a "dangling man."

There is nothing to do but wait, or dangle, and grow more and more dispirited. It is perfectly clear to me that I am deteriorating, storing bitterness and spite which eats like acids at my endowment of generosity and good will .... Alternatives, and particularly desirable alternatives, grow only on an imaginary tree. (2,38)

To many students the search for Bellow's "imaginary tree" is the factor which has stirred their concerns most.

It is therefore somewhat surprising to note that issues which so adversely affect the morale of today's students would in turn attract so little attention from the so-called "helping professions" of the campus community. The military draft is one such poignant example of the times. The problem reaches deeper into the profession than just the campus level, though, as the dearth of information supplied
by the professional organizations attests to the situation. The literature is appalling! As helping professions, most campus agencies are directly or indirectly associated with students to the extent that they are dedicated to the purpose of informing and representing them on issues central to their concern. The fact of the matter, though, is that we are one thing on paper, and quite another thing in reality.

Dr. Dean A. Allen, chief psychologist of the University of Massachusetts Health Services has focused upon the exact nature of the problem as it specifically relates to the military draft. Writing in the Journal of College Student Personnel, Allen confronts the character of the issue being dealt with by both college student and college personnel worker.

... despite the nearly ubiquitous impact of the draft on educational, vocational, marital and psychological choices, and despite the critical role presumably played by college counselors in these areas of personal concern for students, college counselors can find no mention of the draft in [their professional journals]. (1,218)

The paucity of available information and related data causes Allen to conclude,

... it does seem that our profession can only appear absurdly irrelevant when some of the most basic and nearly universal issues facing our constituents go unnoticed. (1,218)
Thus, we find the dilemma of today's college student personnel worker. There is a very real need to have at very least a basic depository of knowledge on the issues and concerns of this generation of college students. In addition it becomes necessary to study the groups themselves to determine if and to what extent such external factors play a role in structuring attitudes. The profession must understand the problem as it is viewed by those most affected by its social pressures.

Problem

It is the purpose of this study to determine the character of the attitudes possessed by college men as they relate to the military draft. A dreadful lack of organized and published information now exists within the pupil personnel services profession, and yet institutions of higher education will be expected to meet these and other needs of their students. More data must be secured.

More specifically, this present study is concerned with reviewing attitudes as they are now formulated. Comparison with former studies and the effects of recent changes in draft legislation will aid in determining how students have viewed their situation in years gone by, as well as how they look to present and future.
Null Hypotheses

With the advent of legislative alterations to the laws of military conscription in January, 1970, the present investigation seeks to identify any major shifts of significance in student attitudes which have occurred as a direct result. The concern is whether or not students at The Ohio State University (OSU) will react in a similar fashion to the responses gathered in previous OSU studies.

Stated in null form, the first hypothesis is:

Ohio State University students queried in 1970 will not differ significantly from those students studied in 1969 and 1967 respectively regarding their attitudes toward the possibility of impending military service.

Additionally, an attempt is made to determine any significant differences existing within the sample among students of different rank levels. Stated in null form, this hypothesis is:

There will be no significant differences in attitudes noted on the survey questionnaires among freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors and graduate men regarding some factors related to the probability of military service.

The study attempts to explore the issue in order to see how students define the probability of serving in the United States military, in addition to identifying those causal factors that seemingly determine these attitudes. Student reaction to the newly
imposed lottery system of manpower procurement is also explored briefly.

**Basic Assumptions**

1. The instrument used for measurement was valid.
2. Each subject was adequately motivated to answer honestly and to the best of his abilities.
3. Sampling procedures were the same for all subjects for each of the three studies compared.

**Justification**

1. This is a relatively new attitude formation.
2. The military draft is of immediate concern to male students.
3. The opinions gathered on the military draft are of those persons who are most affected by its provisions.
4. Student attitudes regarding the military draft are real and not hypothetical.
5. Student attitudes relate to the problems of society as a whole and have meaning for college student personnel workers.
Limitations

This study is limited by the fact that only 500 respondents were employed for the final analysis of results. These 500 men represented an equal number of students from each class rank level: freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors and graduate students.

Furthermore, the reader is cautioned to believe that the results obtained here would be similar to those found at other colleges and universities. The entire sample of this study was drawn from the male student body of OSU, and may therefore not be representative of other campus populations. However, the results of this study could be considered valuable clues to what factors are operating in the minds of college men today, no matter what school they may be attending. To this extent, the information provided here could be of great interest.

Lastly, it should be noted that the researcher has experienced nine years of being an undergraduate and graduate student, while at the same time not having been in the role of a member of the United States Armed Forces. This may cause him to present information in favor of the role with which he is most familiar. However, the intent is to present data with as open a mind as possible.
SUMMARY

In working with college men, it is evident that the military draft has been, and continues to be, a major source of discouragement, discontent, anxiety, fear and frustration for them. This is so in spite of recent changes designed to make the Selective Service System more equitable, as well as more predictable. It is not merely an exaggeration to state that most issues of consequence for college men are somehow directly or indirectly related to the military draft. The draft, in itself, has diverted many young men to college whether or not they really desired further education. It is therefore important that understanding be achieved of the problem so that college personnel workers are capable of dealing with the difficulties that arise.

Chapter I of this dissertation is a review of the problem and a plan for studying its nature at The Ohio State University.

Chapter II is a review of the literature which is pertinent to a study of student attitudes regarding the military draft.

Chapter III contains a discussion of the research methodology of this study and provides a review of the nature and source of the instrument employed.

Chapter IV is devoted to the findings of the research, with the concluding chapter providing a summary and brief discussion of the results.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

It is indeed significant that controversy over an issue such as the military draft can have such a profound and far reaching effect upon such a large segment of the college population. However, the problem does in fact exist. It is honed to an even greater degree by the apparent scarcity of research data and information on the topic, which if available, might enable student personnel workers to deal more intelligently and successfully with such issues. It appears evident that the student personnel workers are unable to speak of any pertinent literature which might aid their present efforts in helping students to cope with such problems. The unfortunate result is often too obvious; students are turning in countless numbers to other agencies for the assistance they so enthusiastically seek. The relevance of the "student" personnel profession is severely shaken by such a fact, as it has not visibly taken any active involvement with the issue.

