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CHAPTER I

LOVE, HATE, AND THE SCHOOL: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Why men behave as they do continues to be a perplexing and seemingly insoluble puzzle. Even the quest to understand the physical world appears plain in comparison with the complexities of the social world, the world of values and motives, of introspection and internalization, of mind and soul, and of other infinitessimal, immeasurable, and unobservable phenomena. What seems to be known is soon disproved; what appear to be productive channels of exploration crystalize into sterile dogma. The behavioral scientist, true to the tenets of determinism, empiricism, and behaviorism, is forced to limit his horizons in the hope one day of broadening them. The generality of his truth is frequently that of an artificial universe, and the revelations of his scientific inquiry fail to affect the quality of men's relationships with one another.

The inquiry reported here has been undertaken in full realization of the adversities to be encountered in the exploration into the human condition. But it has been done in the belief that if man's humanness is to be engendered
then man's behavior toward man continues to be worthy of study. It cannot be abandoned because of difficulties or discouragements.

1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Men sometimes behave in ways that are positive, supportive, and lifegiving toward their fellow men. At other times they behave in ways that are negative, destructive, and deathgiving. Why do some men help others? Why do some seek to harm others? Is this man's nature? Is man merely the product of his environment? What set of variables might account for this ambivalence?

History has demonstrated that the paradoxes of competition and cooperation, individual and community, self and other are not new sets of choices. But modern societies, even more than traditional ones, seem to require more discriminating responses as complex social structures develop, multiplying role expectations, stimulating pluralism, spawning alienation, and generating conflict.¹ Within modern societies in particular, the maintenance of positive

¹See, for example, Herbert Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964); Donald N. Michael, The Unprepared Society (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968); Pitirim A. Sorokin, Social Mobility (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1927).
satisfying human relationships seems to be difficult. Technology, industrialism, materialism, bureaucracy, and specialization appear to conspire to remove the human element as an independent variable - to create what Clark has called "technical barbarism . . . men acute in technical judgment but myopic in social affairs, politics, and cultural understanding."^3

As one response to the increasingly differentiated demands of such a complex social order, schools have been more fully entrusted with the critical task of securing in children the essential conditions for the continued existence of society. Thus aside from their more traditional function of transmitting existing knowledge and cultural norms, schools now also play an important role in the encouragement and implementation of change by supporting the discovery of new knowledge. In addition they allocate individuals to positions in society, aid in courtship rituals, help maintain sub-group traditions, and even become agents

---


of social reform. These multiple functions may be necessary but not yet sufficient. Evidence mounts to support the contention that the continued existence of human societies—that is, the survival of such societies—may require the development of patterns of behavior which magnify positive human relationships. Some educators are therefore urging that greater emphasis be placed upon the planned development of these social behaviors, but until much more is known about the nature and strength of school effects, as well as about the genesis and nature of pro- or anti-social behaviors, reliable means for restructuring experience for any such purposes will remain elusive.

II. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The primary concern of this research endeavor is the more complete identification and explanation of phenomena

---


which have been empirically demonstrated to have significant effects in influencing persons to behave either in positive, helpful, supportive ways or in negative, harmful, destructive ways in their relationships with others. It is hypothesized that these particular classes of social behaviors when exhibited by students may be explained as a function of the interaction between environmental and personal dimensions of activity in the school context. A model which is capable of generating a set of related hypotheses which when tested may more completely verify the explanation of interactions between these dimensions and the demonstration of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior in educational settings is the intended outcome. A forthcoming product will be the development of a program of research designed to test the hypotheses generated.

Justification for the decision to use the school as a focus for inquiry into social behavior rests upon the assumption that the school is a miniature social system and as a microcosm of the larger society is one indicator of the trends, tensions, aims, and outcomes of interactions within the larger social system of which it is a part. A further consideration is the realization that as an organizational arm of the larger educational system, the school has the potential for becoming an increasingly active agent
in the guidance of social action. The investigation of the nature of personal and contextual variables may not only contribute to more informed educational planning but give some indication of the nature of patterns of behavior which are emitted into the larger society as students demonstrate the effects of school-related experiences.

III. RELATED ENDEAVORS

The person. Efforts to understand man’s behavior probably originated no later than man himself. Certainly the history of mankind as well as the history of education is replete with theoretical notions about man, notions ranging from those in which he is seen as a frightened, desperate creature whose struggle for survival results in a war of everyman against everyman to that of an innocent, good, natural being whose corruption is attributable to the unnatural, repressive effects of society and its institutions. Implicit in each of these positions, despite their antithetical content, is the assumption that man as a living, functioning being has a “nature” which both provides energy and gives directionality to his behavior.

---

8 Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan (Everyman’s Library), Chapter XIII.
9 Jeanne Jacques Rosseau, Emile (Everyman’s Library).
Among those who have tried to understand the self-regulative properties of man, this "nature" has been explained by a variety of constructs - traits, drives, instincts, impulses, needs - but to what extent these motivating processes are accounted for by fundamental, given genetic endowments of the individual and to what extent they are attributable to the social context of man's experience continues as an unresolved dilemma in psychological thought. Within the present century empirical evidence has mounted to document numerous theoretical positions. There is now little doubt, for example, that basic physiological states do influence personality development; furthermore it has been shown that changes can be induced physiologically which have effects upon responses attributed to internal psychological organization. A number of recent discoveries in biochemistry clearly demonstrate the influence of certain drugs upon both the cognitive and affective process of the individual.\footnote{Gordon Rattray Taylor, The Biological Time Bomb (New York: The World Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 128-33, 144-45. Although a popularized version, this account summarizes much of the work done to date.} The work by Birch and associates has isolated a number of primary reaction characteristics of children which appear to indicate a set of organismic factors independent of situational
modification. Even sociologists now propose the existence of certain basic human needs common to people of all societies and suggest that social orders may be judged upon their effectiveness in meeting those needs.

Yet hardly anyone would deny the significance of social experience for the development of the individual. Anthropologists as well as social psychologists have shown that motives are defined in terms of different cultures and different group settings, that personality is determined by perceptions as shaped by experience. A number of psychological theories emphasize the developmental nature of personality and emphasize the criticality of the environment in bringing about discontinuities in the developmental pattern. Some, such as Sears, view


15 Henry W. Maier, Three Theories of Child Development (Harper and Row, 1965).
personality as dependent upon a life-long process of modification of behavior based upon new experiences. 16

It appears, therefore, that a logical and parsimonious, if not highly sophisticated explanation of man's "nature" is that an individual's personality rests upon the existence of certain basic energizing forces biologically determined but develops as a transaction between those physiological needs and the context of experience. With this interaction, it is conceivable that complex, relatively stable forces will come to exist which in themselves take on the appearance of basic needs. In sum, then, the individual's personality can succinctly be described as \( P = f(NE) \) where \( P = \) Personality, \( f = \) function, \( N = \) Needs and \( E = \) Experience.

However, this particular explanation provides an orientation adequate only to initiate this investigation. In order to more fully explain social behavior, it probably is necessary, for one thing, to be able to describe personality richly and precisely. Two promising approaches for doing this have been developed by Guilford 17 and

---


10

Cattell who, by means of multivariate analysis isolated sets of factors which more accurately sample the totality involved in behavior and discriminate more effectively among individuals. But personality, in and of itself, is not an adequate explanatory construct for the prediction of behavior in situ.

The environment. Investigators of social experience normally presume a field or environment which exists apart from the personal dimension. This environment, they may further postulate, includes the existence of relatively stable social structures by means of which men carry on integrated human activities. Sets of obligatory norms or institutions are formed. Within these institutions certain expectations are defined as roles. The actor who exists within the purview of an institution is thus confronted with certain expectations for his behavior in keeping with the role he assumes. Thus at any given time within the organizational milieu, the social behavior of an individual cannot be conceptualized just as the function of his personality, but must be regarded as the function of the interaction of his personality and the expectations defined by the social order. This can be expressed symbolically as

\[ B = f(PE) \]

---

One of the difficulties, however, in determining the nature and extent of environmental effects upon behavior has been the paucity of means for adequately describing both the totality and the specificity of relevant environmental determinants. As Sells\(^1\) noted, conceptualizations of the environment have tended to be unsatisfactory and unsystematic. The external, unlike the personal dimension, simply has not been explored to the extent required to provide an ecological analysis of social transactions.

Just how much and what kind of influence the environment in the form of the school in concert with the personal dimensions of that individual exerts upon his behavior is a question requiring more than mere typologies of school characteristics and taxonomies of personal attributes. It has been suggested that one reason that efforts to date have been less than successful in the explanation and prediction of student behavior is:

\[
\ldots \text{that the determinants of behavior need to be sought more often in the characteristics of the environmental context and the interaction of these characteristics with individual traits and abilities, and that a search for individual characteristics in vacuo can}\]

lead only to a partial understanding or no understanding at all. 20

Person-school effects. Although there has been a clear trend within the last decade to give more attention to "total school" effects, 21 the number of empirical studies which have directly examined individual-institutional interaction in an educational context remains limited in both quantity and scope. Investigations illustrative of the progress that has been made are briefly described below.

One of the earlier efforts toward the assessment of behavior using such a conceptual framework was undertaken by Stern, et al., and reported in their volume Methods in Personality Assessment. 22 Here the authors drew attention to the fact that prediction of success in a given situation depends not only upon the attributes of the individual but upon the expectations extant in the situational context.


Later Stern and Pace developed a series of instruments designed to measure individual needs and assess school "climate" through identification of certain features and characteristics as measured by student responses. These scales, originally developed for colleges, have been widely used and are now available for high schools, evening colleges, and organizations. Their underlying theoretical orientation presumes that institutional cultures consist of complex environmental stimuli which may in turn be related to an independent complex of personal needs.

A somewhat different but related conceptualization proposed by Astin resulted in the development of an input-output model which attempts to explain variations in outcomes by using a variety of input characteristics of students and colleges from which is then computed an

---


24 George G. Stern, *High School Characteristics Index, Evening College Index, Organizational Climate Index* (Syracuse, New York: Psychological Research Center, 1963).

"expected output" which in turn is statistically removed from the students' "observed output." The residual is theorized to measure the strength and nature of school (college) influences.

One of the few experimental studies probing the nature of school effects was recently reported by Minuchin. Four schools, specially selected, were arranged on a traditional-modern continuum and the influence of their basic philosophy upon the behavior of fourth grade students was studied over a two-year period. The researchers concluded that the school context differentially affected different kinds of children.

In an attempt to identify the kind of environment conducive to high scholastic achievement, Thistlewaite studied "college press" which he defined as environmental demands or pressures measured by two sets of scales, one eliciting student responses, the other faculty responses. His findings suggested that the different kinds of climate may produce different kinds of academic excellence. Climate thus may be understandable only as a multi-dimensional variable.


In another study of institutional effects upon academic behavior of high school students, McDiI 28 concluded that an individual student's behavior is influenced not only by the motivating force of his home environment, scholastic ability, and academic values, but also by other participants in the school setting. More specifically, he offered the tentative conclusion that in those schools where academic competition, intellectualism, and subject matter competence are emphasized and rewarded by faculty and student bodies, individual students tend to conform to the scholastic norms of the majority and achieve at a high level. These conclusions appear consistent with Coleman's 29 earlier findings that different value climates are related to achievement. However, the most controversial study to date has undoubtedly been Coleman's monumental work which attributed only a small part of the variance in student achievement to school-related effects. 30

By far the greater number of investigations which have examined the significance of student-school interaction have been psychologically or sociologically oriented.


However, the value components within the institutional dimension as well as the interactive nature of the phenomena of interest suggest that the potential inherent in anthropological conceptualizations and methodologies should not be overlooked. A number of efforts in this field have already contributed to the greater understanding both of classroom interaction and of the relationship of schools with the socio-cultural milieu, but those at the middle level, comprehensive enough to include the total school effects and yet limited enough to separate the school effects from those of the larger cultural context, are less numerous. Studies tend to be narrowly conceived, as, for example, the Smith-Geoffrey\(^ {31} \) report which though utilizing the ethnologist's devices for data gathering is almost purely psychological in its interpretation, or so broadly descriptive and idiosyncratic that confident generalizations are prohibitive. Henry's analysis\(^ {32} \) of the school and its relation to student lives in "Rome" and Friedenberg's report\(^ {33} \) of the effect of the school on adolescent


self-esteem are experiential in nature and fall in the latter category. However, the transactional nature of the data reported in both of these documents of social criticism is undeniable.

The early studies of Vassar College are good examples of one of the most comprehensive anthropological attempts to describe the relationship of institutional variables to student variables. Here a distinct student culture was discovered which emphasized pleasant social relations and resisted commitment to academic achievement. An attempt was also made to identify discrete student "types" which in effect related personality traits with institutional expectations.

A rather different approach by Burnett employed in a study of a rural midwestern high school may well contribute further richness to the description of person-environment interactions in its examination of the ritualistic nature of school events.

Limitations of the interaction approach. The fund of

---


empirical evidence already generated by explorations in person-environment interaction serves to highlight both the progress in the field and some of the conceptual and methodological limitations which have relevance for the aims of this investigation.

There are still serious problems in distinguishing individual from contextual effects; it has not been possible to establish clearly that school effects are not effects of self-selection or of other extraneous variables. Statistical treatments have tended to focus on identification of main effects rather than to emphasize interaction effects and have thus failed to consider what may be the most critical source of information.

Most frequently the dependent variable is specified as some global construct such as "achievement," "change," or "learning," which is neither measured directly nor is adequately predictive. It also hampers comparisons across studies. Assuming that all stimuli cannot be identified and included, dimensions of the independent variables which are studied are often selected on an ad hoc basis without a credible rationale to justify their inclusion and dependent variables are too often interpreted on a post hoc basis.

But most importantly, in so far as the problem posed here is concerned, to date, there has been no theoretical formulation or associated program of research which
specifically seeks to provide a rational explanation for the demonstration of positively or negatively oriented social behavior within the educational context.
CHAPTER II

STRATEGIES AND TACTICS: THE RESEARCH DESIGN

I. SUBSTANTIVE CONCERNS

Some fundamental questions posed earlier bear repetition. The major substantive concern illustrated by the studies previously cited and raised again by this investigation is a question which asks that judgments be made concerning the instrumental nature of the school. What effect does the school as an environment have upon its students' behavior? Or to pose the counterpart, to what extent does the school not affect students' behavior; to what extent does the individual himself, by virtue of his own needs and prior experiences, behave according to those demands rather than respond to the demands associated with the school environment?

Although the mere fact that schools in one form or another have continued to exist for some 4000 years may be some evidence as to their past functionality, such evidence may not be adequate for future predictions. If the basic attribute of the school is, as Durkheim proposed,¹ that of securing in children the essential conditions for

---

the continued existence of society, then it might well be argued that, given the rapid rate of cultural as well as technological transformation, the school may already have entered upon a cycle of gradual deterioration which will result in its eventual disappearance by dint of its increasingly dysfunctional nature. Thus, the question of school effects is a substantively legitimate as well as a methodologically challenging one.

As was noted earlier, however, most substantive questions which have been explored to date have been those seeking to determine school effects upon students' academic performance. These investigations attest to the fact that a manifest function of schools has to do with the transmission of skills and knowledge. It is a rather odd paradox that so little empirical evidence can be found which attests to the adequacy of the school as an instrument in the moral or character development of the child even though nearly every set of objectives conceived by any educational institution includes a reference to such outcomes as a basic function. Does this mean that schools do not actually attempt to perform this function? Does it mean that it is too dangerous or too difficult to try to answer such questions? Whatever the reasons, it is ironic indeed to discover that of the three major societal institutions which have generally been held responsible for the moral education of the child - the family, the church, and the
school - the one which may have done the least to evaluate its own efforts is the institution one would suppose as having the most scientific, inquiry-oriented nature.

This is not to say that nothing has been written upon the subject; there is certainly no shortage of opinion, doctrine, and philosophical consideration. But empirical evidence which clearly attests to the influence that the school exerts upon student behaviors which have moral significance is scarce indeed.

II. METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

This substantive scarcity places definite methodological constraints upon the implementation of this investigation. Most importantly it meant that much of the data gathered related indirectly rather than directly to the questions asked. This in turn suggests that the conclusions offered be viewed as hypotheses, hypotheses which have been generated by a series of intuitive leaps rather than by precise step-by-step progression in a well-charted area. But considering the significance of the problem, it is hoped that the approach has been both appropriate and adequate to make a meaningful contribution toward the development of productive theory.

Basic assumptions. With respect to more specific methodological concerns, two major postulates probably need to be made explicit. First, the approach taken recognizes
the principle of multiple determinism; this view explains phenomena as consequents of multiple antecedent events.

Second, the interaction equation \( B = f(PE) \) discussed earlier is regarded as the basic paradigm by which interpersonal behavior can be understood.

To understand school effects it therefore becomes imperative to examine not just the particular traits of the individual nor the characteristics of his environment but the integrative aspect of the two as they coincide. The problem is analogous to a dilemma in the physical world. Whether we have hydrogen and oxygen is not the crucial issue if we are thirsty. What is crucial is whether we have water or peroxide.

This is not to propose that the understanding of social events cannot be furthered by increasing our knowledge of personal and environmental determinants per se, but to add that greater understanding of interpersonal behavior requires that persons be viewed in context. Certain other questions then become critical for the effective implementation of such an investigation: In what situations does pro-social behavior occur? In what situations does anti-social behavior occur? How richly and fully have these situations already been described? The description of such situations cannot be considered adequate unless all the relevant dimensions of the contextual and personal determinants of the situation have been identified.
The problem as it has thus been delineated appears to be one which cannot properly be attacked except by a multi-dimensional approach. Data drawn from only one field of inquiry would provide evidence limited by the parameters of that domain; data which have utility for these questions need only be limited by the parameters of the reality under investigation.

It seems fortunate, therefore, that the school, its structure, its functions, its actors, its evolution, its culture, and its influence patterns, has not remained a subject of inquiry indigenous to educators nor has the human actor who inhabits the school. Psychologists, sociologists, biologists, social psychologists, anthropologists, and political scientists have been concerned with these same phenomena. Although independently their contributions are shaped by the assumptions and methodology of their particular disciplines, their findings when synthesized can conceivably provide a significant contribution to the development of an integrated body of educational knowledge.