A review of some of the professional literature illustrates this situation, yielding only meager amounts of meaningful information.
The paucity of such data is all too striking. A five year review of seven specific journals which usually deal with the problems of college students furnished but one article of any significance to the situation. The journals reviewed were:

Personnel and Guidance Journal
Journal of College Student Personnel
Journal of Counselor Education and Supervision
Journal of Counseling Psychology
Today's Education
Journal of Teacher Education
Phi Delta Kappan

In 1968, the Journal of College Student Personnel reviewed the results of a study conducted by Stewart and Hauck at The Ohio State University. It was that study which serves as the forerunner to this present investigation. Their study sought to determine the importance of several causal attitudinal factors upon student willingness or reluctance to serve in the military. In summation their study concludes:

Current unrest about the ethical status of the draft and the war -- as well as the adverse effects of forces related to the draft on college achievement and long term planning -- should make student personnel
workers very much aware of the need for making available to students full and accurate information about Selective Service and for opening avenues for dialogue and counseling in dealing with individual students. (6,377)

Needless to say, such a statement has not in itself created any emphasis of concern for this problem.

Two years after this initial investigation, the military draft continued to serve as a focal point of campus controversy at OSU, as well as at numerous other institutions across the country. This prompted Hauck and Stewart to once again investigate the situation in 1969 to determine what attitudes were now operating at OSU, in addition to deciphering what changes, if any, had occurred since 1967. In an article slated to be published in an upcoming issue of the Journal of College Student Personnel, the 1969 study reveals the following findings:

1. Student Attitudes had significantly changed toward the military draft, and in a negative direction.
2. Comments indicated that it may be the Vietnam War, and not necessarily unfair draft laws, which is the focus of concern among students.
3. Students are generally more of one mind in their attitudes, and
4. Students would in growing numbers openly resist the military draft in defiance of the war effort.
Thus, it is at this point that the present study is conceived in an attempt to determine any additional changes that may have taken place. Such changes, it is hypothesized, may have transpired as a direct result of recent legislative changes in the laws of the military draft which have been designed to make the system more equitable, predictable, and fair.

Additionally, it is at this junction that related literature also finds its point of departure, as the search for further information requires the researcher to look elsewhere.

As a result of the fruitless search in the professional literature, this researcher has attempted to make personal contact with several agencies of education and government to obtain any data which they might have, or be aware of. The agencies contacted were:

1. State Selective Service Headquarters
   State of Ohio - Columbus, Ohio
2. Research and Statistics Division
   National Selective Service Headquarters
   Washington, D.C.
3. Superintendent of Documents
   U.S. Government Printing Office
   Washington, D.C.
4. National Education Association
   Washington, D.C.
5. American Council of Education
   Washington, D.C.
However, it is once again surprising that none of the above named agencies was able to supply any information on student attitudes of the military draft. The inability of these groups to yield any information points to the generally distant stance they too have maintained on the issue.

In April, 1970, a research report was published by Miron and Seldacek for the Counseling Center of the University of Maryland. Entitled "Student Attitudes Toward Military Service," their study was very similar to that conducted in 1967 by Stewart and Hauck. Using an original instrument which incorporated many of the items employed by the OSU study in 1967, the Maryland study of 225 men students found attitudes revolving around three basic issues; militarism, patriotism, and military service. The results of the Maryland study provide additional indication of the high degree of negative attitude that exists among college men. For example, reporting on the degree of disruption felt by students, the Maryland study speaks of even greater concern than that evidenced at OSU in 1967. However, the 1969 OSU study reports very similar responses to those gathered in Maryland the same year. In general, the Maryland study agrees closely with the results reported by Stewart and Hauck at Ohio State.
Aside from the above mentioned studies, a search for possible masters' and doctoral studies reveals no additional information of value to this topic.

Summary

A review of the professional literature, as well as the materials gathered by related agencies of both education and government yields few studies of value concerning the effects of the military draft upon college men. Only three studies can be cited that have dealt directly with the situation, two of which serve as the basis for this longitudinal investigation. The third, and most recent study, was conducted at the University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

It is concluded, therefore, that the student personnel profession has not taken a lead in helping to better understand and resolve the difficulties besetting college men who are preparing to make vocational, personal and marital decisions. Rather it appears that student personnel is not allowing itself as a profession to become involved, although such a situation appears both illogical and absurd.
Chapter III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Selection of the Sample

One of the most critical steps for conducting an attitude survey is
the selection of a sample which will be representative of the larger
community from which it was drawn. Thus, when attempting to obtain
as unbiased and true a representation as possible, researchers are
cautionsed to employ random methods of selection to identify their
sample. Randomization means that every person in the total
population has an equal opportunity for being selected and considered
in the study. In terms of the present study, this would imply that
every male student enrolled full-time at The Ohio State University
during Winter Quarter, 1970; who was residing in University
residence halls might be selected. In other words, the 500 students
sought for the sample would be obtained from the more than 6,000
residence hall men believed to reside in the complex.

As worthy as random procedures are for consideration, the
scope of the present investigation of student attitudes does not
permit such randomization to be achieved. The resources necessary
to conduct such an ambitious endeavor were not available. With a population of such proportion to select from, the task of obtaining a truly random sample was enormous, if not impossible, as residence hall populations are in a continual state of flux. Thus, the total population is continually changing from day to day.

As a result, a non-random sampling procedure has been used. What this means is that each and every man in the residence hall system has not had an equal chance of being drawn into the final sample. In research terminology, then, the sample would be considered biased. However, to help counteract such a fact, the 1970 sample was measured on certain characteristics which previous samples were also quizzed. From that data a comparison is more easily determined to see how one sample compared with the remaining two. Table I provides this information. No significant differences exist.