Neither has the investigation of interpersonal behavior been neglected by researchers. Social scientists have long been concerned with the forces that impel men to behave in particular ways toward one another. The processes of interpersonal exchange, the analysis of a wide variety of intra-human actions, are not new subjects of inquiry.
Although in comparison to the physical sciences, this domain is still relatively uncharted and the attribution of cause to effect remains an illusive goal, from the broad range of empirical data already available it is reasonable to suppose there is much that can contribute to the further understanding of interpersonal relations in school settings provided an appropriate framework is designed by means of which the available data can be related to the specific questions asked.

**Clarification of the design.** Presenting several corollaries derived from the two basic assumptions stated above should further elaborate details of the conceptual structure underlying the work presented here.

First, a truism, but one that must not be forgotten; human behavior is complex. Therefore, other things being equal, the validity of the explanation of social acts should be increased as the interrelations of relevant variables are identified.

Second, it has been assumed that social phenomena can be "known" more fully in context. This implies that the school as a social institution exists within a larger field of social interaction. The individual as a social being exists in many different social settings. Each is part of the other and although each may be conceptualized as a discrete entity, none exists as a discrete entity.
Next, in studying social phenomena, transactions must be regarded as key variables. Situations, therefore, are assumed to contain the richest fund of information relevant to the understanding of human behavior and dynamic rather than static representations are more appropriate models of reality.

Fourth, regardless of the vantage point employed, the same reality exists. Therefore, what appear to be diverse or even conflicting facts or theories may represent only different perspectives derived from the utilization of different frames of reference.

In summary, then, the position taken in this investigation is that, due to the lack of previous research with respect to the explanation of positive-negative behavior in educational settings, it is appropriate to initiate efforts in this direction by attempting to build from related empirical evidence new arrangements of data from which can emerge more complete maps of relevant relationships—perhaps the genesis of a theory of positive-negative social behavior related to educational settings. The attempt is primarily heuristic; its aim is to generate hypotheses which can later be tested, the results of which tests can in turn modify and elaborate the emerging theory.

III. ANALYTIC TECHNIQUES

From the Lewinian paradigm cited earlier, $B = f(PE)$,
Getzels and Thelen developed an interaction model which seems to have validity for explaining the social behavior of specific role-incumbents in the school context. These authors refer to the two conceptually independent but phenomenally interactive classes of their model as the nomothetic (institutional) and idiographic (personal) dimensions of activity. Through utilization of a set of analytic concepts and elements which are assumed to comprise the basic dimensions, they show how transactions between dimensions manifest themselves in the behavior of the individual.

Getzels and Thelen note that their model does not comprise the totality of relevant components present in reality and have suggested that their basic paradigm can be enlarged by including two related but not reductive classifications, the anthropological and the biological. These additional dimensions are referred to as ethos and organism and are explained by the central concepts mores and constitution, the analytic elements of which are values and potentialities. With the addition of these variables, the model theoretically moves into closer juxtaposition with the comprehensiveness and complexity which are assumed to

---

be present in reality.

Although the model already shows high heuristic power as an analytic device, this power will be increased if the model can achieve higher congruence with the phenomena it represents. To map more completely the total influences upon behavior it may be hypothesized that the individual must be considered historically as well as psychologically and biologically. Over time an individual becomes a person who orders, processes, and defines himself in terms of his universe. His way of perceiving his environment and himself within that environment, his belief systems, become synthesized in a personal philosophy which give him identity. The richness of the model may therefore be considerably supplemented by including this fifth class person.

A cybernetic theory developed by Deutsch for use in political science suggests that in considering the contextual dimensions of a system it is appropriate to add another concept. A group, institution, or organization seeking to achieve certain goals develops a more or less stable inner program which provides guidance for the total system.

---

3For drawing attention to the importance of this dimension, the writer is indebted to Willis A. Harmon, "The Issues Behind the Issues," Paper presented at the Second National Conference for Innovative Educators (San Diego, California, December, 1967), pp. 6-11 (mimeo).

The system then attempts to project this inner structure or character upon its environment through the imposition of its will. Will is a "pattern of relatively consolidated preferences and inhibitions, derived from the past experiences of a social group, consciously labeled for a relevant portion of its members, and applied to guide the acting, to restrict the subsequent experiences of that group and its members." Given no interaction with external influences, a system tends to continue to act on the basis of past decisions, on habit. However, in a dynamic set of interrelationships, other dimensions tend to place certain constraints upon the exercise of "free will," and the extent to which organizational will can be imposed is determined by the power available.

Will is differentiated from "role" both by its scope and its distance from the individual. Roles are defined by expectations for the individual as a member of the group, organization, or society. Will is defined by the predecisions for the total system derived from the past experiences of the system. Will thus serves to keep the system on course, to maintain consistency.

5 Ibid., p. 111.

6 Power viewed in a social system, however, is not a construct which can be restricted to a single dimension but is a function of the relative strength of any one dimension with respect to all others it its influence upon behavior.
Margaret Mead’s definition of a social system suggests the possibility of a non-human dimension which would have relevance for the explanation of human behavior. In her view, a social system includes, among other components, "non-human material objects involved in human interests or activity, and relations of individuals to material objects." Her observations gain support from economists who have demonstrated the critical influence of quantity as well as quality of goods and resources in shaping men’s behavior. Concurrently, both biologists and sociologists have noticed the significant effects of such physical spatial components of the environment as temperature, humidity, and density upon animal life. To map the social reality without these material components may be omitting very relevant factors critical to the explanation of human behavior. This dimension might very appropriately be titled the "ecological" dimension, but since recently it has become common to refer to the total reality impinging upon an organism as its

---


ecology, it may be less confusing to use the term physical medium in labeling it. The central concept of the dimension appears to be most appropriately deemed habitat; it refers to all the non-human objects which have relevance for the elicitation of human behavior.

Theoretically, then, a social system is comprised of seven key dimensions which are presumed to be conceptually independent but phenomenally interdependent. This model which will serve as the major analytic device in the chapters that follow is presented schematically in Figure 1.

To the extent that this conceptualization is representative of the reality relevant to the exploration of positive-negative behavior in a school context, these concepts will appear in the empirical investigations which have posed questions related to the major variables under consideration. To the extent that the model is invalid, a lack of fit will occur with the collective empirical evidence, and the model must be either modified or discarded.

Limitations. One of the major difficulties which accompanies investigation into this particular set of questions by the procedures previously outlined is the problem entailed in trying to explore the domain of interest through the contributions of a number of disciplines. Distortion quite often occurs when data are integrated within

---

Getzels and Thelen, op. cit., p. 226.
FIGURE 1

HYPOTHESIZED DIMENSIONS OF PHILANTHROPIC-MISANTHROPIC BEHAVIOR
a field; the possibility of its presence when utilizing data across fields is even greater.

Another very critical concern is related to the fact that explorations into social phenomena often must recognize the presence of underlying value orientations which influence the nature of reality by attributing meaning to events in normative terms. In some studies of interpersonal behavior, a value connotation may detract from understanding because the phenomena studied are not examined in terms of their social significance; therefore, a neutral language is adequate and appropriate for describing the phenomena. However, the dependent variable with which this study is concerned is a class of human behaviors which gathers its integrity from the fact that it carries a value valence with respect both to the intent and the effect of instances of the behavior upon some person or persons selected by the initiator of the behavior. Since the instigator knowingly affects the welfare of others through his own choices, the moral nature of such acts cannot be denied. To say that the extension of one's help to another in need or a physical attack upon another's person are totally valueless phenomena is to deny part of the reality of the situation. Instances of such behavior displayed by an individual, aside from the fact that they represent moral choices on his part, have inherent positive to negative valence in terms of their interpretation in the social
order in which they occur.

A third difficulty arises from the already mentioned scarcity of empirical investigations directly concerned with the interrelationship of the three major variables - personal and contextual determinants, positive-negative social behavior, and school settings - compounded by a relatively small amount of concern with the investigation of instances of positive behavior in comparison to that for instances of negative behavior.

Given these three considerations, it is apparent that the language of this investigation must be carefully devised so as to minimize the effects of these limitations. It must be molar rather than molecular so that it can discuss findings across disciplines; it must make possible the use of terms in a value-based syntax, and it must provide a structure for integrating unrelated sentences into meaningful paragraphs.

**Definitions.** Definition can serve as one means for minimizing ambiguities. It is also a means for integrating notions from disparate realms of inquiry into a common language. At this point, therefore, three key definitions are offered as a means for facilitating communication.

The class of behaviors which has heretofore been referred to in rather vague terms as "positive-negative social behavior" will be referred to hereafter as **philanthropic-misanthropic behavior.** Precisely defined, philan-
thropic-misanthropic behavior is a class of human behaviors appearing in social events, a class which consists of instances ranging from those in which one human actor exemplifies feelings of affection and respect for men as men and from which one can infer the behavior was engaged in primarily for the purpose of helping others by reducing the discrepancy between their needs and the satisfaction of those needs, to those in which one human actor exemplifies feelings of disaffection and disrespect for men as men and from which one can infer the behavior was engaged in primarily for the purpose of hurting others so as to reduce the discrepancy between his own needs and the satisfaction of those needs.

The term school is a global construct which includes those various levels and arrangements of interrelated social systems having general educational functions as their major raison d'être but deriving their structure from both their manifest and latent functions. The focus in this research is upon the lower school rather than the college, university, vocational, or professional school.

A situation is the total reality extant at a given time within a given space which is hypothesized to have

10 Manifest functions are planned outcomes which may or may not be achieved; latent functions are actual outcomes which may or may not have been intended.
potential for eliciting a specific class of human behavior. A social situation requires the interaction of two or more human beings. It has previously been postulated that a productive means for investigating the determinants of behavior that occurs in social situations is by means of a model which represents the dynamics of that situation as a social system. It has been hypothesized that the relevant interactive dimensions of social systems which will prove productive for explaining behavioral outcomes are sevenfold: the individual, person, organism, institution, character, ethos, and physical medium. The central analytic concepts and elements defining these dimensions have been discussed in the preceding pages and will be further clarified as they are applied in the following chapters.
Before presenting any analysis of data, the identification, selection, and inclusion procedures by which the data were gathered must be made explicit. As noted earlier, the research reported here rests upon the assumption that new structures can be generated from the synthesis of existing knowledge. However, the diffusion of information among fields and the lack of common language create problems for determining the relevance of evidence. To accommodate this concern, it was decided that the data-formulating procedures must necessarily be exhaustive with respect to identification and search, but discriminating in terms of inclusion. In this way it was hoped that validity would be maintained at the highest possible level. The intensive identification procedures would throw out a wide net designed to catch the broadest possible range of data. The discriminating inclusion procedure would attempt to preserve that richness and complexity while at the same time guarding against distortion which is apt to occur in the simplification of reality by removing it from context.

Identification procedures. To initiate data collection, it was necessary to identify from the literature published between 1930 and 1969 all research reports which might have relevance for the questions raised earlier in this investigation. To begin this process secondary source materials were first consulted. (See Appendix.)

From these sources a list of articles, reports, books, and monographs was compiled which according to title, topic, and/or accompanying summary were judged by the investigator to have potential relevance for the purposes of this research. In addition, as primary sources were reviewed, additional possibilities were identified from accompanying bibliographies. Finally, the collection of research reports included in the files of The Center for the Study of Human Motivation at The Ohio State University was surveyed for useful materials.

As a result of this procedure, several hundred published accounts were identified as comprising a potential source of data.

Selection-review procedures. This strategy required that every effort be made to select and review relevant reports of empirical research which were concerned with the major variables in this investigation - the school
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2Empirical research as used in this investigation refers to both experimental and experiential studies.
context, the person in that context, and the demonstration of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior. It meant that the search tactics must be three-pronged. One avenue would be directed toward the identification of studies which probed the school environment, a second directed toward the inhabitants of that environment, and the third aimed toward the explanation of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior. Often as the search progressed, examination of a piece of presumed evidence would clearly reveal a lack of relevance to any of the variables and the questions being asked. For example, the terminology which led to the identification of a study may have been misleading and the scope of the investigation outside the realm of this inquiry. Or the data presented may have been so vague or incomplete that any findings or conclusions would be highly questionable in validity. Some published articles proved to be merely essays and did not qualify as empirical research. These and similar characteristics eliminated some studies which were located in the exhaustive identification process.

On some occasions the parallel search paths crossed. These convergences indicated studies which contained interrelationships among the major variables. Their greater richness, from the point of view taken in this investigation, was clearly evident, and these studies were selected for careful review.
Between these two polar extremes appeared a broad range of reports which in some way provided empirical data related to at least one of the major variables. It was, however, not always easy to distinguish those which might be relevant from those which were irrelevant, sometimes because of the limitations of generalizability obvious in very tightly conceived and implemented experimental studies, sometimes because of the nature of the reality investigated, but more often because of the looseness deliberately built into the research design to avoid screening out information which when coupled with other data might prove to be extremely valuable. It was often necessary to make such decisions as, for example, whether investigations of social systems overlapping or parallel to school should be included, whether inquiries with respect to the relationship of parental practices to philanthropic-misanthropic behavior of pre-school children was appropriate, or whether the effects of camp experiences on the behavior of school-age participants should be considered. In most instances, a questionable study was reviewed; the decision rule being over-selectivity rather than under-selectivity. The inclusion-exclusion process would later provide a check upon relevance.

To summarize, the second step in data collection was that of selection-review. Decisions were made with respect to all identified reports of empirical research published
between 1930 and 1969. Selection for review was made on the basis of three criteria: (1) directly relevant - includes data pertaining to the interrelationship of the three variables, (2) indirectly relevant - includes data pertaining to the relationship of two variables, (3) questionable - includes data with respect to only one of the variables but cannot be presumed to be irrelevant. Studies fitting none of these criteria were eliminated. This selection-review process yielded 292 pieces of evidence ranging from limited, narrow experiments or case studies to comprehensive reports summarizing numerous and/or complex research endeavors.

**Inclusion-exclusion procedures.** Reviews of the 292 pieces of evidence were read and reread by the investigator several times for the purpose of gaining what might be called an "intuitive understanding" of the content of the research data. During this process several events occurred.

First, a number of pieces of evidence when considered in concert with the total collection were unquestionably unrelated to any emerging pattern of the whole. There were fifteen of these studies in all, and they were removed from the data bank at this point.

Next, and for the first time during the data collection procedures, the seven dimensions hypothesized in the research design as having relevance to the explanation of
philanthropic-misanthropic behavior were applied in an exploratory way. Each piece of evidence was again reviewed carefully and the major statements made by that research tentatively categorized according to their explication of any of the dimensions proposed by the model. If the statement fit none of the dimensions, it was assigned to an uncategorized grouping. This process gave a tentative indication of the degree of congruence of the data to the model. If little or no congruence had emerged with this exploratory venture, the efficacy of the model as an analytic device would be in serious doubt. This did not occur. Most of the data showed relationships to one or more dimensions of the model. Even at this early point, however, it was evident that the seven dimensions of the model were not mutually exclusive in terms of the language of the empirical evidence. This does not necessarily deny their conceptual independence but does indicate that as research findings have accumulated over the years through various experimental and experiential studies, the results have often been reported in terms which are not isomorphic with the more "pure" concepts of the social system model.

Nonetheless, the process of categorizing evidence according to the dimensions of the model provided a workable means for running a relevance check upon the selection review process and indicated that most of the studies
reviewed had promise for the purposes of the investigation.

There were some pieces of evidence which failed to fit any of the seven dimensions. These pieces again were subjected to careful examination. Two alternatives with respect to their disposition were possible. They could be declared irrelevant data and tossed from the data bank; they could be declared relevant data which could not be accounted for in terms of the hypothesized model. Since a declaration of irrelevance at this point seemed highly likely to result in the loss of data merely because it had not been accounted for in the analytic conceptualization, it was decided to hold all uncategorized data for subsequent analysis.
CHAPTER IV

POTENTIALITIES FOR

PHILANTHROPIC-MISANTHROPIC BEHAVIOR

Although there is little doubt among students of human behavior that biological and genetic factors do influence the way people act, determination of the nature and extent of that influence has been the source of some real dilemmas for the empiricists. There are obviously certain problems involved in castrating human males that have to be avoided by studying mice, and tampering with the hypothalmus of a feline is less subject to criticism than surgery upon homo sapiens. For reasons such as these, much of the evidence with respect to basic potentialities rests either upon studies of infra-human subjects or has been derived from theoretical conceptualizations which are only tenuously supported by empirical tests. Even though such investigations may not directly relate to concerns about philanthropic-misanthropic behavior in school contexts, it is necessary to discuss them briefly as a foundation for some investigations that are more directly relevant.

Anti-social "drives." Scientists in the relatively new field of ethology have posed questions about humans'
destructive propensities and attempted to answer them through observations of animals in their natural habitats. Probably the most noteworthy of these researchers is Konrad Lorenz who maintains that aggressive behavior in man is the expression of an innate drive which is called forth by the presentation of appropriate stimuli in the environment. This drive, he has concluded, is a survival mechanism which insures proper spacing for optimum use of resources, natural selection for singling out the "better man," and the establishing of a social rank order. This drive or instinct of aggressiveness manifests itself in competition and fighting. Since, however, such a drive could be self-destructive, ritual behaviors generally lacking in the human realm have developed in the animal kingdom which proscribe intra-species killings and permit the establishment of bond behavior and mating. Support for Lorenz' thesis is found among anthropologists such as Freeman who gives credence to the discoveries of paleoanthropologists which have "in fundamental ways, transformed our comprehension of the origin of man and the probable processes of evolution." Using evidence gathered from Raymond Dart's
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discoveries about Australopithecinae, a pre-human form. Freeman joins Ardrey, who wrote a popularized version describing man's territorial nature, in conceiving of man as an essentially predatory creature whose aggressive tendencies are built in phylogenetically. Ardrey's account is suspect, however, and he appears to have gone far beyond the facts in describing his case for man's innate propensity.