In order to obtain 100 respondents for each of the five rank levels of study, similar procedures as those used in 1967 and 1969 were used. The distribution and collection of questionnaires was largely facilitated by members of the residence hall staffs. The instrument was introduced to the students of each hall on campus at approximately the same time of Winter Quarter as in previous studies.
Table I

Characteristics of sample
Total N=500 for each year

QUESTION: What was your age at last birthday?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1967</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Under 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 18 or 19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 20 or 21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 22 to 25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 26 or over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1970 df=4 $\chi^2 = 1.24$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1969 - 1970 $\chi^2 = 1.46$ NOT SIGNIFICANT

QUESTION: Are you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1967</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Engaged, pinned or otherwise “going steady?”</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Single or unattached</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1970 df=1 $\chi^2 = .09$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1969 - 1970 df=1 $\chi^2 = .02$ NOT SIGNIFICANT

QUESTION: In which bracket is your cumulative college average?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1967</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In good standing (2.00 +)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not in good standing (1.99 -)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1970 df=1 $\chi^2 = .42$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1969 - 1970 df=1 $\chi^2 = .06$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
The attempt to duplicate the time of disbursement was done so as to reduce the amount of influence the time of the school year might have upon student attitude formations.

Finally, after the first 100 completed questionnaires were obtained for each rank level, the data was coded and punched on data control cards in preparation for computer analysis. The data was exposed to the Ohio State Questionnaire Analysis (O.S.Q.A.) for interpretation. Additional information on the O.S.Q.A. is provided in a later section.

**Instrument**

During the early 1950's, a trio of investigators from Cornell University set about the task of determining the nature of student attitudes toward the military service. In addition, the Cornell team attempted to identify some of the major causal factors which were suspected of being strong forces of influence upon attitude formation. During April and May of 1952 their lengthy questionnaire was distributed to nearly 3,000 students at eleven universities across the nation. The major causal factors of influence were:

1. Guilt feelings
2. Attitude toward Korean War
3. Concern about serving
4. Disruption of plans
5. Personal adjustment
6. Attitude toward war
7. Attitude toward Armed Forces
8. Duty to serve

These eight causal factors were determined after several months of intensive interviews with college students.

In 1967 the Cornell questionnaire was once again used. The sample consisted of 500 men at the campus of The Ohio State University, and the instrument was employed to investigate each of the inferred causal factors revealed in 1952. Each of these independent variables, or inferred causal factors, was measured against the ninth variable, or dependent variable, identified as "student attitude toward military service."

In 1969 the Cornell questionnaire was again used at OSU, but greatly reduced in its length. The instrument was condensed to measure those specific variables which had been noted as being of major influence in the 1967 study. Specifically, the major inferred causal factors for the 1969 study were:

1. Concern about serving
2. Disruption of plans
3. Duty to serve
In addition, an item seeking student reactions to resisting military service was included.

For the present study the instrument maintains basically the same materials and format of the 1969 survey. The list of causal factors for analysis remains the same. However, an additional inquiry is included to determine more precisely what students feel regarding the lottery system of military selection. For a sample of the questionnaire see the appendix.

**Statistical Treatment**

Hypothesis I requires the researcher to test for any significance of difference resulting from responses made to questions in 1970 with those responses made to the same question in 1967 and 1969 respectively. Computed by hand, hypothesis I is tested by using the general formula for Chi-Square.

To test the results of hypothesis II, the Ohio State Questionnaire Analysis Program (O.S.Q.A.) is employed. The O.S.Q.A. is a program which tabulates and summarizes the results of questionnaires of the multiple choice variety. The program is designed to handle multiple sets of data under the control of data control cards. For each class ran, -- freshmen through graduate students, -- it is possible to obtain both a frequency count and response level for each of the twenty-five questions asked.
In addition, the O.S.Q.A. program provides a comparison of responses of two class levels to the same inquiry. This type of comparison provides the mean answer of both groups, plus the Komolgorov-Smirnov statistic\(^1\) and the Chi-Square approximation with a level of significance. To test for any significant differences between groups of students to the same inquiry, the O.S.Q.A. proved to be a highly dependable and efficient measure.

**Summary**

It is well recognized that whenever and wherever possible, surveys of attitude formation should attempt to gather research data by random sampling procedures. This is in accord with the procedures followed by similar studies conducted in 1967 and 1969.

Although the present sample has been selected by non-random methods, comparison reveals that it is quite similar to the two previous samples with which it is compared. No significant differences are noted between either of the two former samples and that selected in 1970.

The instrument used is that designed in the early 1950's at Cornell University. It has been modified for use at OSU, but still maintains most of its original content.

To test for significant differences, hypothesis I was tested by use of the general Chi-Square formula. Hypothesis II also requires Chi-Square levels of significance to determine the extent of differences, but such statistical treatments were provided by use of the O.S.Q.A. program of questionnaire analysis.
Chapter IV

FINDINGS

Hypothesis I

Ohio State University students queried in 1970 will not differ significantly from those students studied in 1969 and 1967 respectively regarding their attitudes toward the possibility of impending military service.

Attempting to accept or reject this hypothesis, each of the two previous OSU samples (1967 and 1969) will be compared with that sample selected in 1970. As previously indicated, neither of these three samples differs significantly from the other two on a number of identifying characteristics (Table 1). Thus, the three samples are considered to be quite similar. Comparison is therefore made on the student attitudes of full time military service (dependent variable), and then examined further by a review of the three causal factors (independent variables) which affect the formation of this attitude.

Attitude Toward Full Time Service

Examination of the responses offered by students in 1970 with those made in 1967 and 1969 indicates rather conclusively that
student attitudes appear to be more similar at OSU than before studied. Whereas the 1967 report indicates a very diverse attitude among students, 1969 reveals an increase in homogeneity of attitudes which in 1970 has seemingly developed into a common outlook. Thus, attitudes have in fact changed. For the purposes of clarification of when certain attitudes made their initial appearance, the tables that follow will include comparisons of 1967 with 1969, in addition to those already made mention. Examination of the specific questions regarding attitude toward full time service helps to determine the significance of changes that are reported (Table 2).