The merging of evidence from ethology and anthropology with psychoanalytic theory has become particularly apparent during the last decade. It was Sigmund Freud, of course, who through the study of pathological human behavior, finally arrived at the conclusion that man has two basic drives which provide energy and direction for his actions. Both of these, Eros and Thanatos, the life and death instincts, serve to reduce tensions and return the organism to a state of quiescence. Later psychoanalytic theorists either modified or rejected these notions, but the fundamental postulate that man has innate tendencies

---


to act in ways that are destructive of other human beings remains. Storr has summarized the "state of the art" and added what may be a significant corollary:

What we still need to know and what we may hope that physiologists may soon tell us, is the biochemical state underlying tension. There is so far no convincing evidence that the aggressive response is, at a physiological level, any less instinctive than the sexual response; and, provided that the term aggression is not restricted to actual fighting, aggressive expression may be as necessary a part of being a human being as sexual expression.

... Once we can bring ourselves to abandon the pleasure principle, it is easy to accept the idea that the achievement of dominance, the overcoming of obstacles, and the mastery of the external world, for all of which aggression is necessary, are as much innate human needs as sexuality or hunger.

Storr thus deviates from the tension-reduction Freudian notion to propose that an organism actively searches for stimulation and that aggression is not only a basic human drive and a biologically adaptive, selective force which helps the species survive by spacing population and insuring reproduction by the strongest but is also the means whereby the individual moves from dependence to independence.

Crooke, a well-known ethologist, and Scott who has

7Ibid., pp. 47-49.
undertaken extensive studies of animals under laboratory conditions, offer evidence which contradicts the conclusions reached by Lorenz, Ardrey, and Storr. That the described aggressive behaviors exist in man, they do not deny. But that they exist largely because of an internal physiological force which has to be satisfied, they refuse to accept. Scott, after citing extensive research, takes the position that there is an internal physiological mechanism which when stimulated produces fighting and other anti-social behaviors, but he contends that the initiating stimulus must arise outside the organism. Thus, unlike hunger and thirst, which issue from metabolic changes in internal states or needs, satisfaction is not demanded innately. 8

Crook regards the Lorenzian view as "limited" and suggests that most of the experimental ethological literature on the subject has been ignored by Ardrey. Crooke's own work plus that of others in the field lead him to conclude that instead of resulting from an innate and ineradicable force demanding repetitive expression, aggressive behavior occurs normally as a response to particular aversive stimuli and ceases upon their removal. 9

To say that men harm others to satisfy their own need to aggress appears to be, on the basis of the evidence, an oversimplified answer to a complex question. Even to say that men are influenced toward aggressive (harmful) behavior because of instinctual tendencies cannot be asserted with conviction. Neither the empirical nor theoretical evidence, in so far as these questions are concerned provides an unequivocal answer.

Pro-social "instincts." In comparison to the efforts to explain man's hypothesized anti-social instincts, considerably less interest has been shown in the exploration of the possibility of impulses which direct human behavior toward integrative and help-giving acts. Although Freud postulated the life instinct, since his conception was based upon the underlying sexual nature of the drive, positive social behavior often became nothing more than the outcome of control mechanisms such as sublimation and displacement. Theories which have been advanced by Fromm, Holmes, and Montagu that there is a biological basis for man's pro-social behavior are also supported by limited empirical evidence. Holmes suggests that the dependency relationship of parent to offspring is concrete evidence of a deep-seated altruistic trait which appears far down

into the animal kingdom. Egoism and altruism, he maintains, have their roots in two life activities: preservation of the individual and perpetuation of the race.

Fromm proposes that there are "experiences" which are specifically human and, unlike the drives of sex and aggression, are not shared with animals. These particularly human affective experiences such as love, tenderness, and compassion do not in his estimation serve the function of physical survival as do those controlled by the "old brain," but are the product of man's highly developed neocortex. Their potential function is that of moving beyond survival into freedom. He admits that although neurophysiologists have not yet demonstrated the basis for these phenomena, the fact that they can be observed empirically makes it impossible to deny their existence. 11

In somewhat the same vein as Holmes, Montagu argues that the biological fact that dependency in the form of needs is basic to all living organisms gives a biological validation to the principle of cooperation, or love, in human life. Humanness, however, requires social experience.

The notable thing about human behavior is that it is learned. Everything a human being does

as such he has had to learn from other human beings. From any dominance of biologically or inherited predetermined reactions that may prevail in the behavior of other animals, man has moved into a zone of adaptation in which his behavior is dominated by learned response. . . . That heredity plays a part in all human behavior is patently false, but that heredity plays a role in some human behavior can scarcely be doubted . . . 12

Thus, although the evidence supporting the existence of a "pro-social instinct" is equally equivocal as that with respect to an "anti-social instinct," the conclusion that constitutional determinants do play a role in behavior is generally accepted.

It may be fruitful to look at the empirical evidence that is available in the hope that it may clarify the nature and extent of that role in the demonstration of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior especially as it may relate to the school context.

1. PHYSIOLOGICAL INFLUENCES

Mechanisms and structures. To understand the responses of children and young adults requires that questions be asked about the infant. Are there present in the characteristics of neonates any fundamental responses which appear to be unmodifiable by situational factors? While this may appear to be again opening the unresolved dilemma of instinctual versus learned behavior, it is actually not the
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12 Montagu, *op. cit.*, p. xii.
same. This question focuses upon differences rather than likenesses. It suggests that new-borns, as separate organisms, may vary upon a range of characteristics, but that the unique pattern of dispositions of any one child will remain basically constant as he grows and matures.

A study by Birch and associates mentioned earlier offers strong support for the probability that there are "primary reaction characteristics" by which children can be classified during their first two years of life and that these characteristics have significance for later personality development. The nine characteristics identified in this study were activity level, rhythmicity of functions, approach or withdrawal, adaptability, intensity of reaction, threshold of responsiveness, quality of mood, distractibility, attention span, and persistence. The researchers suggest that although these may to some extent be modifiable, they do appear to constitute a set of factors which provide a general orientation for behavior. At present longitudinal studies are needed to verify and expand these hypotheses, but the potential significance of such fundamental "sets" to later emission of helpful or harmful behavior must not be ignored.

A number of studies of older children further suggest that human acts cannot be accounted for by situational factors alone. Bender and Schilder\textsuperscript{14} in a study of the aggressiveness of eighty-three three to fifteen year old children under observation at Bellevue Psychiatric Hospital noted that the hyperkinetic child displayed more violence toward other persons and concluded that these manifestations had close relation to organic structure and motor drives. In such cases these clinicians observed that the aggressiveness was more diffuse than that originating from psychic traumas which led to aggressiveness in specific situations. Bender and Schilder also considered their findings valid for children in general, not just for those with reported disturbances.

In another study intended to investigate the effects of situational determinants upon the interpersonal behavior of nursery school children, Margaret Body\textsuperscript{15} was unable to account for the fact that eighty-three per cent of all the "unprovoked attacks" in one group were made by three children with the highest over-all aggression rating and twenty-six per cent of all such responses in the other group.


\textsuperscript{15}Margaret R. Body, "Patterns of Aggression in the Nursery School," \textit{Child Development} 26:3-11, 1955.
were made by only one child unless she took into consideration their "biological make-up." Unfortunately the design of her study included no effort to determine the proportion of effect attributable to that as compared to several other confounding factors - mental development, past experience, and reactions of other children.

An earlier but questionable finding which needs to be explored more carefully has been offered by Sheldon and Stevens. They found that mesomorphic people were more apt to exhibit aggressiveness than ectomorphic persons. The body structure of mesomorphic individuals is predominately muscular while ectomorphic individuals are more linear and fragile. However, the study failed to establish whether the correspondence between body structure and aggressiveness was inherent or derived from experience due to the greater success of mesomorphs in physical confrontations.

Psychological states and physiological functions.

Since emotional states are very often associated with interpersonal behavior, the investigation of anti-social acts in particular has been confounded by the confusion of emotion and action. Although it is generally understood that aroused psychological states are accompanied by

physiological changes, it has not been possible to establish, for example, that adrenaline, noradrenaline, and a variety of steroids and other hormones are the mechanisms which activate the central nervous system. Both the adrenal cortex and adrenal medulla produce a series of hormones which apparently have a strong relationship to psychological and physical arousal but endocrinologists have yet to establish the exact nature of that relationship.\textsuperscript{17}

The male sex hormone has been shown to have a direct relationship to aggressive behavior in animals, but even so, the effects of training and experience seem more significant in calling forth fighting behavior. Mice which are trained to fight do decrease in pugnacity when castrated and resume aggressive activity with application of male steroids. Normal mice, however, may be passive regardless of the presence of such hormones if they have been trained not to fight or have experienced many failures.\textsuperscript{18}

Upon the basis of experimental work with animals Scott\textsuperscript{19} concluded that the hypothalamus and cerebral cortex are largely responsible for the sensations experienced by a person who “feels angry.” Even though many types of


\textsuperscript{18}Scott, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{19}Ibid.
experimental studies of brain functions have necessarily been restricted to infra-human subjects, some experiments with humans also point to specific brain regions as centers for emotional states.\textsuperscript{20} These experimental studies are supported by numerous clinical observations of patients suffering brain injuries or abnormalities who show increased irritability and a low threshold for aggression. However, these human subjects also tend not to engage in aggressive behaviors until presented with an external stimulus cue.\textsuperscript{21}

Even if it were possible to establish the relationship between anger, fear, and changes in certain physiological states, the problem would not be resolved since acts of violence and disrespect toward others are not necessarily accompanied by anger, and restraint from such acts does not necessarily indicate the presence of fear and anxiety.

With respect to pro-social behavior, the measurement and description of emotional states remains lost in the great unknown.

\textsuperscript{20}V.P. Chapman, \textit{et al.}, "Physiological Evidence Concerning Importance of the Amygdaloid Nuclear Region in the Integration of Circulatory Function and Emotion in Man," \textit{Science} 120:950, 1954.

II. THE INFLUENCE OF SEX

That a great body of empirical evidence attests to the fact that boys exhibit more aggressive behavior than do girls probably only corroborates what is obvious. Investigations by Dawe, Green, Jersild, and Walters representing a series of studies of nursery school children spaced over some forty years all yielded similar findings — boys quarrel more than girls, are more overtly aggressive than girls. On an index of aggression administered to 863 third grade children by Semler and Eron boys had significantly higher mean scores than girls. Even a study of Russian children found girls to be less aggressive; however

since this study was conducted in 1932 it might be enlightening to test its representativeness today.

Lensky reported more significant interrelations among aggressive variables for middle-class adolescent boys than girls. Several investigations using college students as subjects have also found males more aggressive than females.

There is, of course, considerable speculation as to how much of this difference is constitutionally related and how much can be accounted for by sex role demands. Mallich, McCandless, and Boyd enlisted some sixth grade students as confederates in frustrating younger children (ages 8-9 years) and found that in a permissive, confidential situation, girls behaved as aggressively as boys. These findings suggest that the major part of the differences may be allied with sex typing.
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The relationship between sex and supportive behavior is not so well established. By means of carefully timed observations spaced over a period of eighteen school days, Hartup\textsuperscript{31} categorized children's behavior according to types of nurturance or dependency acts. No age or sex differences were found among these forty-one three to six year olds.

Fesbach\textsuperscript{32} predicted that empathy would serve as an inhibitor of overt aggressive behavior. In an older group of boys (six to seven years) high empathy boys were significantly less aggressive than low empathy boys, but the converse was true for the younger boys (four to five years). For girls there were no significant differences at either age level. These findings also lend further support to the existence of differential correlates of aggression in the two sexes.

Anderson\textsuperscript{33}, in replicating an earlier study of preschool children with kindergartners found no sex differences in integration scores. (Integrative behavior was


defined as "flexible, adaptive, objective, scientific, cooperative." He did find boys using more force, commands, threats, shame, blame and attacks against others (dominative behavior). This finding was contrary to earlier results.

White34 found fourth and fifth-grade girls to be more generous and more consistent in their giving than boys, and a study of social sensitivity (sympathy) among adolescents revealed adolescent girls to be highly sensitive as compared to boys. Noting that on most of the measures girls demonstrated greater variation than boys, the investigator35 observed that this might be an indication that there were no constitutional differences but that social demands required greater flexibility from girls.

III. AGE-RELATED RELATIONSHIPS

The behavioral changes that may be associated with aging cannot be attributed to precise causation since it is difficult to cancel out the effects of experience, but the fact that they do occur is substantiated by numerous empirical studies.


Investigations of the behavior of nursery school children show clearly that as children grow older both the mode and frequency of their interpersonal relations change. Early studies of children's quarrels indicated that quarrelsomeness tends to decrease with age, in that the number of quarrels are fewer, but the degree of aggressiveness and emotionality which characterizes these quarrels becomes greater. Friendship also increases with age and is highly correlated with quarreling suggesting that the latter is part of friendly intercourse with young children. A high proportion of quarrels arise over questions of property rights, and even though these kinds of quarrels decrease with age, they hold the lead in proportion to all other causes. As children become older they combine more violent motor activity with their altercations but also develop indirect methods of aggression through greater
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36 Green, op. cit., pp. 237-52; Dawe, op. cit., pp. 139-57.

37 Green, op. cit.


39 Dawe, op. cit.
facility with language. There is much less evidence available which focuses upon age-related changes in older children and adolescents. It does appear that aggressiveness tends to peak at about age four and remain constant until ages six or eight after which in school against peers it tends to increase in frequency until adolescence. Although there are no investigations directly concerned with the incidence of philanthropic behavior of older children, Walton did determine that the "empathetic response" is present at the kindergarten level and exhibits a fairly uniform growth through grade twelve with individual differences appearing at all age levels. He noted an increasing range of empathetic responses present in older children as did Bender and Schilder with respect to aggressive behavior.

Whether children tend to be more disposed toward philanthropic or misanthropic behavior with increasing age is a


43 Bender and Schilder, op. cit., pp. 410-525.
critical question which remains to be answered. Walters found that affectionate responses outnumber aggressive ones, but Hartup concluded that "... in general nurturant behavior does not appear very frequently in interactions of nursery school children." Murphy's extensive study of social behavior in young children also indicated that sympathetic responses occurred much less frequently than did expressions of aggression. Turner found no increase in altruism in boys from nine to sixteen years of age.

In considering these apparent contradictions it may be helpful to compare the concerns expressed by Murphy in her study of sympathetic responses to those of Bender and Schilder who were primarily concerned with aggressive behavior:

The only empirical relationships between different traits that is still of importance is the consistent correlation of 0.40 or thereabouts between aggressive and sympathetic behavior - which points to the importance of a general tendency toward outgoing responses

45Hartup, op. cit., p. 688.
underlying both aggression and sympathetic behavior. It is difficult to draw the borderline between activity which is a general characteristic of life, and aggressiveness. We speak generally of aggressiveness when the activity leads to an encroachment on the physical integrity of others.

IV. INTELLIGENCE AND PHILANTHROPIC-MISANTHROPIC BEHAVIOR

"Intelligence does not appear to be a significant factor in making humans either altruistic or egoistic." So concluded Sorokin drawing examples from history to prove his point. Empirical research, however, does not make so clear a case. That there is little relation between conduct and ideas about conduct has been shown in a number of studies, but that intelligence, at least certain facets of intelligence, is not an influential factor with respect to how one behaves toward others is challenged by several more recent investigations. As early as 1937 Murphy noted in her study of sympathetic behavior that:
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48 Murphy, op. cit., p. 282.
49 Bender and Schilder, op. cit., p. 520.
51 Hugh Hartshorne, Mark A. May and Frank K. Shuttleworth, Studies in the Nature of Character (New York: Macmillan, 1930); Bender and Schilder, op. cit.
... the correlations with intelligence quotient and mental ability suggest that the degree of intelligence of the child will affect his initial behavior; probably specific qualities of his intelligence would be even more important ... seeing relationships between situations, 'getting the point' from a few cues would be of more importance in sympathetic responses than rote learning and memory, for example. 52

Appel's 53 study of aggressive behavior in nursery school children also suggested that the characteristics of a given child's aggression would depend in part upon his intelligence, and an analysis of correlates of defiant behavior in elementary school boys yielded a mental ability factor. 54

Bandura and Walters 55 suggested that good discrimination learning might account for both typical and atypical behavior. Children usually learn that aggression in the home, especially aggression against parents, is more strongly disapproved than in other situations, but a reversal may occur with children whose parents are relatively

52 Murphy, op. cit., p. 286.
53 Appel, op. cit.
permissive but whose aggressive responses outside the home are largely unsuccessful.  

Peck and Havighurst's "rational-altruistic" type demonstrated an intelligence-related set of capacities including the ability to see relationships, to generalize, to apply principles appropriate to the situation, and to foresee the results of any action taken. They referred to this over-all perceptual and adaptive ability as rationality of behavior since it included not only the ability to think logically but the tendency to behave logically. This component proved to be a vital factor in the development of a person whose character tended to show the greatest moral stability and who was able to express his liking for others in ways that effectively advanced their well-being.


58. Ibid., pp. 171-72.


V. SUMMARY

To the horror of those behaviorists who long ago buried the concept of instinct, it has been revived and given substance by the marriage of ethology and psycho-analytic theory. Many scientists refuse to accept the validity of such conclusions, however, since they represent extrapolations from animal to human behavior.

But, because of the problems involved in testing hypotheses about constitutional determinants with human subjects, experimentalists have also contributed conclusions based upon extrapolations from laboratory studies of animals. Whether these findings under controlled, often highly artificial conditions, are any more relevant to the explanation of human behavior than are the contributions of ethologists drawn from observations of animals in their natural setting is a moot question.

That there are within the human organism physiological "mechanisms" that influence interpersonal behavior has been established. The exact nature and extent of that influence is not yet clearly mapped. Both sex and age have been shown to be strongly associated with changes in the mode, frequency, and intensity of instances of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior, but individual differences within sexes and across age levels are so great that knowing sex and age makes possible only very gross statements about
such behavior. Intelligence, too, is a factor, but only when viewed as a multi-dimensional construct.

The evidence will support four generalizations which will perhaps become more meaningful with the investigation of other dimensions of the hypothesized model:

1. Potentialities of the organism which are functions of the physiological and genetic structure of the individual describe one of the dimensions of the individual which influence his behavior in a social system.