Review of the data from Table 2 shows rather substantial increases in the number of students who see the military service as offering fewer advantages than disadvantages. Significant increases toward negative opinion are determined between 1967 and 1970 (question 1). The greater part of this difference took place between the first two studies (1967 and 1969) where significant difference at the .01 level of confidence is reported.

In addition, significant increases in the number of men not desiring to enter into the military is noted in question 2 of Table 2, with more than twice the number of men in 1967 (19%) being reported in 1970 (41%). Again, the major thrust of negative response falls between the years of 1967 and 1969.
Table 2
Attitude Toward Full Time Service
Total N=500 for each year

QUESTION 1 - When you think of your personal situation, would you say that the advantages of going into full time military service outweigh the disadvantages, or is it the other way around?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Advantages heavily outweigh disadvantages</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advantages tend to outweigh disadvantages</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advantages and disadvantages about equal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disadvantages tend to outweigh advantages</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disadvantages heavily outweigh advantages</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1969 df=4 $X^2= 5.14$ Significant at .01
1967 - 1970 df=4 $X^2= 9.36$ Significant at .005
1969 - 1970 df=4 $X^2= 1.58$ NOT SIGNIFICANT

QUESTION 2 - Which of the following statements comes closest to describing your own feelings about going into full time military service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- I'd like to get in</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I'd just as soon stay out</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I don't want to go in at all</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1969 df=2 $X^2= 4.50$ Significant at .05
1967 - 1970 df=2 $X^2= 13.96$ Significant at .01
1969 - 1970 df=2 $X^2= 2.70$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
### Table 2 continued

**QUESTION 3** - If it were up to you, would you want to be deferred from military service as long as possible?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 5.20 \text{ Significant at .05} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 20.14 \text{ Significant at .001} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 6.54 \text{ Significant at .05} \]

**QUESTION 4** - As things now stand, do you think it is best for you, personally, to go into military service and get it over with, or to stay out as long as you can?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best to go in and get it over with</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best to stay out until you graduate, then go in</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best to stay out as long as you can</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.68 \text{ NOT SIGNIFICANT} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 6.80 \text{ Significant at .05} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 1.94 \text{ NOT SIGNIFICANT} \]

**QUESTION 5** - The Armed Forces try their best to give a man a chance to show what he can do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .58 \text{ NOT SIGNIFICANT} \]
\[ \chi^2 = .42 \text{ NOT SIGNIFICANT} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 4.08 \text{ Significant at .05} \]
Closely aligned with these results is the paralleled growth in the number of men seeking as lengthy a deferment from military service as possible (question 3). Between 1967 and 1969 a greater increase in the percentage of men who maintained a more negative viewpoint is reported than that which exists with the comparison of 1969 and 1970 responses.

Additionally, there appears to be a trend since the original study for students to feel it is personally better for them to remain out of the military service as long as possible. Whereas 47% in 1967, and 56% in 1969 reported they would prefer to stay out of the military as long as they can, 64% of the respondents to the 1970 inquiry report similar attitudes (question 4). This represents a significant increase at the .05 level since 1967. Such an attitude is maybe partially explained with question 5 of Table 2 which reveals a significant change in the last year regarding the number of men who feel the service will not give them an opportunity to show what they can do.

Overall, questions 1 through 5 of Table 2 show quite conclusively that significant change has in fact evolved over the past three years. Students now appear to feel stronger about not wanting to go into the military and feel it is best for them to avoid it if at all possible.
They see less advantages of a service career and maintain a rather strong belief that one is not able to show what he can do if in the military. The most considerable amount of this change in a negative prospectus appears to have developed between the years of 1967 and 1969, with a leveling off affect having emerged during the last two studies of 1969 and 1970. Thus, insofar as the dependent variable is concerned, the first hypothesis might in part be rejected. However, a review of the causal factors as well is required before any substance may be given to this possible rejection. The causal factors considered are Concern About Serving, Disruption of Plans, and Duty to Serve.

**Concern About Serving**

In 1969, Hauck and Stewart report that no significant changes were noted since 1967 regarding student concern about serving. In fact, attitudes about how guilty students felt about not being in the military, as well as how worried they were over the prospects of impending military service were quite similar from one year to the next. In general, the first two observations of this longitudinal study revealed samples possessing little guilt about not being in the military, as well as an attitude of not being too concerned about the prospects of such. Most students in these first two studies
maintained deferments which almost certainly assured their safety.

One such category of deferment was the relatively high number of students enrolled in ROTC (34% and 29% respectively).

The results of this present study nearly replicate the results of the previous inquiries. No significant differences are noted (Table 3). However, it may be possible to detect a trend as there was a minor increase noted by the number of men now worrying about the service in 1970 (question 2). In addition to this increase is an even greater and significant decrease in the number of men enrolling in programs of ROTC instruction (Table 4). Since the initial study some very significant decreases can be noted. Thus, it appears that as fewer men seek the guaranteed deferred status of the ROTC, more students are exposed to the uncertainty of their student deferment, and increased worry seems to be exhibited.

It is therefore of interest to note that although an increase in concern was not significantly different between 1967 and 1969, as well as 1969 and 1970, the number of enrollments in ROTC was significantly lower (Table 4). Perhaps this is an indication of a negative attitude students have regarding war under any circumstances similar to the undeclared war of Vietnam.
Table 3
Concern About Serving
Total N=500 for each year

QUESTION 1 - Do you, yourself, ever feel guilty about not being in active service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Yes, often</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Yes, sometimes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Yes, but rarely</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-No, never</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1969 df=3 $\chi^2=0.38$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1967 - 1970 df=3 $\chi^2=1.48$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1969 - 1970 df=3 $\chi^2=0.54$ NOT SIGNIFICANT

QUESTION 2 - How often do you worry about being called into full time military service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-I worry about it often</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-I worry about it occasionally</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-I rarely worry about it</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-I never worry about it</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1969 df=3 $\chi^2=0.18$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1967 - 1970 df=3 $\chi^2=2.10$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1969 - 1970 df=3 $\chi^2=2.28$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
Table 4

ROTC Enrollments
Total N=500 for each year

QUESTION: Are you a member of ROTC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = \begin{cases} 
0.52 & \text{NOT SIGNIFICANT} \\
8.61 & \text{Significant at .01} \\
4.84 & \text{Significant at .05}
\end{cases}
\]

Thus, as a causal factor, concern about serving appears to be an important force which holds real meaning for determining student attitudes toward full time service. However, no significant changes in this concern are noted when each study is compared with the other two.

Disruption of Plans

It is clearly evident from the responses made in previous studies, as well as those of this 1970 investigation, that the factor of disruption is very potent and viable force in student attitude formation. In the minds of many students, the possibility of having their personal and professional ambitions disrupted is the greatest single factor to
be dealt with (Table 5). However, no significant change is found regarding this factor. Over the course of the three studies in this series, increases in the number of students seeing the military service as a major source of disruption are noted (question 1), to the extent that nearly 80% of the population view serving as a major or minor disruption. Although no significant change has occurred, it is indeed difficult to overlook the importance of this extremely high percentage.

In addition, significant increases are noted in the amount of sacrifice serving will create. Whereas 50% in 1967 and 53% in 1969 viewed serving as a fairly great or very great sacrifice, more than 70% are now responding with similar outlooks in 1970 (question 2). It is worthy to note that such attitudes have been the product of only the past year since no significant differences were noted between 1967 and 1969.

Related to these findings, the question of draft resistance comes to mind. In an attempt to isolate how much the disruptive factor would have an influence upon resistance, the following was asked:

"Do you feel draft resistance is justified under any circumstances?"

If the response was positive, respondents were asked to specify their reason(s). The percentage of positive replies to the question
Table 5
Disruption of Plans
Total N=500 for each year

QUESTION 1 - Would (or will) going into full time military service directly after graduation cause a major disruption in your life, or a minor disruption?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Major disruption</td>
<td>43.74</td>
<td>50.74</td>
<td>59.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minor disruption</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>19.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No disruption</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Don't know</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>13.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1969 df=3 \( \chi^2 = 1.88 \) NOT SIGNIFICANT
1967 - 1970 df=3 \( \chi^2 = 6.46 \) NOT SIGNIFICANT
1969 - 1970 df=3 \( \chi^2 = 2.04 \) NOT SIGNIFICANT

QUESTION 2 - If you are called to full time military service after graduation, how much of a sacrifice will it mean for you in general?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No sacrifice at all</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minor sacrifice</td>
<td>38.37</td>
<td>37.37</td>
<td>22.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fairly great sacrifice</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>33.53</td>
<td>37.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very great sacrifice</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>34.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1969 df=3 \( \chi^2 = 0.26 \) NOT SIGNIFICANT
1967 - 1970 df=3 \( \chi^2 = 10.36 \) Significant at .05
1969 - 1970 df=3 \( \chi^2 = 3.18 \) Significant at .05
and the reasons for a positive choice are observed on Table 6. Because this inquiry was not included in 1967, only this present study and the one preceding it are compared. Although there has not been significant movement since 1969, small increases of substantial interest are to be noted. The reasons for this attitude are quite similar for both studies, with the only notable change being the slight increase in the number of men assuming no responsibility for the war effort.

Thus, disruption serves as a very significant causal factor due to the overwhelming concern about it. At its present rate of increase, this factor should continue to serve as a major source of student bewilderment and anxiety in the years ahead.

**Duty to Serve**

Comparison of the responses made to the same questions for each of the three studies reveals very few significant differences regarding one's duty to serve. In fact, it is even difficult to assume that any trends are forming as respondents did not significantly differ with their replies. In general, students still appear to be saying that each person has an obligation to protect his nation in times of national defense. However, a great number of men prefaced
Table 6
Draft Resistance
Total N=500 for each year

QUESTION - Do you feel draft resistance is justified under any circumstances?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1969 - 1970 df=1 \( \chi^2 = 1.43 \) NOT SIGNIFICANT

*Classification of responses concerning resistance to the draft

1. Moral reasons                  41 | 42
2. Vietnam War illegal, unjust crime against humanity 20 | 20
3. Circumstances for which present draft laws defer 12 | 6
4. Unfair draft laws              8  | 6
5. Would resist under all circumstances 6 | 7
6. Believe that talents could be better utilized 4 | 5
7. Only through lawful means      3  | 3
8. Personal - Non acceptance of any responsibility 3 | 10
9. Manner of conducting war       3  | 1

TOTALS 100 % 100 %
such replies by declaring a difference between the defense of Vietnam and the defense of the United States. This point is brought vividly to mind when we see that 88% of the 1970 sample disagree that only a coward would refuse to protect his government. In addition, 79% of the same sample felt that a person has the right to remain in the country even if the same individual objects to supporting the government's war policies (Table 7).

In general, OSU men respect their obligation to serve the nation, but they reserve the right to individually determine what is, and is not, a national threat worthy of their support. For example, a growing number of students feel that it is fair for someone to be deferred while others are not (question 2). However, a significantly growing number of men also feel that it is not necessarily an obligation of a person to always "stand by his flag," and to protect it wherever it may be flown. Students seem to reserve the right to first question the governments activities, justify its intent, and then determine for themselves whether they can personally support it.

Duty to serve therefore continues to be a major variable for college men at OSU, and represents a large portion of their attitude formation of the military draft. The evidence presented
here indicates that growing numbers of men do not always hold hard
and fast to the opinions of students from previous years. For
example, significant numbers of men do not agree that persons are
cowards for not protecting the government in the military service.
In addition, only a relatively small percentage of the 1970 sample
feel one should not live in the country for refusing his "duty."
This fact is indicative of the significant increase which is noted of
men who believe that an individual does not owe it to the
government to protect it at all times in return for other privileges.

Thus, duty to serve appears to be a personal matter for each
individual, and decisions which are forged by students will rest in a
large part upon one's own conscience and convictions.