2. The influence of experience in the form of interaction with the environment is so significant in the determination of instances of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior that unless there are extreme constraints placed upon the organism by physiological dysfunctions or genetic abnormalities, the relationships of specific constitutional potentialities to particular instances of behavior cannot be clearly established.

3. The human organism from birth appears to thrive on an optimal amount of stimulation from the environment. This optimal level seems to vary with the individual.

4. The interpretation of an individual's behavior in a social setting may, especially in children,
be noticeably colored by the judgments made about the appropriateness of the intensity as well as the nature of his activity.
CHAPTER V

PATTERNS OF PERSONALITY

Need dispositions have been defined, but it may be well to repeat that definition as an introduction to the findings presented in this chapter. As the central analytic element of personality, need dispositions are considered to be "individual tendencies to orient and act with respect to objects in certain manners and to expect certain consequences from these actions."¹ Needs may, as Getzels and Thelen have observed, be thought of as motives for behavior derived from personalistic sets and propensities.² Thus, if the model which has been hypothesized approaches reality, and if the empirical research which has been selected is representative of that reality, statements from that research should help identify patterns of personality which are associated with displays of philanthropic and misanthropic behavior.

²Ibid., p. 228.
1. DISPOSITIONS TO HARM OR DEGRADE OTHERS

In testing out notions about the genesis of human acts which are detrimental to other human beings, researchers have employed a variety of terms to identify their central concepts. This diversity of language has raised issues and created controversies about the interpretation of data. It has become exceedingly difficult to talk about anti-social behavior without using the terms aggression, frustration, hostility, and anger, and yet the mere use of these terms gives rise to a number of considerations which could block further communication unless a particular theoretical framework is employed to contain the conversation.3

Furthermore, the number of studies which actually have tested hypothesized relationships between need dispositions and misanthropic behavior is very small in proportion to the large number of investigations which have offered explanations of this class of behavior. The great body of research has instead been devoted to tests of global theories such as the frustration-aggression

3Harry Kaufman, "Definition and Methodology in the Study of Aggression," Psychological Bulletin 64:351-64, 1965. This author gives a very thorough analysis of these problems.
the social learning model, or the behavioral approach, some of which have postulated internal conditions or constructs such as hostility, anxiety, and guilt but typically include only indirect measures of potential personality traits by looking at the presumed goals of aggression - security, self-esteem, love, prestige, achievement, etc.

Kaufman has made the point very effectively:

In order to pursue such a study systematically, determinants other than those inherent in the stimulus itself must be investigated. While present assessments of habitual hostility as a personality variable may not allow for unequivocal predictions of aggression, there can be no doubt that personality variables do play a part in determining aggression, and interactions between the stimulus and such dispositional variables are probably going to afford even greater predictive accuracy than personality variables alone.

The exploration of pro-social behavior and personality raises similar obstacles, but is perhaps less hampered by
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conflicting language since the nature of the work in this area has been both less systematic and less productive of theoretical formulations.

To avoid placing rigid constraints upon the ordering of available data which does relate to this dimension, the course followed in this chapter has been one of attempting to weave a new perspective, one which does not violate any previous valid statements of relationships among variables, one that will make it possible to discuss the sense of the data without being bound by loyalty to any particular theoretical position or mode of analysis, and one that may suggest productive avenues of further investigation. In so far as it was possible to do so with the limited information to be found, the data have been allowed to generate their own form, to suggest clusters held together by an inclusive concept.

Although it is customary to begin with definition and follow with example, since the generalizations here have been inductively derived from the evidence, all the instances will be presented first so that the scope of their content can be reviewed before any comment is offered. This procedure should provide a test for the appropriateness and adequacy of the subsequent discussion.

**Empirical evidence.** In a study designed to determine the differences in reactions to frustration (goal blockage) between children classified as "controllers" and those
classified as "undercontrollers," Block and Martin referred the two groups access to some very attractive toys. The undercontrollers exhibited many more aggressive responses than did the overcontrollers who played constructively with less attractive toys to which both had access. The investigators interpreted the greater display of aggression on the part of the undercontrollers to a lack of (1) ego-control demonstrated by their inability to defer immediate gratification and (2) satiation, the extent to which working on one task extinguished the motivation to work on a similar task. A later study with a similar design carried out by Livson and Mussen also showed measurements of ego-control were negatively correlated with instances of aggressive behavior.

Using male college students another experiment tested the hypothesis that undercontrollers have a higher and steeper gradient of aggressive behavior as a function of provocation than do overcontrollers; that is, personality


style is significant both as a main effect and in interaction with provocation. Subjects were classified as undercontrollers or overcontrollers on the basis of a self-report index of hostile behavior. They were then led to believe they were competing with another subject in a task involving reaction time. Results showed that aggression increased in all groups as a function of provocation, but as provocation increased, the behavior of the undercontrolled group became increasingly more aggressive than that of the overcontrollers.

Redl and Wineman have reported in their study *The Aggressive Child*\(^{11}\) that highly aggressive boys tend to be low in ego-strength. They are easily provoked by obstacles or interferences, suffer from severe anxiety, panic easily at threats to their security, and find it hard to resist temptation. These patterns suggest serious ego-disturbances.

Using college students as subjects, Worchel\(^{12}\) administered a bogus intelligence test to induce frustration and predicted that persons with a low self-ideal discrepancy would be more likely to express direct aggression.
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toward authority figures than those with a high discrepancy. Low discrepancy subjects would theoretically be more threatened by the attacks upon their ego and would be more apt to respond by attempting to remove the source of frustration, that is, to aggress toward the instigator. High discrepancy subjects would be more willing to accept the attack since it represented less of an inconsistency with an already doubtful self-image. As predicted, low discrepancy subjects displayed significantly more direct aggression.

Presenting both "cognitive dissonance" and "choice" as hypothesized interacting variables, Glass\(^{13}\) gave two groups of subjects opposed to the administration of such stimuli the option of refusing or directions to administer a series of painful electric shocks to another person. Subjects also received falsified psychological test results aimed to increase or lower their level of self-esteem. Predicting that dissonance would be greatest on subjects who believed they had high self-esteem but chose to carry out aggression, Glass found that these subjects did become more unfriendly toward the persons they attacked than Low-Esteem, No-choice subjects. The main hypothesis gained support from the results and the investigator further

emphasized that in considering the consequences of choosing to aggress, it is essential to take such personality factors into account.

In a study of psychotherapist-patient relationships, Bandura, et al., \(^{14}\) reported that strong affiliation needs and associated desires for social approval are associated with the avoidance of aggressive behavior. The same restraints against aggression were discovered in nursery school children who had been made conscious of social relationships through the experimental procedures\(^{15}\) and in college students who were strongly oriented toward avoiding social disapproval.\(^{16}\)

Middle-class adolescents also show similar tendencies along with some possibly significant sex-related factors.\(^{17}\) Lansky and his associates conducted a comprehensive


investigation of correlates of sex differences in aggression and noticed some interesting variance when comparing boys and girls on certain measures of aggressive behavior. For the boys, both aggressiveness towards father and aggression displayed on the Rorschach measure were related to self-rated need for acceptance and to dependency as reflected in their projective test responses. For the girls, expressed criticism of mother was related to preoccupation with recognition for achievement, anxiety about sexuality, low concern with affiliation, low desire to be similar to mother, and minimal guilt about aggressive acts directed against a male authority. Expressed criticism of father by girls was negatively related to preoccupations with affiliation as measured by responses on the French Test of Insight.

Two studies, one by Beller, the other by Beller and Haeberle, lend support to the notion that the degree of dependency need influences the amount of aggression displayed. The first investigation showed that the greater


the dependency arousal in children deprived of help from an adult, the less they showed destructive aggression, given a dependency stress situation. Given a frustrating situation, a less dependent child will tend to exhibit aggressive responses more quickly than one with stronger dependency needs.

In a comparison of behavior in a situation offering the alternatives of "submissive-compliant" as compared to "dominant-aggressive" behavior, preschool children who had a "need for love affection," demonstrated less aggressive activity as measured by an opportunity to insist that the experimenter allow their cars to move ahead in a game situation than did children with a dominant "need for power."^20

Using a complex factorial design, Rothaus and Worchel ^21 carried out a well-controlled experiment designed to test the efficacy of three theories with respect to the reduction of hostility. The frustration-aggression catharsis hypothesis presumes that making an aggressive response reduces the instigation to aggression; ego support theory proposes that reduction of ego-threat will reduce hostility; power theory predicts that hostility will be reduced to the
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extent that individuals are effective in restoring their expected power. Rothaus and Worcher provoked 171 male and 150 female college students during a presumed intelligence test and then measured their hostility after three treatments - catharsis, allowing them to discuss and accepting their feelings; ego support, allowing discussion and giving acceptance plus contributing supportive comments for group members; and instrumental communication in which the experimenter who had provided the original provocation received the evaluative comments and then altered his behavior. All three theories were given support in that all predict reduced hostility under instrumental communication, but the fact that the ego-support and control groups' hostility means were significantly different from the communication group but not from each other gives support to the power theory.

In the "game" played by preschool children in the Otis-McCandless experiment cited earlier, children with a dominant "need for power" showed more aggressive behavior.22

That individuals develop a generalized tendency to respond in aggressive or passive ways was demonstrated by Zuk23 in a study of sixth grade students. Zuk found that

22Otis and McCandless, op. cit.
pupils could be operationally classified as aggressive-dominant, passive-dominant, and neutral through both tests and behavioral data. Using the natural settings of classroom and camp, Zuk's experiment showed that aggressive-dominant, passive-dominant, and neutral individuals differ in the degree of aggressivity and impulsivity they show in various situations, and with respect to certain observed behavioral variables related to characteristic response patterns of the individuals comprising each of the subgroups. Aggressive dominant and neutrals were "high" on competitiveness, while passive dominants were low; aggressive dominants were also "high" on hostility, while passive dominants were low. Zuk interpreted these findings in terms of assumptions underlying theories of control and impulsivity of Freud and Mead. He defined the aggressive dominant children as "pleasure oriented," the passive-dominant children as "reality oriented" and the neutral individuals as "open to experience" and able to evaluate the situation "in its own terms rather than in terms of compelling predispositions to respond regardless of the particular set of demands in the situation."^{24}

Interpretation of the evidence. Because the tendency in designing explorations into the nature of personality variables has been to isolate discrete traits and attempt

\[\text{^{24}ibid., p. 164.}\]
to predict from one factor alone, the results of these investigations at first appear to contribute isolated bits of information. However, when the results of the various studies are considered as potential components of an interrelated whole, a new perspective begins to emerge. It seems possible to describe at least the embryo of a general orientation which predisposes people to behave in harmful and degrading ways toward others.

This interpretation, however, must be regarded as a tentative one since it is based upon an as yet ill-defined universe. The framework proposed is a suggestion of the possible meaning of the data, but a suggestion firm enough to warrant testing.

The findings point to the existence of two basic classes of needs - those which are self-oriented and those which are other-oriented.

Self-oriented needs are those which separate the individual from his environment. The interaction of these self-oriented needs constitutes a search for autonomy. Without some realization of these needs, the individual fails to achieve any identity except that which is the mirror image of others. To the extent that the individual has autonomy he is able to maintain control over his own experience and is not threatened when a situation changes form and causes him to adjust his activity. In contrast, the individual who lacks autonomy is controlled by his
experience and must prove to himself with every changing situation that his environment will accede to his demands. Thus individuals low in autonomy can be expected to exhibit aggressive behavior more consistently since they tend to interpret situations as hostile, threatening, and obstructive. An individual with higher perceived autonomy could be expected to have available a broader range of alternatives and to feel less threatened or blocked by the changing situation; therefore, he would be less likely to consistently react in a hostile, aggressive manner. His reaction would be more responsive to the specific situational cues. However, if self-oriented needs become excessively dominant in the total needs structure, the individual loses contact with others and exists for self alone.

Other oriented tendencies unit the individual with his environment. This cluster of need dispositions has to do with the maintenance of satisfactory relationships with significant others. The human organism cannot survive apart from contacts with other human forms; therefore, existence requires dependence. Dependency is also the means by which the individual becomes an active part of the social reality as contrasted with autonomy, the means by which he exists uniquely.

If dependency needs become excessively dominant, the
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individual may cease to exist apart from the whole; his being remains totally described by the externalized world, a reflection of that which is present and approved in others. Like low autonomy individuals, highly dependent persons consistently seek reaffirmation of their existence, only from outside rather than from within. Their behavior is shaped entirely in terms of the responses they perceive in others. Because of this they lack integrity in that these external requirements have remained untempered by any merger with self. They tend to be more situationally specific in displaying misanthropic behavior and highly responsive to stimulus cues in the environment. If significant others approve aggressive behavior, such behavior may be assumed; if, however, the maintenance of satisfactory dependency relationships prohibits displays of harmful interpersonal acts, aggression may be expected to be inhibited.

Low dependency persons are not necessarily aggressive. However, they have less need to conform and concur, are less sensitive to the responses of others and more apt to be guided by self-oriented needs.

In summary, then, it appears that need dispositions are useful constructs for describing the general orientation an individual may be expected to bring to a situation since this orientation does influence his interpretation of
the situation and his choice of behaviors. Whether he will view a given stimulus as one which is hostile, threatening, or obstructive and therefore be more prone to display misanthropic behavior will be determined in part by the interaction between his autonomy needs and his dependency needs.

II. DISPOSITIONS TO HELP AND RESPECT OTHERS

Like misanthropic behavior, the investigation of philanthropic behavior tends to have its own language. The schisms among theoretical positions are not yet so critical here but probably only because less effort has been exerted in the systematic analysis of pro-social behavior than has been expended in attempts to understand its counterpart. There has been considerable effort directed toward the interrelations of personality factors and philanthropic behavior within the more recent years.

The organization of this section will proceed in the same manner as that employed in the preceding one. The empirical evidence will be presented with a minimum amount of structure and the discussion that follows will attempt to identify new structures that are suggested by the findings.

The research. Cattel and Horowitz26 took the initiative in trying to determine which personality factors

interact in producing certain socially valued and utilitarian behaviors. They chose altruistic behavior as their first area of investigation. From results of earlier factorization of components in pro-social behavior, they hypothesized that factors A and L (Cyclothymic vs. Schizothymic and Paranoid Tendency) of the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire would be found to be the chief roots of altruistic behavior. On the basis of what was assumed to be the essential nature of the factors deemed crucial to altruism, thirteen objective tests of personality were designed. These tests were intended to measure the following characteristics: (1) interest in people rather than things, (2) the continuum between hostility and friendliness, (3) optimism, (4) readiness to take a chance, and (5) readiness to face the unfamiliar. All the tests showed positive correlations with the A and L factors but four of them proved especially valid as measures of the total pool. The four tests elicited responses to items related to friend remembrance, modesty as to one's own correctness, freedom from hostility over irritations, and willingness to impart information risky to self. In an additional correlation with the C-L Humor Test some highly significant relationships were found which suggest that the altruistic behavior was motivated by powerful superego pressures together with disregard of the external pressures of current society.
Miller used student ratings of upper class section advisors in men's residence halls as his means for determining the relationships of personality characteristics to helping behavior. He anticipated that individuals rated as exemplifying a higher degree of helping behavior would obtain significantly different scores on the personality factors measured by the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire from the scores of individuals rated as exemplifying non-helping behavior. The results indicated that individuals perceived as more helpful exhibited a relatively high degree of surgency as expressed in factor F+. This factor is characterized by a high degree of enthusiasm, happy-go-lucky, cheerful and talkative behavior which is frank, expressive and quick and alert in nature. Thus these helpful subjects were perceived as exhibiting more outgoing types of behavior. The other significant factor G+ represents character or super-ego strength. Individuals high in G tend to be more conscientious and persevering, more responsible, more interested in people, and exemplify emotional maturity. A rather unexpected finding was that people viewed as showing more helping behavior also scored lower on factor C, emotional stability, than those considered less helping. C- people tend to have a low tolerance for frustration, are excitable, worrying, and get emotional
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when frustrated; they appear to have a tendency toward strong emotional experience.

The marked contrast between factors identified in this study of helping behavior with those described in the previous study with the same instrument illustrates the difficulties which arise when dissimilar operational measures are used to predict a class of behaviors.

Another effort to isolate factors which comprise altruism was undertaken by means of correlational and factorial analysis of responses to a questionnaire administered to 280 male college students. Altruism was defined as the subject's tendency to inhibit (or control) his own impulses and desires in order to make it possible for others to express or satisfy theirs. Results showed that a combination of measures as a configuration were more conducive to the appearance of altruism than any one measure alone. This configuration, which the investigator deemed the "sacred" construct, included the personalistic components religiosity, ethnocentrism, authoritarianism, personal morale, sociability, and mental health as well as several social or situational factors. Ethnocentric individuals, it was found, are not likely to be egoistic in in-group relationships; if "authoritarian" in underlying
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make-up, they are likely to be relatively altruistic.

Like hostility, anger, and anxiety, sympathy and empathy are often assumed to be either necessary or sufficient to explain the occurrence of philanthropic behavior. Whether they are truly productive constructs has yet to be agreed upon, but inquiries attempting to clarify the understanding of helpful behavior through use of such variables do offer a considerable amount of information with respect to the probable need dispositions that may relate to the emission of philanthropic acts.

Aderman and Berkowitz offer support for the contention that empathetic experiences mediate altruism. They predicted that "an observer empathizing with a person in need of help will become motivated to help others to the extent that his empathy has led him to feel bad, while an observer empathizing with a helping model will act altruistically to the degree that his empathetic experience was pleasurable." It was expected also that the strongest motivation to act altruistically would result from empathizing with either a needy person who received no help, or with a rewarded helper. Subjects, who were 120 male undergraduates, listened to a taped conversation in which


30 Ibid., p. 379.
a potential helper did not help, helped and wasn't thanked, or helped and was thanked. Subjects who attended to the person who received no help or to the helper receiving thanks subsequently displayed more helping behavior than those who had listened to the person not helping the needy person. A significant interaction between the speaker observed and the outcome of the conversation was shown by comparison of scores on mood factor data thus offering further support to the thesis that empathetic responses do mediate altruism; the strength of the empathetic response did tend to determine the strength of the altruistic response. Although investigators could not accept empathy as a necessary prerequisite for altruistic behavior, they did feel the study lends support to the statement that empathy can provide the motivation for at least some altruistic behavior.

Additional evidence for regarding empathy as a mediating variable was provided in a study by Sidman again using college students. Measurements of empathy were obtained by means of judgments of responses to short stories and helping behavior was assessed by three different instruments. The more empathetic subjects tended to help others more frequently and more appropriately.
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A test of the relationships of empathy to certain personality factors of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory undertaken by Goldstein showed a relationship to Repression only. This negative association offers some support for the psychoanalytic concept that a distrust of one's own feelings and impulses interferes with empathetic ability.

Falk conceptualized a sympathetic response as one in which the observer understands the circumstances, feelings, and wishes of the sufferer, has feelings of warmth toward him, and a wish to help him. Five personality factors were then investigated for their probable effect upon the sympathetic response. They were (1) type of defense preferences by the observer against the impulse operating in the object of sympathy, (2) type of defense chosen by the observer against the guilt aroused by that impulse, (3) need affiliation, (4) complexity of interpersonal perception, and (5) tolerance of faults in oneself. Using an interview with a female subject who had violated the sexual code through illegitimate pregnancy, Falk found that high need affiliators tended to be more sympathetic when
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maintaining psychic distance. These high affiliators appeared to be so concerned with the reaffirmation of their own worth through approval from similar others that they could not accept the possibility that they might resemble someone who had transgressed. They were also fearful of helping the transgressor and thereby receiving the approval of such a person. The other three factors, defense of guilt, complexity of interpersonal perception, and tolerance of faults were without significant effect in incurring a sympathetic response.

Nurturant behavior in children - defined as the child's giving affection, attention (including help), reassurance, and protection to another person in the nursery school group - was shown in a study by Hartup and Keller\(^{34}\) to be related to the dependency components of seeking help and seeking physical affection, both qualities of activeness and outgoingness, and negatively associated with being near, a passive response.

Daniels and Berkowitz\(^{35}\) used "liking" along with awareness and dependency as key variables in a helping relationship hypothesizing that the greater the degree of liking an


individual had for a dependent other, the greater would be his motivation to help that person. Subjects - again male college students - worked hardest for a dependent supervisor when they had greater liking for him. Consistent with this finding is a report by Speece\textsuperscript{36} that among her sample of elementary school children there was a significant correlation between altruism and rating on friendship.

That choice may be a factor in helping behavior was studied by Jones\textsuperscript{37} whose findings led him to accept two major hypotheses: (1) Among people who are not free to refuse requests for aid, more help will be given the greater the dependence of the person making the request. Among people who do feel free to refuse requests for aid, the greater the dependence of the person making the request, the greater the threat to one's freedom to refuse. The greater threat results in increased reactance arousal and a subsequent increase in the tendency to reject the request; (2) a threat which carries with it the complication of future dependence will arouse more reactance and cause an increased tendency to reject the request as compared to


a condition where there is no implication of future dependence.

In another test of the reactance theory Horowitz predicted correctly that more help would be given upon condition of no choice and that the amount of help given to a dependent other would depend directly on the amount of freedom the more powerful person has in deciding whether or not to help.

Guilt may also play a role in altruistic behavior. Subjects who were responsible for or even witnessed another's punishment were significantly more altruistic in a different situation with a new partner. However, a model proposed by Graf suggests that harming another may lead to subsequent compensatory or reparative activity. Following anti-social behavior, an individual's self-concept may be lowered so that he seeks to demonstrate pro-social behavior as a means of restoring the concept to its
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former level. This rewards-minus-costs model was used to generate two hypotheses which were tested in a design requiring one third of the subjects to help an actress posing as a crippled student; another third were prevented by the experimenter from complying with her request for help, and the final third comprised a control. The results supported the prediction that pro-social manipulation would increase the self-concept level which would be followed by anti-social action in the form of administering greater shock. The anti-social manipulation resulted in a lowering of the self-concept and was followed by pro-social behavior, the administering of reward. The pro-social manipulation had no effect on later pro-social behavior, nor did the anti-social manipulation on anti-social behavior.

Interpretation. Mapping of the personality domain which may relate to the incidence of philanthropic behavior has been furthered by the identification of a number of factors which over several studies appear in association with helping responses. Although these factors are sometimes identified by different names, they include (1) a factor related to the development of conscience or social responsibility, (2) a factor having to do with taking the role of the "other," (3) a factor having to do with approach rather than avoidance, and (4) a factor relating to control over the environment. It does not seem unreasonable to consider these factors as additional components of the autonomy-
dependency construct identified in the interpretation of evidence related to misanthropic behavior.

As part of the complex of needs which help the individual maintain his link with the social reality - the dependency cluster - are those specific need dispositions which move him toward greater union with that reality. These needs have been typically referred to as love-needs, affiliation-needs, prestige-needs, and status-needs. Within the autonomy cluster are needs which help the individual achieve worth and identity in his own right; these include self-esteem needs, power-needs, and self-actualization-needs. The "philanthropic personality" - if such can be conceived to exist on the basis of incomplete evidence - is a tension model which requires the constant interplay of relatively strong dependency needs to maintain a close relationship with the social environment and active autonomy needs which refuse to allow identity to be sacrificed. Although outgoing, friendly, conscientious, and "in tune with" others in the social milieu, the individual who demonstrates this dynamic merging of self and other is also self-confident, sensitive, daring, and independent. Obviously, no one trait can define a person as philanthropic or misanthropic, nor is any person philanthropic or misanthropic in every situation. However, the philanthropic personality permits the individual to deal with contextual cues in a positive (approach) rather
than a negative (attack-avoid) way. The predispositions are toward constructive (helpful) rather than destructive (harmful) acts and the cues must be quite strong and pervasive to elicit a negative classification of a situation.

III. SYNTHESIS

When the behavioral dimension is combined with the personality dimension, it can be seen that the complex of needs related to dependency-autonomy can interact to provide an orientation toward either misanthropic or philanthropic behavior (Figure 2). The person who is positive-dependent and positive autonomous is a dynamic individual constantly seeking integrity, one who is attempting to be true to self and to society. This is the "philanthropic personality." The individual who is negative-autonomous and negative-dependent is prone to define the world as a hostile environment. His failure to achieve adequate control over his environment coupled with his lack of social responsibility, suggest that he will be more prone to demonstrate misanthropic behavior. He is the "misanthropic personality."

The other two personalities, those either negative-dependent but positive-autonomous or positive-dependent and negative-autonomous, will be more responsive to situational cues. Prediction of their behavior is more difficult because it is less consistent and more situationally specific.
FIGURE 2

THE AUTONOMY-DEPENDENCY COMPLEX
AND THE PHILANTHROPIC-MISANTHROPIC PERSONALITY
CHAPTER VI

THE PERSON: PHILOSOPHY AND BELIEF SYSTEMS

Does the basis upon which an individual makes judgments about the truth and correctness of his knowledge and beliefs make a difference in the way he behaves? This is the fundamental question which underlies this dimension.

Historical evidence suggests that belief systems have been crucial influences in the "progress" of civilization. Magic and myth, gods and kings, reason and science, experimentalism and existentialism have all helped shape man's destiny. Surely the way in which any one individual makes sense out of his environment must make a difference also.

Since the problem here is one which relates to morality rather than veracity, and to character more than intellect, the evidence which is relevant is evidence which indicates that the way in which an individual behaves in his relationships with others is determined at least in part by the nature of the criterion measure he employs to decide what is "right," what is "good."

At first inspection few relevant relationships of this nature appeared to be contained in the empirical evidence. There were the seminal studies by Hartshorne
and May\textsuperscript{1} and the recent investigation of character development by Peck and Havighurst\textsuperscript{2}, but in general findings from the studies offered little support for the existence of any such influential dimension. The reason for this soon became apparent. These are concepts usually discussed by philosophers; experimentalists do not use the same language so that these ideas are implicit rather than explicit in their conversations. Closer inspection of the data bank thus did yield a number of studies which contained information about such influences upon philanthropic-misanthropic behavior. As anticipated, the concern of the investigator was often represented quite differently than is the major problem here.

These several studies provide empirical evidence which suggests that there are at least five bases upon which individuals rely to determine the "correctness" or "goodness" of their interpersonal behavior. These are (1) Self, (2) Authority, (3) Situation, (4) Rationality, and (5) Humanism. In the following pages illustrative studies will be used to define each of these types.


Self. It is probably not necessary to offer a great body of evidence to support the statement that people may behave in both helpful and harmful ways in order to meet their own selfish desires. Nor is it necessary to offer considerable proof that the young child is highly egocentric. These are both truisms. However, it is probably appropriate to cite at least a few studies which demonstrate the relationships of self-interest as a criterion measure with respect to the demonstration of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior.

One study quite vividly illustrates both the fact that behavior is influenced by self-validating principles and that the continuance of social relationships demands than constraints be placed upon those interests. Azrin and Lindsley\(^3\) were attempting to determine whether cooperation between children could be developed and maintained by operant conditioning techniques. Two children as a team were seated at a table, each with a stylus, and told they could play any game they wanted. If they cooperated in inserting their styli in holes, they received reinforcement in the form of candy. The experiment went well in so far as the major predictions were concerned; most children cooperated, got their candy, and divided it in some manner.

without receiving any kind of direction or verbal support, but in two teams, one member immediately took all the candy each time the team was rewarded and proceeded to do so until the other member finally refused to cooperate.

Another instance of self-interest typical of youngsters is found in Wright's study of altruism in children. Five-year olds, when given a choice between a desirable and an undesirable toy, chose the better one for themselves and gave a second child the poorer one.

Selfish interest also seems to be reflected in the lives of the "least sensitive" adolescents in Loban's study of social sensitivity. In responding to the "My Ideal Self" questionnaire, these subjects showed approval of persons who "run their own lives . . . are reckless, independent . . . free and impatient of all control and law . . . are ungovernable, superior and powerful, and free from the need of considering how others will react to what they do."5

Authority. Early in the young child's life he meets obstacles to his own desires, and he soon learns that social barriers are different from impersonal objects. He


also begins to get notions about the rights and wrongs of behavior from parental interference with his ongoing behavior and later through verbal communication. Whether he learns standards and values through the process of identification or reinforcement, the fact remains that the parent (and later other adults and peers) is the means by which he validates his behavior. His choices are "right" or "wrong" according to an external measure of authority. Thus it is not surprising to find that Fite's questions about the rights and wrongs of aggressive behavior elicited responses from three-year olds which appeared to be direct representations of parental attitudes and of the rules imposed by parents at home, and that there was a tendency to exhibit a strong emotional response to requests for behavior definitely contrary to parental rules.

Looking to authority for judgments of right and wrong is not just a criterion used by young children. Of the
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five character types among adolescent identified by Peck and Havighurst, the "conforming" group continually look to authoritative sources for reinforcement of their beliefs concerning the rightness of their behavior. An individual who illustrates this type quite clearly is Catherine, an especially pure example of an adolescent whose behavior is significantly influenced by a belief system which rests upon external judgments by others.

In her Moral Ideology Test responses, Catherine chose the following items:

**Good Things:**

**Bad Things:**
1. Don't use good language, 2. Be mean to your sister or brother, 3. Talk out loud in school, 4. Don't do anything teacher asks you to do, 5. Don't do anything that your mother asks you to do, 6. Don't do anything your father asks you to do, 7. Don't pick up the papers for the janitor, 8. Step on the American flag, 9. Don't be good to your classmates.

These responses reflect a generalized, passive moral orientation based upon adult-devised rules.

Authority can be based in groups as well as in single
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persons. Stotland\textsuperscript{12} showed, for example, that subjects who could talk with their peers expressed greater hostility toward a frustrating supervisor than did subjects who were working alone. The experimenter did not attribute this reaction to increased bravery but rather to the fact that the peer group served as the validating agency for the subject's own opinion. The group provided confirmation of the "rightness" of his decision.

**Situation.** Situations are complex and the use of a single base for validating the "rightness" or "wrongness" of behavior is not typical of most individuals. For one, conflicts between self-interest and external authority must be resolved. Thus, the evidence shows, the complexity of the validation system increases with increasing maturity. Also, as situations differ, other external and personalistic influences impinge upon the individual so that in a specific situation, he may be responding to other forces which override concerns about the "correctness" of the behavior.

Fite\textsuperscript{13} also noticed in her study of young children that their verbalizations about right and wrong aggressive

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{13}Fite, op. cit.
  \item \textsuperscript{14}Hartshorne and May, op. cit., p. 372.
\end{itemize}
behavior were unrelated to the aggressive behavior they showed on the playground. In their epic study of character, Hartshorne and May concluded in their final volume that they could find little consistency across situations in children's service tendencies. Conduct, according to their findings "represents an achieved association between a certain type of situation and a certain type of response." In children eight to fifteen years of age they found little integration of character:

In proportion as situations are alike conduct is correlated. In proportion as situations are unlike conduct is uncorrelated. The situation in which he (the child) acts in an antisocial way may be quite varied. The secret of his performance lies in the specific experiences which had brought him satisfaction and disappointment in the course of his short career.

There is more recent evidence, however, that suggests that in basing their conclusions upon overt manifestations which are subject to conscious control Hartshorne and May seem to have overlooked internal states such as motivation and fear which when considered display increasing consistency across situations.

In their longitudinal study of children of Prairie

15 Ibid., p. 373.
16 Ibid., pp. 373-74.
17 Hoffman, op. cit., p. 306.
City children, Peck and Havighurst found that there does seem to be such a thing as individual character - a persisting pattern of attitudes and motives which produces a predictable quality of moral behavior. They found that individuals could be categorized according to five types which represented a continuum of increasing strength of conscience. The less mature types tend to rely upon more rigid, unitary measures for judgments of rightness and wrongness similar to those reflected in the earlier classifications of self and authority, but as conscience matures, there is an increased internalization of a moral code which may or may not remain open to testing and questioning. If the code is closed to experience, the stimulus cues in the situation will elicit stereotyped, rigid judgments about appropriate responses.

Several studies are presented to serve as examples which demonstrate the manner in which individuals cope with the complexity of situations in which competing motivations are represented. The decision whether to behave in helpful or harmful ways toward others is not necessarily made on a moral basis. Even though there is consistency across situations in the belief system which a particular individual uses to validate the "goodness" of his behavior, in a particular situation this belief system may not be an influential dimension in determining the behavior he manifests.
Levin\textsuperscript{19} found that the frame of reference individuals used upon which to make judgments about goal fulfillment affected their tendencies toward social aggression. Relative evaluators who used an external frame of reference to judge their performance and thus their sense of worth demonstrated more social aggression under conditions of relative deprivation than did self-evaluators who used personal productivity as the standard for comparison. The investigator suggested that relative evaluation may lead to a zero-sum orientation whereby individuals are viewed as competing for the same scarce goals and personal success must be protected. Such an orientation views aggression as a response to personal threat which reinforces feelings of personal adequacy.

The interaction of friendship and fairness was found by Morgan\textsuperscript{20} to be critical in interpreting the behavior exhibited by partners in a cooperative task situation. Friends continued to cooperate even if one seemed to benefit more than the other, but if the partners were strangers, the perception of unequal benefits resulted


in a process of "evening-up" in which each member attempted to equalize his benefits by reducing those of the other. With friends the egalitarian principle seemed not to serve as a determinant of behavior.

Schwartz, et al., 21 demonstrated that in different situations cognitive and motivational variables held different values. Subjects were first exposed to a situation in which they had an opportunity to cheat. All those who had cheated along with a random selection of others who had not were later exposed to a situation in which they could demonstrate various degrees of helpfulness. It was found that a morally positive decision in one situation (not to cheat) and a morally positive decision in the other (to help) were differentially affected by the variables of achievement and affiliation. A high achievement led to not cheating, a morally creditable decision in the one context, and a morally reprehensible one, not to help, in the other. In the cheating situation affiliation had no effect but led to morally desirable action in the helpfulness context. The Level of Moral Thought scores which were used as an index of the direction decisions would be influenced by the moral domain showed a positive

relationship to not cheating (significant) and to helpfulness (not significant), but were not predictive of behavior across situations. There was no relationship between not cheating and being helpful. In this case at least it seems clear that the belief system was not the primary determinant of the behavior displayed. This does not say, however, that these subjects did not have a base for validating the morality of their behavior, but that the influence of personality factors within the group was more pervasive. Within a particular individual, this would not necessarily follow; there may have been individuals in the group who followed the dictates of their belief system. Unfortunately the study did not pursue that question.

Torgoff\textsuperscript{22} examined the effect of differences between the relative strength of internalized moral standards of reflecting concern for others and the strength of achievement motivation. He predicted that individuals for whom achievement gratifying lures are attractive and who have internalized a concern and responsibility for the welfare of others will be more likely to identify with the moral conflicts involving these particular components. They will, he supposed, display more guilt than those of equal

moral persuasion but less need achievement or those who, regardless of the strength of their achievement need, have less concern and responsibility for the welfare of others. It was found that subjects with high achievement and high concern for others seemed to block out any open admission of guilt. They manifested lowest remorse, confession and rectification in responses to projective tests and used "fortuitous retribution" as an indirect means for punishing the transgressors of the moral code. The study also illustrates the need to investigate internalized responses in order to understand the complexity of the situation for the individual with contradictory orientations.

Rationality. Conflict can be resolved through rationality.

Glass's study cited in Chapter V is an example of a rational resolution of dissonance which in that case permitted the subjects to justify their aggression by changing their perceptions of the person against whom they aggressed.

In an attempt to determine the effects of modeling and reinforcement on aggressive behavior under conditions

---

of positive feedback, Hoelle discovered that boys who evaluated the supposed peer's performance highly valued their own performance highly in teaching him and thus felt at ease about administering shocks as an "aid to learning." However, boys who were dissatisfied with their "pupil's" performance were also unhappy with their own performance as instructors and were very bothered by administering shock.