Conclusion

From the information that has been gathered, it is concluded that
hypothesis I is both rejected in part and sustained in part. Present
findings indicate that change has occurred in many instances, but
not in sufficient number to warrant a complete rejection. In each
case where significant change has been noted, attitudes were more
negative and against the draft system than in years previous. In
not one instance can it be reported that attitudes have become more
Table 7
Duty to Serve
Total N=500 for each year

QUESTION 1 - Only a coward would refuse to protect his government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Agree.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disagree.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1969 $\chi^2 = 0.26$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1967 - 1970 $\chi^2 = 2.36$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1969 - 1970 $\chi^2 = 4.19$ Significant at .05

QUESTION 2 - It is not fair for one man to be excused from military service while others are not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Agree.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disagree.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1969 $\chi^2 = 1.18$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1967 - 1970 $\chi^2 = 3.30$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1969 - 1970 $\chi^2 = 0.54$ NOT SIGNIFICANT

QUESTION 3 - If you refuse to support your government in war, you should not continue to live in the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Agree.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disagree.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1969 $\chi^2 = 2.59$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1967 - 1970 $\chi^2 = 0.00$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1969 - 1970 $\chi^2 = 2.59$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
Table 7 continued

QUESTION 4 - Too many people use conscientious objection as a loophole to escape service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disagree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1969 $\chi^2 = .08$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1967 - 1970 $\chi^2 = .18$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1969 - 1970 $\chi^2 = .33$ NOT SIGNIFICANT

QUESTION 5 - You owe it to your government to protect it in return for more important privileges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967 - 1969 $\chi^2 = .18$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
1967 - 1970 $\chi^2 = 12.00$ Significant at .001
1969 - 1970 $\chi^2 = 2.49$ NOT SIGNIFICANT
positive. Thus, it is to this fact that this hypothesis is rejected in part, as attitudes have changed to a limited degree.

To a larger degree, though, hypothesis I is also sustained in part. With absolutely no expression of more positive response by the 1970 sample, and in light of the limited growth of negative response, the majority of instances give firm indication that attitudes are somewhat sustained. Such a factor gives credence to the supposition that attitudes have reached what is termed as a leveling off phase. After a great deal of negative advance between the years 1967 and 1969, this present study yields evidence that indicates a stabilizing affect evolving between 1969 and 1970. Perhaps never before have so many individual attitudes on a topic created such a unanimity of opinion among students.

**Hypothesis II**

There will be no significant difference in attitudes noted on the survey questionnaire among freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors and graduate men regarding some factors related to the probability of military service.

The first significant differences reported by the OSQA program of analysis is the greater number of freshmen and sophomores who reported their academic status at the University as not in good
standing. The freshmen displayed significantly greater proportions of their sample in poor standing than did juniors, seniors and graduate students (Table 8).

Similarly, the freshmen sample exhibited stronger feelings in a positive direction that it is not fair for one man to be excused from the military service while others are not. It may be realized that this is a result of the greater number of freshmen in academic jeopardy at the University due to their poor standing, as well as the higher degree of self protection assumed by upperclassmen who have invested more time and money in their futures than have freshmen (question 2).

At the other end of the continuum, the graduate sample differed with the remainder of the population in two particular categories. First, the graduate men are evidently more settled in their family planning than any of the other class levels. Exactly half of the graduate sample indicated "attachment" while the other class samples fluctuated from 71% to 76% indicating no attachment (question 3).

Secondly, the graduate men displayed a far smaller percentage of their sample not maintaining a student (2-S) deferment (question 4) than did the other class levels.
### Table 8

**Significant Differences Among Class Ranks**

Total N=100 for each rank

**QUESTION 1** - In which bracket is your cumulative college average?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In good standing (2.00 +)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In poor standing (1.99 -)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 7.99 \text{ Significant at .025} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 10.58 \text{ Significant at .01} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 11.52 \text{ Significant at .005} \]

**QUESTION 2** - It is not fair for one man to be excused from military service while others are not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 8.82 \text{ Significant at .025} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 11.52 \text{ Significant at .005} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 12.50 \text{ Significant at .005} \]

**QUESTION 3** - Are you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaged, pinned, or otherwise attached</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single or unattached</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 13.52 \text{ Significant at .005} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 11.52 \text{ Significant at .005} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 8.82 \text{ Significant at .025} \]
\[ \chi^2 = 12.50 \text{ Significant at .005} \]
QUESTION 4 - What is your present draft status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Student deferred (2-S)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Physically deferred (1-Y;4-F)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Draftable (1-A)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fresh. - Sophs. $\chi^2 = 7.22$ Significant at .05
Fresh. - Juniors $\chi^2 = 14.58$ Significant at .001
Fresh. - Grads. $\chi^2 = 40.50$ Significant at .0005
Sophs. - Grads. $\chi^2 = 79.38$ Significant at .0005
Junior - Senior $\chi^2 = 12.50$ Significant at .005
Junior -- Grads. $\chi^2 = 103.68$ Significant at .0005
Senior -- Grads. $\chi^2 = 44.18$ Significant at .0005
Other than these few examples, no real significant differences are noted. The strands of commonality which presently exists among the entire 1970 sample is interesting to note. Compared with former studies, the latest investigation is significantly different as it is far more representative of homogeneous thoughts. It is therefore upon this fact that hypothesis II is accepted as no major listing of differences presents itself. It appears that more than ever before, students do maintain a rather unified and concerted attitude of the military draft system.
Chapter V
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND OBSERVATIONS

As one reviews the data that has been gleaned from the present investigation and then couples it with that information previously obtained in 1967 and 1969, several pertinent points are observed which are worthy of summation.