A series of experiments conducted by Pepitone give support to the thesis that individuals may act either in hostile or friendly ways toward others as a means for maintaining valid cognitions. Thus, as one experiment showed, if a person acts in a boastful manner, others may be less apt to react with hostility to that person if they believe him to be a knowledgeable person than if his boastfulness seems unwarranted by his abilities. Additional support for the nation was obtained by asking subjects in another experiment to listen to positively, negatively, or unbiased accounts of a third person and then measuring the


extent of friendliness or hostility toward that person. Subjects appeared more friendly toward the person to whom they believed the informer to have a negative bias and less friendly toward one to whom they thought the informer was positively oriented.

Margolin\(^26\) employed a series of cooperative-competitive group situations to determine whether the transfer of hostility to a participant instigator was a random process governed by chance or the function of a more rational psychological one. It was found that the greater transfer of hostility took place when the third person (participant-instigator) was perceived as being in a competitive rather than a cooperative relationship with the subject. This finding supported the implication that the transfer of hostility was rational and motivated and is associated with the tendency of individuals to maintain cognitive stability and to avoid conflict and ambiguity.

Humani sm. Hoffman\(^27\) reports a study in which subjects selected on the basis of their responses to moral judgment items were assigned to two groups, one with a “humanistic” moral orientation, the other with a more conventionally


\(^{27}\) Hoffman, op. cit., p. 310.
punitive one. The humanistic group consisted of children who in their moral judgments considered circumstances and invoked principles in support of judgments which were based on human need. The conventional group tended to consider the circumstances and gave principles based more on convention and authority. The responses of the two groups to later test items further substantiated the existence of disparate belief systems. The humanistic subjects showed more guilt when the consequences of the transgressions involved human life but considerably less when consequences were minor and easily rectified. The responses of the conventional subjects showed a tendency to treat all infractions the same. The conservative subjects were also less able to face conflicts; the humanistic subjects could contemplate a forbidden course of action and consider a proscribed act before rejecting it.

Rutherford discovered that generosity in nursery school boys was a part of a pattern of characteristics which included altruism, kindness, and cooperation. It may be worth noting that both Hoffman and Rutherford as a result of their investigations suggested that there is a strong implication that proscriptive rules for behavior may be taught by specific learning experiences and through

---

reward and punishment, but that patterns of behavior that reflect compassion, cooperation, and sympathy may only be achieved through developmental identification with an appropriate model.  

**Summary.** The evidence presented in this chapter is suggestive rather than definitive. It has offered support for the contention that belief systems are an influential element in the explanation of human behavior. It has also provided a tentative typology for describing those belief systems. Thirdly, it has illustrated the criticality of the interaction among dimensions.

The five types of belief systems which have been discussed are (1) Self, (2) Authority, (3) Situation, (4) Rationality, (5) Humanism. The validity of this typology is given additional support in the work of Piaget.  

There appears to be a correspondence between these five types as represented in the empirical research and Piaget's three stages of moral growth: adult constraint, moral realism, and autonomous morality.

It is important to note that although the types are conceptualized as being separate for descriptive purposes,
the evidence suggests that in reality an individual may rely upon a combination of systems. Peck and Havighurst’s “rational-altruistic” type appears to correspond to a merger of the rational and humanistic belief systems. A blend of situation and rationality might be very close to Piaget’s moral realism. Some combinations, however, produce conflict; for example, self-interest and authority, humanism and authority. Conflict is also created with the interaction of belief system, personality, and situation. An awareness of the existence of such conflict as it appeared in the lives of children was expressed some years ago by Mary Fite in her study of children’s aggressive behavior.

... the outstanding pattern in the development of attitudes toward aggression among these ... subjects was one which seemed to reflect similar patterns in adult attitudes; a conflict between ideals of cooperation, sympathy, and loyalty on the one hand and, on the other hand, a need for personal competitiveness and aggression of a certain kind. 31

It might appear that belief systems are themselves means for resolving conflict for they provide the base upon which the “goodness” or “badness,” “correctness” or “wrongness” of behavior is validated. But human behavior is not just a matter of moral decisions, and in this

31 Fite, op. cit., p 315.
research only belief systems pertaining to moral judgments - of which the decision to harm or help is one - have been investigated. It may be that philosophy - as the composite of many systems of beliefs - is the means by which the individual does resolve conflict, but the compilation of evidence from the total sphere of human activity would be necessary to support such a position empirically. Such evidence would relate to the fundamental questions: Who am I? How do I know? Why?
CHAPTER VII

INSTITUTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS: INTENT OR DEFAULT?

With this chapter the gestalt reverses and the focus shifts from the figure to the ground. Conceptually that ground or environmental field has been predicted to have four relevant dimensions: the institution, the character, the ethos or culture, and the physical medium. The institution with which this investigation is concerned is, of course, the school. Questions which were raised earlier are brought into sharp focus in the exploration of this dimension. What expectations with respect to the demonstration of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior does the school hold for its students either explicitly or implicitly? What behaviors do these expectations elicit? Can forty years of research provide any answers?

The structure of the school. The school is a social system. As a social system it is characterized by a hierarchy of roles (a status system), and body of rules for its members (norms), a decision making procedure (authority), and a set of shared feelings (sentiments). By means of these four concepts, status, norms, sentiments, and authority, it is possible to examine the configuration of
the school. By means of these concepts also it is possible to delineate more clearly the effects of schools upon the particular class of behaviors with which this research is concerned.

I. STATUS

Social orders of any complexity seem always to be accompanied by hierarchies; even chickens have their pecking order. Status rather than situs is the characteristic pattern of relationships among roles in the school as well. As a member of the social system, each student has a position in the rank order. His position in relation to that of all others is his status. His status affects his relationships with others in the social system. It influences both the ways in which he perceives and behaves toward others and the ways in which they perceive and behave toward him.

The pecking order. There are considerably more studies which explore the effects of the student's social status upon his academic performance than upon his pro- or anti-social behavior. However, the few studies which are relevant provide clear indications that status is an influential determinant of these behaviors.

When children enter a new group, their status is uncertain and their level of aggression tends to be low. Anxiety-induced inhibitions over the newness and the
uncertainty of the situation reduce the instigation to
aggress. As familiarity increases, inhibitions are les­
sened and aggressive responses which exist in the reper­
toire of behaviors are likely to become more evident.
This observation by Buss\(^1\) is certainly not a startling
revelation to any teacher who has begun the year with a
new class of pupils. What may not be so evident, however,
is that with his entrance into school, the child is
ascribed a position in the status hierarchy. That ascrip­
tion occurs through both the formal and the informal pro­
cesses inherent in the system. First, his role as a pupil
places him in a subordinate position to that of the teach­
er. By virtue of his higher status, the teacher has
privileges which are not extended to the student. This
inferior-superior relationship continues throughout the
school life of the pupil.\(^2\)

In addition, the student is ascribed status on the
basis of the social class he represents in the larger
community. The insidious effects of this ascriptive

---

\(^1\)Arnold H. Buss, *The Psychology of Aggression* (New

\(^2\)David Goslin, *The School in Contemporary Society*
(Glenview, Ill.: Scott-Foresman and Company, 1965),
pp. 19-30.
process were examined in a revealing study by Neugarten who found that children were perceived by other children to be "well-dressed, clean, good-looking, well-mannered, popular, to like school, have a good time, and play fair" not by virtue of any observable characteristics which could be determined by an outside observer, but because their parents held higher social standing in the community. Lower-class children were assigned reputations for being "poorly-dressed, not good looking, unpopular, aggressive, dirty, bad-mannered, not liking school, never having a good time, and not playing fair." These reputations remained with youngsters throughout their elementary school years. Although the stereotypes were ameliorated somewhat when students passed on to secondary schools, only a part of this could be attributed to changing perceptions. It appeared more likely that since many of the lower class pupils had fulfilled the prophecy and dropped out of school, there were fewer such individuals actually involved in the observations made of older students. Although Neugarten did not relate status directly to helpful or harmful behavior, she did find that friendship patterns at the elementary level were directly controlled by these considerations. The effect was less clear at the secondary level but upper-class status was an indication that the student would at least be the center of attention.
Status also seems to be a function of school achievement. Grann and his associates\textsuperscript{4} found that IQ as manifested in achievement appeared to be the foundation of the difference between the accepted and rejected child in the classroom.

The fact that status relationships among students remain relatively constant over time is supported in a study by Northway\textsuperscript{5} who also found that there was never sociometric equality among members of classroom groups. Individuals always arranged themselves in hierarchies, and the position of any one person in the group changed relatively little over time.

An example of the relationship of status to the demonstration of positive or negative interpersonal behavior in one school context was discovered accidentally in an action research project by Foshay\textsuperscript{6}. Starting with an attempt to understand the nature and extent of "considerate" and "inconsiderate" behavior as exhibited by students,


Foshay and his teachers found what they were actually describing was the social structure of the classroom. Considerate behavior was an expression of group acceptance rather than the indication of any deeply-rooted moral orientation. Inconsiderate behavior was a means for maintaining the prestige system in the classroom, a way in which children maintained balance in their relationships with one another.

Position in a hierarchy has a differential effect upon the display of constructive and blocking behavior. Kelley found that the more unpleasant a person's position is, the more likely he is to hinder the progress of the group tasks. However, a high status person is less likely to be the object of overt hostility and aggression than is a person of lower rank. Of particular importance is whether the high status person is perceived to be able to control the mobility of the low status person. As Cohen


showed, low-status people who thought they might gain more desirable positions if high status members were favorable to them were less critical of high status people than were those who were unable to move upward. Also, the greater the punishment-threatening value of the individual, the less the aggressiveness of the response.\textsuperscript{10}

Since low social status in the larger society often results in ascription to a less desirable position in the social order of the school, it is not surprising also to find a high positive relationship between personal maladjustment in school-age children and parents of low social status or to learn that the social status of the classroom is a determinant of an individual child's level of aggression.\textsuperscript{11}

Briggs showed also that pupils who had failed two years in their elementary school careers were more aggressive than successful pupils and were also lower in social status.\textsuperscript{12}


\textsuperscript{12} L.D. Briggs, "The Impact of Failure on Elementary School Pupils" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, North Texas State University, 1966.)
Wayne found considerable support for his theory that the dominant motivation of the high school student is to achieve and maintain a general social status within the organization of the school. Using data obtained through participant observation over a period of ten years he found support for his hypothesis that student behavior was functionally related to his social status within the school and highly oriented toward prestige, the price of which was conformity to highly valued patterns.

Burnett has suggested that American high schools provide for modern societies the rites and ceremonies of status change much as do more simplistic rites of transition in primitive societies. Using a small midwestern school as an empirical test, she investigated the interrelationships among the elaborate ceremonial cycles of the secondary school, the academic work system, and clique structures. Although her work is still exploratory, it does "raise the question of what part ritual plays in the multichartered, multigrouped institutions that educate, socialize, and enculturate young people into modern


megalopolises."

There is other evidence, however, that suggests that students of low status find other means for gaining prestige and rewards than those valued by the school "establishment." One of the most revealing analyses of school social systems is Hargreave's report of an English secondary modern school. His investigation led him to conclude that not only were there rigid status hierarchies and divergent normative structures reflected in the pupil-school relationships but that there actually were two distinct subcultures represented within the school and the norms of these subcultures indicated a polarization of values. He found a "delinquent" subculture whose members had been deprived of status as it was typically conferred in the school setting. To erase this deprivation these lower stream students had substituted a peer system which conferred status and prestige upon members in direct proportion to their rejection of the school's values. In the academic (high stream) sub-culture, control of physical aggression and violence was a respected norm. Fighting ability was irrelevant to status and such aggressive

15 Ibid., p. 9

activity was considered deviant behavior. In the delinquent sub-culture, however, physical aggression was a major criterion of status. Hargreaves' data led him to conclude that the structure of the school not only encouraged deviance - to school norms - among lower stream students but permitted the school to play a major role in generating delinquency. His observations present a remarkable similarity to conditions in American high schools.

II. NORMS

Norms provide several kinds of information about a social system. They clarify the values of the system. They identify the deviant members of the system. They predict the behavior of the conforming members of the system.

Norms are not easy to isolate. They do not necessarily reflect any expressed intent of the system. They can be inferred from behavior, but since behavior is the culmination of the interaction of numerous variables, this is risky business. In addition, since an individual is a member of numerous overlapping social systems, his behavior cannot be ascribed to the normative structure of any one system. Nevertheless norms are useful conceptual devices for gaining insight about institutional effects.

If the normative structure of a school can be described, certain inferences can be made about the values represented by that institution. If, for example,
rewards are dispensed or privileges assigned to those who act in positive, helpful ways toward others, the norms of the school obviously condone and encourage such behaviors. If, on the contrary, sanctions are not imposed upon those who aggress towards others, different values are indicated. Those individuals who strive for rewards and privileges through behaving in ways that are congruent with these expectations may be said to have "conformed." To the extent that individuals act in ways that are opposed to these expectations, they may be regarded as "deviant."

All this is merely saying that evidence is required to show that schools either encourage or sanction students who behave in positive, respectful, and helpful (or negative, disrespectful, and harmful) ways toward others in order to establish the direction of the school's influence. Secondly, evidence is needed with respect to whether students do strive for the rewards and prestige associated with the demonstration of these behaviors. Finally, data indicating the proportion of students who deviate from these expectations will be necessary so that statements can be made about the actual effects of the school.

Unfortunately very little such evidence is available.

Institutional "press." In schools rewards and privileges are clearly associated with academic excellence, athletic prowess, social facility, and unquestioning
conformity. There is no evidence which pertains directly to the relationship of the dispensing of rewards and assigning of prestige with the demonstration of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior. There is, however, some indirect evidence.

A number of measures have been devised recently for the purpose of measuring the "environmental press" of the school as it is perceived by students. The responses given by students on such instruments may be considered as indications of the normative patterns of the system as revealed through student perceptions. These instruments may very well be the most reliable and valid means yet devised to discover both the nature and scope of school expectations and the extent of their congruency with student "needs." Unfortunately for the purposes of this study, they have been employed more widely at the college level than in the lower schools and have been primarily concerned with determining variables associated with achievement.

rather than interpersonal behavior. Fortunately, one study undertaken at the high school level is available and provides some relevant information.

After administering the High School Characteristics Index to 725 students, Herr reported the discovery of a two-dimensional press, one from faculty and administration, the other issuing from the peer group. The academic press encouraged organized, purposeful, planned activity. These activities were perceived as being set in a context of friendly, reciprocal relationships between teachers and students. The peer press was more emotional in nature and tended to run counter to the academic press in encouraging impulsive, spontaneous, impetuous behavior. Further and perhaps more significant differences were noted in the perceptions of different groups of students:

Students categorized as high or middle achievers perceived more press for affiliation and dependence on others for love, assistance and protection; (italics mine) for intense, open emotional display; for detached, unprejudiced, impersonal thinking; for problem-solving, analysis, theorizing; for introspective preoccupation with private, psychological, spiritual, aesthetic or metaphysical experience than did students categorized as low achievers.

---

18 See pp. 12-17.

The low-achieving students perceived more press for self-deprecation and self-devaluation; for indifference or disregard for the feelings of others as manifested in overt, covert, direct or indirect aggression; for dissassocation from others, withholding friendship and support; (italics mine) for restrained response; for compulsive organization of the immediate physical environment, manifested in a pre-occupation with neatness, orderliness, and meticulous attention to details; and, for superstitious, irrational, paranoid or otherwise egocentric perceptions and beliefs than did students classified as high or middle achievers. 20

Girls tended to perceive more intellectual and dependency press, more emotional expression press for dominance, emotionality, narcissism, and sexuality than did boys. Boys perceived more press for play and aggression.

Although there are no studies which specifically illustrate an institutional press toward philanthropic as compared to misanthropic behavior, it may be at least suggestive to note that the rate of aggressive responses of three- and four-year old boys in a nursery school class was significantly reduced by teachers systematically ignoring aggression and attending only to acts incompatible with aggression. The "press" in this case was toward the inhibition of misanthropic behavior by the strengthening of positive responses. 21

20 Ibid., pp. 680-81.

Peer Press. In the elementary school as well as in the secondary school, the influence of the peer group can be significant in affecting the behavior of individuals. Brinkman and Brinkman\textsuperscript{22} noted that with some children the influence of the group was more noticeable than that of the teacher and that the group was more direct in its efforts to change the individual when the goals of the group were affected.

Hargreaves\textsuperscript{23} investigation has already been mentioned but bears repeating with some elaboration here. His identification of two antagonistic sub-cultures illustrated the presence of institutional norms which upheld middle class values but were rejected by a large element of the school population. Controlled, non-aggressive behavior indicated conformity to the normative structure of the school but deviancy in the delinquent sub-culture. This was, however, an incidental rather than a central concern of either the school or the peer culture. It does not appear that the institutional norms of Lumley School placed any significant or pervasive emphasis upon humanistic values as part of the school press. Had those values been

\textsuperscript{22}Hargreaves, \textit{op. cit.}

present they would appear in the normative structure. It is possible only to speculate about probable effects. Perhaps the higher streams would have remained dedicated to individual achievement and competitive standards. Perhaps the lower stream group would still be alienated and reject institutional values, perhaps not. Conversely, there is no evidence that the school openly supported hostile, disrespectful personal relationships. But the emphasis upon individual achievement and the rigid status system which created a wide schism between students in low order and high order positions did, in fact, create a punitive, hostile environment for students of lower status. This was shown by the interviews and observations describing the relationships between teachers and students and between peer groups. Since the most predictable determinant of aggression is aggression, it might be supposed that students in lower streams had a long history of painful, repressive experiences which might be expected to elicit like responses.

Clark's\textsuperscript{24} investigation of the American high school is offered as a final piece of evidence to support the proposition that schools contain sub-cultures whose norms are often incongruent and conflicting both with each other

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{24}Clark, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 244-70.
\end{flushright}
and with the institutional press. His analysis, based partly upon research and partly upon speculation, led him to conclude that there were three peer cultures predominant and growing in American high schools: the fun subculture, the academic subculture, and the delinquent subculture. Two of these groups adhere to a system of values which if not antagonistic are at least incompatible with the traditional academic expectations of the institution. Again, by what is not present, the study provides further evidence that the emphasis within normative patterns of neither the peer culture nor the institution is upon humanistic values. Philanthropy or misanthropy are incidental behavioral outcomes.