What appears as the most striking finding of this study is not the fact that college students feel negatively toward the military draft, but rather the intensity with which attitudes are held. In what might be termed a tidal wave of opinion, college men have displayed an attitude toward military service which has grown from the moderate dislike revealed in 1967 to an outright distrust and defiance of the system as viewed in the initial months of 1970. Between the years 1967 and 1969 negative attitudes gained considerably wide support. Since 1969, though, a leveling off of negative attitudes is noted. Such a tapering off of attitudes in a more negative direction is
possibly indicative of the plateau now reached which is probably representative of the common attitudes maintained by most college men at OSU. Perhaps never before has such an upheaval of emotion made itself so apparent to 20th Century America in such a short period of time and with such widespread support and conviction.

What must be regarded as a major factor of influence on these attitudes toward the military draft is the active U.S. involvement in Indochina. Great dissatisfaction against such intervention is being expressed on campuses across the country. This is evident to the extent that the major news services were reporting in mid-May 1970 that protests against the war and the draft had contributed in part to the temporary closing of nearly 300 institutions of higher education. As an ancillary agent of the war, the military draft falls easy prey to the protests of the time, becoming a real target for the cries of dissent.

Although college men seem quick to react against America's present policies of foreign involvement, most students are in general agreement that they owe it to their government to protect the nation in time of threat. However, policies presently being pursued are not in accord with what the majority of college men would seemingly regard as a national peril. Thus, growing numbers
of students are finding fault with intervention in Vietnam, and they appear to be prepared to display their displeasure with every means from peaceful protests to overt resistance and defiance.

In addition, college men generally agree that America is presently suffering from enough of its own internal problems to justify the use of their obtained knowledge to aid in combating our domestic issues before those of an international commitment. Candid comments obtained on questionnaires indicate that greater numbers of college men now speak of joining VISTA, as well as other local agencies of similar intent and pursuit.* Thus, the issue of whether college men are patriotic or not rests upon one's personal point-of-view. Under present regulations and priorities, and in the eyes of a critical public, college students are having an increasingly difficult time proving their allegiance to America. For college men, though, they appear to be forging for themselves a new kind of patriotism, -- that of standing up against that which they so strongly believe to be wrong.

*Based upon representative comments offered by respondents of the 1970 study which included the following:

"Two years in the Peace Corps or Vista is more my idea of serving mankind," and "I personally prefer helping my own nation first!"
Closely related to this factor is the intense degree of fear and anxiety being created within students by the possibility of having their personal plans, as well as degree hopes, interrupted by the draft. Such a possibility is an awesome thought for many, and representative of a great sacrifice if in fact it must be faced.

Aside from these points, it is important to conclude this summation with one rather significant fact. Possibly more than ever before, individual college students are speaking and acting their concerns in such a manner that attitudes now appear to be more similar and unified than those reported in past studies. In reference to nearly all inquiries that have been made of students over the course of this longitudinal study, replies have become steadily more similar with each year. Whereas the seniors and graduate men have maintained rather negative attitudes since 1967, the freshmen, sophomores, and juniors have come to alter their rather positive viewpoints in a more negative direction which is consistent with the ideas of these former two groups. Diverse opinion in 1967 has emerged today as a more common and definable attitude.
Overall, the issue of the college student who is faced with possible induction into the military serves as a point of contention and concern for thousands of men yearly. Such a situation deserves its due interest by student personnel workers.

Implications for the Profession of Student Personnel

Speaking and working with college men, it is not difficult to sense the feelings of desperation and emergency on their part. The young men of this country are presently faced with a crusade in which they believe and for which they will fight. They are making a strenuous effort for dialogue and understanding, but too often are meeting with defeat. In light of such a unanimity of response among students as reported here, it seems almost ridiculous that the professionals of student personnel administration know the least and seem to act the slowest in becoming attuned to today's student and his unique concerns.

With reference to this situation that confronts the profession, some of the following discussion points might prove beneficial in dealing more effectively and intelligently with problems of this nature.
1. GUIDANCE PERSONNEL NEED TO BE BETTER VERSED ON THE
NATURE OF CURRENT ISSUES OF CONCERN AMONG STUDENTS.

There appears to be a rather obvious lack of professional
guidance that student personnel workers are affording college youth
on the draft. The data reviewed in this study suggests the extent
of this need. The lack of use of available information to guide
counselors with the complexities of better understanding the issue of
the military draft might now engage the counseling profession in
developing new lines of communication with young adults. Each
generation harvests its own unique personal concerns. Possibly the
profession might do well to prepare itself to anticipate and attack
such concerns before they become major issues of great consequence.

2. PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR STUDENT PERSONNEL SHOULD
CONSIDER THE VOICING OF CONCERN OVER GOVERNMENTAL
REGULATIONS WHICH DIRECTLY AND INDIRECTLY AFFECT THEIR
CLIENTELE.

The extent of the problems created by the draft laws draws
attention to the possibility of organizing the profession for purposes
of lobbying with the country's law makers. Removed from political
shuffling, committed and enthusiastic leadership seem to be
necessary prerequisites for reaching the roots of the issues.
3. **PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS FOR STUDENT PERSONNEL NEED TO BE KEENLY AWARE OF THE NEED TO INFORM PROFESSIONAL WORKERS ON THE ISSUES WHICH CONFRONT THEIR ROLES.**

   Student personnel workers may do well to update their professional dialogue through their own house organ(s). Only if the literature reflects the relevant concerns of the era might counseling personnel be made aware of the more exacting nature of their continually changing role and the issues which affect it.

4. **RATHER THAN MERELY ASSOCIATE, COUNSELORS NEED TO COMMUNICATE WITH ONE ANOTHER.**

   Personnel staffs which actively share their successes and failures through those appropriate channels provided them might in time assist in altering the direction which the profession is apparently pursuing. Activity seems necessary before we can lay claim to advancement.

5. **DEVELOPMENTAL STEPS SHOULD BE MADE TOWARD DEFINING A BETTER APPROACH TO DEALING WITH CURRENT ISSUES.**

   This study strongly suggests the possible need that exists for encouraging the development of new programs and offerings which would be designed to overcome the high degree of anxiety being
created by issues such as the military draft. Pertaining to the military draft, several high schools and colleges in the greater New York City area serve as fine examples where steps are being taken to assist students who are perplexed and confused by the draft.