III. AUTHORITY

If American schools are to continue to operate as status hierarchies, there must be some means for designating those who have the power to make decisions about the nature and distribution of rewards, privileges, and punishments. Typically this is achieved by means of associating authority with specific roles in the school hierarchy. If the social order is to remain stable, there must be

---

25 Clark's work published in 1962 added that, unlike colleges, the high schools did not seem to have a nonconformist culture - young radicals, alienated bohemian students. Recent events suggest this observation may no longer be appropriate.
someone everyone can peck and someone no one can peck. So long as this is understood, the system runs smoothly, rewards are dispensed according to conformity with norms and authority is not challenged.

Aggression in the schools, however, often takes the form of a challenge to authority (by students) and an enforcement of authority (by faculty). This indicates that the pecking order is out of adjustment.

**Challenge to authority.** Underachievers as a group are notoriously more prone to demonstrate hostility toward authority than are achievers. They also display more passive aggression. Passive aggression may take the form of evasion of tasks, daydreaming, failure to follow classroom procedures, frequent absences, truancy, and eventually dropping-out. That this behavior is in part a challenge to the legitimacy of the authority patterns of the school is illustrated by Werthmann's study of delinquent gang members. These students openly expressed their rejection of the legitimacy of the teacher's authority when it was based upon role investiture only. They demanded that legitimacy be earned by the teacher’s teaching them something

---


and dispensing rewards for their efforts. If they felt discriminated against because of their refusal to accept the teacher’s claim on the basis of status alone, they would avoid all behavior that in any way explicitly recognized that authority.

**Enforcement of authority.** Anti-social interpersonal behavior is also more often displayed in the classrooms of punitive teachers than of non-punitive ones. Kounin and Gump showed that as compared with children who have non-punitive teachers, children with such teachers not only manifest more aggression in their misconduct but are less concerned with school unique values, and in some cases show a reduction in rationality pertaining to school misconduct. Nonpermissiveness for aggression in schools may be particularly likely to increase aggression in children whose parents have permitted aggressive habits to be established.

Lewin and White’s classic study of autocratic and

---


democratic groups raised some significant questions about the relation of authority to the demonstration of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior. Although groups under autocratic leadership were not necessarily characterized by hostile, aggressive behavior, they were less conducive to need satisfaction of individual members. Boys in these groups displayed more critical discontent, were more aggressive toward their leaders and lacked any spontaneous work interest. Democratic groups displayed more cooperative behavior, recognition for others as persons, and open friendliness.  

Concurrently, in relatively free unrestrained social contacts aggressive behavior may also be expected to increase. Zuk showed that "the social environmental context in which individuals participate exerts a controlling effect and . . . the controlling effect varies from individual to individual, but is roughly specific for certain groups of individuals." Thus in the relatively uninhibited environment of a camp situation, even passive-dominant children who ordinarily were characterized by


33Ibid., p. 156.
passive responses to situations did not express greater passivity when freed of restrictions but became more aggressive. The authors noted:

In a relatively free situation whatever inhibitions on response exist must come from the peer group; in a relatively non-free situation, inhibitions on response come from perceptions of what the adult authority considers necessary to inhibit. 34

Do authority patterns in the school serve to inhibit hostility, disregard for the welfare of others, harmful and violent attacks upon others or do they provide the cues to instigate such responses? The evidence is suggestive but not definitive.

IV. SENTIMENTS

Status, norms, and authority comprise the mind of the social system, but sentiments reveal the heart. The ways in which students relate to one another, their feelings about what is happening to them and what they are doing cannot be overlooked without missing a very crucial indicator of institutional effects. Because affective constructs are often regarded as mediating variables in the instigation of both philanthropic and misanthropic behavior, any study of institutional effects upon that behavior must consider any evidence which relates to development of sentiments among members of the system.

34 Ibid., p. 134.
**School climate.** One of the newer approaches to the description of behavior and behaviorally relevant variables is the use of behavior stream analysis. This technique attempts to describe in the fullest possible detail the relevant variables in the ongoing stream of behavior of an individual. One such study was designed to secure precise information about the social climate of the classroom by following a single subject — Raymond Birch, seven years old — through a full day. In the classroom setting as compared to settings free of adults, Raymond's world was "less clear, less general, and smaller in the sense of offering fewer recognized and promising things to do." He was "moved to do what he did more by social pressure than by direct interest; in this setting he was often frustrated or in conflict and was warmed less by positive emotional expansiveness — feeling for him on the part of others — and subject to more social disapproval." The researchers were cautious about drawing firm conclusions but tentatively suggested that "the relative indifferent, unrecreative, unsatisfactory behavior" might be derived from the high degree of frustrations and conflicts. If the


36 Ibid., p. 199.
frustration-aggression hypothesis has any validity, the existence of such psychological situations in classrooms may go far to explain the incidence of misanthropic behavior in school settings.

In an analysis of the sociometric structure of thirty-nine elementary classrooms, Lippitt and Gold were disturbed by the presence of individual children who by their hostility toward others contributed to the development of "unhealthy" classroom situations. They noted that other members of the classroom group rigidly labeled and evaluated the troublesome children and were unable to offer sympathetic responses. The groups had no rules of behavior which allowed for the presence of deviancy. Even teachers were generally unskilled in responding to such situations with adequate understanding and concern for low-status children.

A study conducted by the Subcommittee on Human Relations in the Classroom of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools found that this lack of skill and understanding was typical of a large proportion of the 1075 teachers in the 3527 high schools in

---

It appears that children themselves often feel that others are "mean" to them. A study of 285 primary boys and girls revealed that nearly half of the children believed that other children were mean to them and also that adults were mean to them. Negro children expressed more inner feelings of lacking affection, and urban children reported experiencing more meanness than did rural white children. Boys were subject to more meanness than were girls. When the reverse procedure was considered and meanness was defined as the hitting, pushing, and scaring of others, Negro children and rural children appeared meaner than urban whites and boys generally displayed more meanness than did girls. About one in every five children indicated he needed more adult affection and a considerable number of Negro children felt they needed more friends.

Two groups of impoverished male Negro dropouts were interviewed in a study by Weber and Motz. They had

---


been enrolled in four all Negro inner-city schools of a large eastern city. Their comments clearly indicated their view of school as an indifferent and punitive setting. Instead of seeing the classroom as a place where students and staff could influence each other through positive interaction, they saw themselves as dependent subordinates in an impersonal, authoritarian organization which itself occupied some inferior position in a broader context. The investigators concluded that the school staff was punishment oriented and that the school, rather than study the problems of those who break the rules, removed the individuals who interfered with the smooth functioning of the school machinery.

Apparently when teachers are more warm, spontaneous, and responsive to children, children tend to display those same behaviors.\(^{41}\) Also fewer isolated children were found in the classrooms of teachers who scored moderately low on the California F Scale and the highest number of isolates were in classes of teachers whose scores were highest.\(^{42}\)


However, the tendency for other children to regard aggressive behavior more leniently than parents and teachers may alter the standards of a child who has been taught never to be aggressive. The development of strong friendships and the increase with age of group feelings also brings with it increasing independence of adult roles.43 As was shown in Wright's study cited earlier,44 children who develop strong group friendship may become less inhibited and more hostile toward a frustrating adult.

Hartshorne and May45 regarded the mutual friendship of children in the same classroom as a determinant of service behavior second only to the influence of the general background of the child.

Cohesiveness and philanthropy-misanthropy. Many studies have been undertaken to determine the effects of competition and cooperation upon group productivity. Phillips


44M. Erik Wright, "The Influence of Frustration upon the Social Relations of Young Children," Character and Personality 12:111-22, 1943.

and D'Amico found that groups working under cooperative conditions increased in cohesiveness as measured by the change in the number of within group choices between the initial and final administration of a sociometric questionnaire. Groups functioning under competitive conditions did not necessarily decrease in cohesion, but there was a suggestion that the effects of competition might be dependent upon the manner in which group rewards were distributed.

A later and well-known study by Deutsch revealed that under cooperative conditions a greater percentage of encouraging or rewarding remarks were exchanged among members, but that under competitive conditions a significantly large proportion of aggressive remarks occurred. Members of cooperative groups also tended to have higher evaluations of other members' contributions than did competitive group members.

However, if groups are highly cohesive, group members may become less inhibited and more apt to display

---


irritations and hostile feelings. Pepitone\textsuperscript{48} discovered that members of highly cohesive two-member groups expressed a greater volume of hostility toward a frustrator than did members of low-liking pairs. Similar results were found by Strickland, Jones, and Smith\textsuperscript{49} who showed that subjects were more unfriendly toward an antagonist when they believed their peers agreed with their opinions than were subjects who did not believe they had such peer support.

French\textsuperscript{50} studied two groups in which the members were likely to view others as frustrative and found that more open aggression was displayed in long established, organized groups than in newly formed groups. Although the study was not carried out in a school setting, it may have implications for classes of students who typically remain together over months and sometimes years.


\textsuperscript{50}J. R. P. French, "Organized and Unorganized Groups under Fear and Frustration," in Kurt Lewin et al., \textit{Authority and Frustration} University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare (Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1944).
Altruism is often an important value in in-groups, but a study by Sherif, et al., showed that the friendships or enmity which develop between groups is the product not the cause of group interactions. In a uniquely designed experiment with two groups of elementary school-age boys, Sherif and his companions showed that strong in-group sentiments when combined with highly competitive interactions between groups resulted in antagonistic, hostile, aggressive relationships which defied attempts even of high status members to ameliorate. Only by the establishment of superordinate goals which required cooperation among members of both groups for their attainment were friendly, helpful relationships finally established between members of the two groups.

V. COMMENT

Status, norms, authority, and sentiments are four concepts which have been used to discuss the expectations schools have for their students. The research evidence has been of relatively little help in providing answers.


It does suggest that schools have been more concerned with sorting, labeling, classifying than they have been with determining how students behave toward each other. Green was apparently correct when he observed rather cynically that "humanistic education will continue to provide the educator's ideology but not his reality."\(^{53}\)

Because schools are status hierarchies, the way one person behaves toward another is determined more by their relative positions in the hierarchy than by their common humanity.

Because the values of the institution and the values of the individuals populating the institution are divergent, normative structures overlap and often generate conflict.

Because legitimacy of institutional authority is being brought into question, challenges and enforcements of that authority provide justifications for misanthropic behavior.

Because the climate and the processes which characterize the school are not closely examined for their effects upon the feelings people have for one another and about what is happening to them, sentiments develop independent of institutional expectations.

---

Perhaps the scope of the research is too limited to support inferences. But even so, the weight of the evidence available points in these directions. It suggests that the expectations of educational institutions (more implicit than explicit) are permitting behavior characterized by antagonism and disrespect for human worth more by default than intent. But is that any less an indication of the values the school promotes, perpetuates, and prescribes?
Chapter VIII

Character and Integrity

Default rather than intent may partially explain the widespread occurrence of misanthropic behavior in the school context. But it is hardly reasonable to suppose that individuals charged with implementing institutional intents should not be aware of some of the deleterious as well as the serendipitous nature of incidental outcomes. Is it possible that institutions once created have an existence separate from their human creators? Do they then shape their environment in their own image?

More specifically, does the institution itself have certain preferences and inhibitions which it seeks to impose upon its members?

Total effects. A question raised by Campbell as a result of an intensive study of structural effects provides support for the theoretical notion that institutions can affect the behavior of individuals directly by means of an identity which they have as a totality. Using data


149
from a study of 5115 seniors in sixty-two high schools, Campbell reached the conclusion that the behavior of individuals in a large social structure is shaped through the influence of specific relationships with other members of the collectivity. No indication could be found from his data that there were important structural effects which existed independent of the individual's immediate interpersonal influences. However, upon further consideration, he decided that present structural analytic methods were not adequate to confirm or deny the presence of a collective value system. In other words, the values of the total collectivity may constitute behaviorally relevant expectations toward which the individual orients himself, but measure which indicate only the values held by a single individual cannot be used to reject or accept such a possibility. The relevant question Campbell posed remains: "Is there a school-wide value system toward which the individual is oriented and upon which he bases his behaviors apart from the immediate influence of his particular significant others?"²

Integral systems. That large social structures can create a kind of gestalt which impinges very directly upon the behavior of individuals is substantiated in the many commentaries directed toward the description of

²Ibid., p. 288.
national identities. Alexis de Tocqueville's astute observations\textsuperscript{3} in the early 1830's and Gabriel Almond's\textsuperscript{4} more recent analysis of American political character testify to the existence of such influences.

A number of more specific instances outside school settings may be useful to illustrate the ways in which individuals are affected by the character of the social systems of which they have become a part.

A thorough analysis of the effects of a work camp experience upon its participants was reported by Riecken.\textsuperscript{5} College-age volunteers spent eight weeks in a system characterized by highly altruistic motivations. Results of extensive observations prior, during, and following their experiences indicated that they had become enduringly less prejudiced, more democratic, and less authoritarian. They also chose more service-oriented vocations, were more concerned to help their fellow men, were better adjusted, less anxious, more autonomous, and less frustrated. The work camp environment was regarded as particularly effective in bringing about attitude and personality changes.

\textsuperscript{3}Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America tr. by Phillips Bendley (New York: Knopf, 1945).


because the individual was "not only exposed to a systematic, explicit philosophy of altruism, egalitarianism and humanitarianism," but acted it out in his daily work and in his relations with co-workers. Although the results are suspect to the extent that the campers brought with them an orientation toward service, the widespread and long-lasting changes give strong support to the thesis that the pervasive value system or "character" which was continually reinforced by the unity of the system had a direct and powerful effect upon the behavior of the individuals in the system.

Considerable attention has been given in the past decade to the communal child-rearing kibbutzem in Israel in which children are separated from parents at birth. The primary goals of these social systems have been cooperation and work, and they have been tremendously successful in achieving those outcomes. Some critics have raised questions about outcomes related to emotional adjustment, lack of strong, positive parental attachment, and achievement striving, without considering that the institution is not committed to those purposes, and these are expectations which may be held by individuals but not by the total

---

6 Ibid., p. 156.
collectivity. In fact, collective values as reflected in the kibbutzim require the denial of competitive striving and parental love.

Gump, Schoggen, and Redl, using behavior stream analysis in the study of environmental effects upon nine-year-old Wally O'Neil, concluded that, "We might expect that the types of behavior settings and associates provided would be particularly coercive in shaping behavior." They noticed major differences in the character of experiences at camp and at home and cited what they called "milieu factors" supportive of these differences. That the behavior setting exerts strong influences upon the nature of behavior is demonstrated by the comparison of Wally's behavior between home and camp: At camp (1) Wally had more frequent contact with adults, enjoyed more peer-like relationships with adults, and associated more with peers rather than children of different ages and sexes, (2) associates were less frequently demanding (although when aggressive, very aggressive), more nurturant and sharing, (3) Wally engaged in more equalitarian or "give-and-take"

---


9 Ibid., p. 201.
relationships with children and showed his associates more nurturance and less dominance and aggression. The differences appear to be explained by the differences in the two identities, camp-home.

School settings. A number of studies have demonstrated that student aspirations are influenced by the kind of high school they attend. However, the results of many of these investigations have been open to question due to the difficulty in separating school effects from social class or other background variables. Boyle re-analyzed four earlier studies which had attributed differences in aspiration to the fact that the schools attended were predominately middle class or working class. By distinguishing between size of community, he showed that the proportion of school effects could be more clearly separated from other effects. In addition, and of more relevance for the interests expressed in this present area of exploration, he found that variations in educational standards had a strong effect upon students' scholastic attainment. In other words, if the school was strongly committed to high educational achievement, similar values were reflected in the behavior of the students. The same

---

conclusion was reached by McDill, Meyers, and Rigsby\textsuperscript{11} in their study of the academic behavior of high school students. Although in this latter study the research design included thirty-nine aggregative characteristics as analytic elements, the subsequent synthesis identified a strong emphasis upon academic achievement.

By using responses to the Activities Index (AI) and the Organizational Characteristics Index (OCI), Hamaty\textsuperscript{12} classified forty schools in a large system as exemplifying Convention, Work, and Impulse Expression cultures. Using teacher and pupil behavior as criterion measures, his data failed to support any significant effects which were related to these different cultures. Although this study may be considered as evidence that schools as collectives do not directly affect student behaviors, it might also be used to raise a question with respect to the validity of the structural variables used to measure "culture." More importantly, however, since the schools were all members of the same system of schools, there is the possibility that effects associated with the larger collectivity


were masking any effects which could be attributed to separate schools within the system.

A survey of 2,983 freshmen who entered Michigan State University indicated significant differences in mean scores between students who attended parochial high schools and those who attended public and private schools. Students from parochial schools tended to be more stereotypic, more dogmatic, and had higher traditional values scores than students attending the other types of schools. These results suggest that the parochial school represents a generalized value orientation which is reproduced in the behavior of its graduates. In view of the fact that home and church probably support the same values as the school, these findings are not surprising and may only indicate that the three institutions are mutually reinforcing. It is therefore not possible to make judgments about the proportion of the effect which can actually be attributed to the school.

A reanalysis by Mayeski of the Coleman data from the

---

Equal Opportunity report led him to conclude that there are characteristics of the school as a whole which may have an influence upon the perspective its students hold of the world - whether good or bad.

Using two schools, one classified as progressive, the other as traditional, Mensh administered the Rosen-sweig Picture-Frustration Study to two groups of girls in grades five to eight. His purpose was to evaluate under controlled conditions the effects of the two environments on reactions to frustrations. His data led him to conclude that students in the "progressive" school environment differed significantly from students in the "traditional" school in that the students in the latter school showed more of a tendency toward overconformity. Students in progressive schools were more apt to be underconforming. He attributed the differences to the different "psychological atmospheres" of the two schools and their influence.

---


on the degree to which "spontaneity of expression and utilization of initiative operates." These results support other studies which have indicated that environments in which less frustration occurs are more conducive to the individual's using his own initiative to develop his capacities.