6. **EVALUATION OF PRESENT POLICIES MUST BE MADE TO DETERMINE THE COURSE OF PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED IN THE FUTURE.**

There is a need for continuous evaluation of data which is deemed most important and pertinent to achieving student growth and development. Perhaps a constant re-evaluation of the counselor's role in relation to the uniqueness of the problems his clientele face will serve as a point of possible departure. The pulse of the campus scene must be carefully followed if an accurate course is to be charted by the profession.

**Observations**

The mood now running through American college youth runs deep. It is a mood which has shown itself to be related to not just one issue alone. However, the military draft serves as one excellent example of how tensions arise from frustration and bewilderment of
this sort. The explosiveness of the mood may have been suggested more recently by the swift reaction that swept the nation’s campuses in the wake of the Kent State tragedy. Student reaction to issues which concern them directly has been profoundly sad, bitter and deadly serious.

In times such as these, there has seldom been a more urgent challenge to the profession for leadership on the campus, -- a leadership that will educate youth and expose the fraudulence of the rock throwers and hall burners who are bent on violence, and give strong voice to the genuine concerns of the student. Leadership is necessary, and in some small manner the profession of student personnel should be prepared to exercise some of its own in the interests and in behalf of the college student.
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

THIS IS NOT A TEST. IT ASKS ONLY FOR YOUR OWN ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS.

This questionnaire has been constructed on the basis of detailed interviews with students. The questions and the answer categories are based on their opinions and attitudes — now, yours are sought!

THERE IS NO GRADE OR ANY OTHER SCORE. In fact, for most of the questions there is no right nor wrong answer. The only answer is your opinion — your own feelings.

Mark SOME answer to each question. This is important. Answer each question to the best of your ability.

All of these questions can be answered by a check mark next to the category which applies to you. Where instructions are indicated, please read them carefully.

If you care to elaborate your opinions, or to add any fuller explanation, please feel free to do so. You may be very frank with your answers, for these questionnaires are unsigned, unidentified, and completely anonymous.

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS ANONYMOUS.

DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Thank you for your time and cooperation,

Robb J. Hauck
East Baker Hall — O.S.U.
Men's Draft Questionnaire

1. What is your year in college?  
   1- Freshman  
   2- Sophomore  
   3- Junior  
   4- Senior  
   5- Graduate or Professional

2. Your age at last birthday:  
   1- Under 18  
   2- 18 or 19  
   3- 20 or 21  
   4- 22 to 25  
   5- 26 or over

3. Are you:  
   1- Engaged, pinned, or otherwise "going steady."  
   2- Single or unattached.

4. In which bracket is your cumulative college average?  
   1- In good standing (2.00 and above).  
   2- Not in good standing (1.99 and below).

5. Do you, yourself, ever feel guilty about not being in active service?  
   1- Yes, often  
   2- Yes, sometimes  
   3- Yes, but rarely  
   4- No, never

6. How often do you worry about being called into full-time military service?  
   1- I worry about it often.  
   2- I worry about it occasionally.  
   3- I rarely worry about it.  
   4- I never worry about it.

7. Would (or will) going into full-time military service directly after graduation cause a major disruption in your life, or a minor disruption?  
   1- Major disruption  
   2- Minor disruption  
   3- No disruption  
   4- Don't know

8. If you are called to full-time military service directly after graduation, how much of a sacrifice will it mean for you in general?  
   1- No sacrifice at all.  
   2- Minor sacrifice.  
   3- Fairly great sacrifice.  
   4- Very great sacrifice.
9. When you think of your own personal situation, would you say that the advantages of going into full-time military service outweigh the disadvantages for you, or is it the other way around?

__1— Advantages heavily outweigh disadvantages
__2— Advantages tend to outweigh disadvantages
__3— Advantages and disadvantages about equal
__4— Disadvantages tend to outweigh advantages
__5— Disadvantages heavily outweigh advantages

10. Which of the following statements comes closest to describing your own feelings about going into full-time military service?

__1— I'd like to get in
__2— I'd just as soon stay out if possible
__3— I don't want to go in at all

11. If it were up to you, would you want to be deferred from military service as long as possible?

__1— Yes, definitely
__2— Yes, probably
__3— No

12. As things now stand, do you think it is best for you, personally, to go into military service and get it over with, or to stay out as long as you can?

__1— Best to go in and get it over with
__2— Best to stay out until you graduate, then go in and get it over with
__3— Best to stay out as long as you can

13. The Armed Forces try their best to give a man a chance to show what he can do.

__1— Agree
__2— Disagree

14. Only a coward would refuse to protect his government.

__1— Agree
__2— Disagree

15. It is not fair for one man to be excused from military service while others are not.

__1— Agree
__2— Disagree
16. If you refuse to support your government in war, you should not continue to live in the country.
   ___ 1- Agree
   ___ 2- Disagree

17. Too many people use conscientious objection as a loophole to escape service.
   ___ 1- Agree
   ___ 2- Disagree

18. Too many people use educational deferments as a loophole to escape service.
   ___ 1- Agree
   ___ 2- Disagree

19. You owe it to your government to protect it in return for more important privileges.
   ___ 1- Agree
   ___ 2- Disagree

20. Women should be drafted as are men.
   ___ 1- Agree
   ___ 2- Disagree

21. Do you feel draft resistance is justified under any circumstances?
   ___ 1- Yes (specify) __________________________
   ___ 2- No

22. Are you a veteran? 23. Are you a member of R.O.T.C.?
   ___ 1- Yes
   ___ 2- No
   ___ 1- Yes
   ___ 2- No

24. What is your present draft status?
   ___ 1- Student deferred (2-S)
   ___ 2- Physically deferred (1-Y or 4-P)
   ___ 3- Draftable (1-A)
   ___ 4- Other (specify) _____

25. Do you feel the "Lottery System" is more equitable than the previous system of draft selection?
   ___ 1- Yes
   ___ 2- No

*** IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, PLEASE ATTACH THEM. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION****
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