In a much more comprehensive study of the psychological climate within schools, Minuchin et al. arranged four schools on a traditional-modern continuum and measured the effect of the "total school philosophy" on the behavior of fourth grade children. The variables which were used to distinguish the two types of schools were (1) Education for competence, (2) Quality and pattern of interaction among people, (3) View of individuality, and (4) Relation of school to its social and professional milieu. The results of this extensive analysis showed that different environments were consistently associated with clear and significant differences in self-perception and attitude. The most significant effects were found when the impact of home and school were congruent, but there were particular areas, such as intellectual functioning, in which the

10 Ibid., p. 285.

school was clearly a prevailing force. The researchers commented about the general orientation of the school and its effects upon student behavior:

"... it was evident from the data that the potency of the school's orientation in affecting the children was a function of two conditions; the orientation of the home and its interaction with school influence; and the extent to which the school operated as a total integrated environment."

A number of studies have reported influences of the pervasiveness of school character which have resulted in outcomes that can hardly be justified as desirable educational goals. In her survey of two large urban school systems, Newman noted that both systems were characterized by what she referred to as "large-scale infantilization." Because of their bureaucratic orientation, these schools not only discouraged exploration and growth but insisted on dependent, authority-focused procedures which paralyzed adequate decision-making ability. "Mechanical response was substituted for problem solving," and children, teachers, and administrators commonly shifted responsibility because of fear of censure or blame. These conditions

---

18 Ibid., p. 391.

led to "despair, apathy, and regressive behavior." 20

After using a series of written and non-verbal perception tests, Nordstrom and Friedenberg 21 arranged schools on a "ressentiment" continuum. They defined ressentiment as the process by which schools act in such a manner, though often unconsciously and unintentionally, so as to inhibit the development of strong and forceful character in the student. They used this concept to indicate the true identity of schools in terms of their actual effects. They showed that individuals produced by such schools could be typed as Conventional, accepting, desire to please, tend to stereotype and be instrumental rather than affective; Adolescents, concerned with the meaning of their own identity, demanding as well as accepting of authority, self-absorbed and responsive to rational authority; and Residuals, similar to Reisman's anomic individuals.

Interpretive comments. This review of studies adds weight to the claim that a social system can demonstrate character and that this character has direct and measurable effects upon student behavior. However, adequate means have not yet been developed for fully and precisely

20 Ibid., p. 386.
describing the nature of that character so that the extent of its influence upon behavior can also be determined.

Riecken's report of work camp experiences showed that an institution whose character epitomizes altruistic values can guide the actions and restrict the experiences of its members so that they will demonstrate such behavior. The same clear orientation was evident in the kibbutzem. It is possible to develop a high degree of social identity and cooperation when the character of the social system itself fully and forcefully represents those ideals. The behavior stream report of Wally Beach may only be a reminder that certain settings call forth certain behaviors—a hole is to dig. But it may also give evidence that the nature of the camp as a social system is clearly understood by its members and they know what behavior is associated with such a system.

When contrasted to these systems which demonstrate strong, clear, definable characters, schools seem to lack definite, distinct, communicable identity. Unlike the work camp, the kibbutzem, or even the boy's camp, the character of the school is pluralistic rather than monistic, diffuse rather than integrated. Although the orientation of the school most frequently centers on achievement, it is seldom limited to achievement. Other words are needed to define the school's character: conformity, rationality,
self-expression, adjustment, stratification, play, understanding, creativity, failure, awareness.

Because of its lack of integrity of character, the school often seeks to impose a pattern of preferences and inhibitions which are disjunctive and conflicting. They are derived from habit. The school as a system lacks the imagination and insight to generate new patterns. It is neither autonomous nor creative.

Philanthropy does not appear in the character of the school because it has not appeared. Unless the larger societal context forces it onto the already corpulent mass of the school's character, it probably will not appear except by accident. Neither will misanthropy be built into the character by design but rather by default.

School effects which reflect the identity of the collectivity are difficult to measure not because the school lacks character or because there are no effects, but because the character of the school so often lacks integrity and is therefore like scattered mercury.
CHAPTER IX

THE IMPACT OF CULTURE

If schools act largely upon tradition, then much of what occurs - or fails to occur - within the context of the school may be explained by the society which creates and maintains the school. If the school character exemplifies achievement, it may be reflecting an achievement oriented social system. If the school insists upon conformity, this may indicate an authoritarian, dogmatic community. If the school ascribes status, is this not an indication that the larger social order is stratified? And if the school is punitive, can the culture be less so?

The greatest difference between man and other animals is man's ability to create his own environment - to generate a culture. He has a past and the possibility of a future. But whether his self-made environment will restrict or extend his humanity is determined not by the things which he can create and manipulate but by the nature of his relationships with others.

The quality of the social interaction in the school can only be understood in concert with the quality of human
relationships in the total society. It is impossible to determine why students behave in helpful, supportive, regarding ways and in harmful, hateful, disrespectful ways toward others unless the totality of their environment is considered.

In this environment what are the most relevant facets which impinge upon the individual so that he is influenced to behave in particular ways toward others? The data from the empirical studies undertaken in the last four decades indicate that there are three major perspectives which have been used to explore the question: the family, social class, and societal norms. Using those three rubrics—which are by no means mutually exclusive—the empirical evidence can be presented. Then, as has been done with previous dimensions, any emergent patterns and relationships will be discussed.

1. FAMILY VARIABLES

Misanthropic influences. Aggressive children have punitive parents. Aggressive children have permissive parents. Aggressive children have punitive and permissive parents. All three statements are supported by the research but each is too simple to explain the complex phenomenon.

In an attempt to understand the genesis of aggressive
behavior in adolescent boys, Bandura and Walters\(^1\) conducted an extensive study of parental disciplinary measures. They found that mothers of aggressive boys were more permissive of aggression toward themselves than were mothers of a control group. In turn, the aggressive boys displayed much more physical aggression toward their mothers than did the boys in the control. In addition, both parents of the aggressive boys were much more punitive than control parents when the boys demonstrated aggression against other adults.

These findings were supported in another study by Sears, Maccoby, and Levin\(^2\) who also found that initial high permissiveness in mothers encouraged aggression by boys who later — as they aggressed more frequently — were punished for attacking parents and other authority figures. However, a follow-up study\(^3\) of these same children six years later when they were in the sixth grade yielded some contradictory information. Anti-social aggression was still found to be positively related to high permissiveness.


but no longer to high punishment. At age twelve punishment apparently had an inhibitory effect. Prosocial aggression (aggression used in a socially approved way for purposes that are acceptable to the moral standards of the group) and aggression anxiety (inhibition) likewise were found to be associated with high permissiveness, but in combination with high punishment. Additional evidence was also introduced to support the prediction that successful inhibition of early forms of aggression in severely punished children would produce heightened amounts of aggression anxiety, prosocial, and self-aggression at a later age.

Sears suggested that aggression anxiety in boys is related to "conscience" and is the consequent of love-oriented disciplinary methods and relatively strong but non-punitive pressures toward behaving in a socially correct manner. In girls, however, the conditions facilitating the development of aggression anxiety appear to be "antithetical" to appropriate sextyping. 4 Since social disapproval for overt aggression in girls is greater than for boys, learning experiences which tended to activate such responses brought higher levels of aggression anxiety in girls.

Summarizing the results of these studies, Bandura

4 Ibid., p. 492.
and Walters noted:

The effects of parental permissiveness are not independent of the consequences that follow the performance of the permitted act. Presumably parents who permit and reward aggression will develop aggressive habits in their children. On the other hand, parents who both permit and punish aggression also appear to produce highly aggressive children. This aggression may, however, as a result of discrimination learning, be mainly directed at persons other than the primary frustrating agents. 5

These studies lend support to the hypothesis from social learning theory that "one can readily produce a highly aggressive child by merely exposing him to successful aggressive models and rewarding the child intermittently for aggressive behavior, while keeping frustration at a very low level." 6 However, Bandura and Walters also call attention to the fact that much aggressive behavior may be encouraged by the use of schedules which reward only responses of high magnitude. Thus dependency responses such as attention-seeking and food-seeking could be included in the responses that receive reinforcement and generalize to the class of responses regarded as aggressive behavior.


6 Ibid., p. 159.
Hoffman analyzed the relation of parents' influence techniques to the display of hostile and dominating behavior by children. He hypothesized that "the parent's use of unqualified power assertive techniques, initial or reactive, would relate positively to the following characteristics of children: hostility toward other children; power assertiveness toward them; and resistance to their influence attempts; and . . . to the child's expression of these characteristics toward permissive authority figures but to a lesser extent than toward children." Significant correlations were found between the mother's unqualified power assertion and the child's hostility toward children, the child's power assertiveness toward other children, his resistance to children's influence attempts, and his being more hostile and more resistant toward children than toward the teacher. Although no direct relationships between the father's use of unqualified power assertion were found, the findings suggested that the father's assertiveness might be transmitted to the child through his relationship with the mother.

8 Ibid., pp. 132-33.
In her study of aggression of nursery school children, Fite\(^9\) found among the factors influencing the formation of the child's attitudes toward aggression were the rules relating to aggression laid down by parents in the home.

In testing the tendency for children to give harsh or lenient punishment to peers who transgress, Sherman\(^10\) found that children with initially high punitiveness scores did not become more punitive when a punitive examiner was present. Punitiveness scores were highest among youngest children and children who perceived their mothers as highly punitive.

Body's\(^11\) observations of nursery school children revealed that a high percentage of boys in the less aggressive of her two groups was from fatherless homes. All of the boys in the more aggressive group were from father-present homes.


In a study of third grade youngsters Eron and others established an association between increased punishment for aggression at home and increased aggression in school. This relationship held for both sexes regardless of which parent was the punishing agent.

**Philanthropic influences.** Hartshorne and May suggested that service tendencies are influenced by the home and the example of parents. This conclusion is given support in a study by Rettig who found that the only significant relationship between the various home influences and scores on an altruism scale was the altruistic behavior of parents. Direct reinforcement, religious reinforcement, and circumstantial reinforcement were significant influences in some groups but did not hold for all of this three samples.

Hoffman's study of humanistic and conventional groups

---


mentioned earlier indicated that the main difference in the parental practices of the two groups was that the mothers of the conventional subjects were more often reported as using techniques classified as "ego-attack" (remarks about the ineptness or "badness" of the child), and the mothers of the humanistic group were reported as using techniques indicating disappointment in the child for not living up to their expectations. Hoffman concluded that the mothers who used disappointment techniques were strengthening the role of the ego ideal in guiding the child's behavior. Combined with other affectional techniques, this led to identification with the parent. Psychological discipline which capitalized upon this relationship then fostered the development of internalized moral structures.

A later study, also by Hoffman provided support for a hypothesis that parental acceptance relates to a positive affective orientation. In the group which used low power assertive disciplinary techniques love-withholding discipline was related negatively to hostility and

---


positively to seeking nurturance from adults. In the high
power-assertive group only the negative relation with hos­
tility held. It was tentatively concluded that in a non­
power-assertive context either love-withholding or other­
oriented discipline could contribute to socially acceptable
behavior in the child: love-withholding by intensifying
the child's need for approval which then becomes a basis
for impulse control; and other-oriented discipline by in­
ducing positive internal forces, possibly capitalizing on
the child's capacity for sympathy and thus lending to a
more active consideration for others. Hoffman suggested
that the findings seemed to indicate that there are in the
very young child four behavior systems which may be influ­
enced by parental practice. Two of these are pertinent to
the concerns of this study: hostility and related drives,
instigated mainly by power assertion; and consideration for
others, fostered mainly by other-oriented discipline in
a non-power-assertive context.

A study by Harris\textsuperscript{17} showed no correlation between
number of siblings and altruism defined conceptually as
willingness to sacrifice for the good of another and opera­
tionally by solutions to story situation problems. In

\textsuperscript{17}Larry A. Harris, "A Study of Altruism," \textit{Elementary
contrast, Speece, using a sociometric device to measure altruism, found a positive correlation between altruism and having more than one child in the family. Other positive correlations found were (1) no prolonged separation from parents, (2) participation by father in caring for child in infancy, (3) delegation of responsibility to child, (4) liberal praise for good behavior, (5) discipline based on gentle persuasion, (6) family involvement in activities, (7) affectionate relations between father and child, and (8) cooperative agreement between parents with regard to the best child-rearing practices.

II. SOCIAL CLASS VARIABLES

Philanthropic influences. Very little evidence is available with respect to the influence of social class upon philanthropic behavior. Hartshorne and May's data indicated that service behavior is influenced by social class factors "bound up" in the occupation of the father. In his study of altruism, Friedrichs noticed that lower socio-economic status leads to relatively egoistic


19 Hartshorne and May, op cit., p. 372.

behavior which is tempered where responsibility and security are maximized.

Adolescent boys of lower socio-economic status in Loban's investigation showed lower social sensitivity than boys from average or good socioeconomic conditions. There was no relationship shown between socio-economic status and social sensitivity among girls.

Misanthropic influences. The conventional wisdom associates low social class with highly aggressive behavior. However, the relationship of social class and aggressive behavior is much more complex than can be explained by a simple negative correlation.

In an investigation of 327 female students in a medium-sized state college, Haas found that students having a working-class background were significantly more hostile overall than middle-class students. However, middle-class students were more covertly hostile.

McKee and Leader found more aggression among the

---


lower status children in their sample of 112 pre-school children. However, Eron showed that with an increase in social position third grade children (especially boys) were rated as more aggressive in school. He found strongest relations when both social class and punishment were considered simultaneously. There was a significant interaction between social class and punishment for aggression in predicting to aggression in school.

In an investigation of the relationships between parental social status and aggression in the classroom, again with third grade children, Toigo found a bi-modal relationship with both the high status and the low status child displaying more aggression than the child of intermediate level. Toigo drew the following inferences from his data:

The middle-class child socialized in a family milieu in which disruptive behavior is punished (at home) in terms of its psychological intent, will develop greater capacity to monitor and control his own impulsive behavior in the school situation than will the lower class child. In this sense, the greater permissiveness regarding the expression of aggressive impulses in the middle class home may indicate a greater reliance on such controls on the part of parents. If . . . it is assumed by such parents that the child can and should be led to develop strong internal controls regarding

---


aggression, then its occasional display . . . is of no consequence. The lower-status child, socialized in a home atmosphere in which disruptive behavior is judged and sanctioned chiefly in terms of its immediate effects will be likely to control such behavior in the school situation only when there is a clearly visible source of outside authority, or when the behavior is clearly damaging to others . . . such a child probably would be more disruptive since for him, the problem is not whether aggressively toned behavior is good or bad intrinsically, but rather whether it will or will not create immediate trouble for himself. 26

Berkowitz27 has suggested that the type of parental discipline appears to be a stronger determinant of the directness of the expression of aggression by youngsters than social class. Bandura and Walters28 reported that lower-class parents were likely to reward and encourage aggression to a greater extent than middle class parents and yet to present fewer frustrations to their children's impulses.

In Hoffman's29 investigation reported earlier, working class fathers used both initial and reactive unquali-
fied power assertion to a greater extent than middle class fathers, but the significant differences held for mothers only on the initial unqualified power assertion.

III. SOCIIETAL NORMS AND CULTURAL VALUES

Societal norms. Wright reported in her study of altruism in children and adults that eight-year olds were more generous than either five-year olds, eleven-year olds, or adults. Eight-year olds often gave away more toys than they kept. Eleven-year olds usually divided toys equally between themselves and others; seldom did they give more than they retained. Wright's interpretation of this behavior was that the eight-year olds had learned generosity but not fairness. These children's behavior suggests that there are certain norms within the society which guide interpersonal behavior.

Using the notions of fairness, generosity, and selfishness as ways of perceiving specific situations, Shure asked eighty children and forty adults to make judgments to stories illustrating these concepts. In adults the highest agreement was found with respect to concepts of fairness.

---


and the lowest agreement with respect to concepts of selfishness. The study attempted to develop a set of propositions that could reasonably be expected to describe the basis of adult judgments as part of a "naive psychology" which guides interpersonal relations. The research found that judgments of fairness were influenced not only by the equality or inequality of conditions but also by the nature of the conditions. Previous enjoyment of benefits of an activity was the clearest determinant of the fair solution to a problem. Judgments of generosity did not vary by condition to the extent that fairness judgments did, but the same order prevailed. Enjoyment of benefits received the most support and ownership the least. There was even less agreement with respect to selfishness about ownership and effort conditions, but older subjects (children) gave more support to the proposition that "given the same event, the person who claims more benefits or refuses more responsibility than is 'fair' will be judged 'worse' than one whose behavior is no less than would be expected in a 'fair' resolution to the problem."32 There was some suggestion that the ownership criterion had been confounded by the fact that since some persons believed it was "right" to share property, doing so would not necessarily be considered by them to be acting generously. The study

32 Ibid., p. 877.
also showed that those concepts about which there was more agreement in adults were developed the earliest in childhood.

Gouldner also theorized that in all societies there is a stabilizing principle which he referred to as the reciprocity norm. Briefly the norm says (1) If you help me, I'll help you, and (2) If you help me, I'll not hurt you.

Another norm which seems to have influence in directing interpersonal exchange is the norm of social responsibility. In this case the assumption is made that an individual is obligated, or at least has a responsibility, to help those who are dependent upon him. A number of studies have been undertaken in an effort to test the validity and relative effectiveness of such norms.

Daniels and Berkowitz hypothesized that many people are motivated to aid others who are dependent upon them because of a culturally prescribed social responsibility norm but this norm is not equally effective under all conditions. In general, a person will be less likely to continue helping another when the required effort is


psychologically costly to him and/or he dislikes the dependent person. In an experiment using eighty male college students as subjects it was found that subjects worked hardest under low-dependent supervisors when they believed that their supervisors would learn of their performance, but when the supervisor was highly dependent upon them, such awareness had little effect. They also worked harder for a highly liked supervisor. Later, using eighty college women as subjects, these same investigators found that subjects who had previously received help tended to provide more help to dependent peers thus indicating that the individual's experience in the immediately preceding situation affects the likelihood of socially responsible behavior. Results in these experiments could be explained by the reciprocity norm as well as by the social responsibility norm.

Using eighty-four college women, Goranson and Berkowitz attempted to clarify the findings of a previous


experiment which showed that persons who had previously received help themselves were more willing to work for a dependent peer than were subjects who had not received help. After performing a dull task during which some had received help, subjects were led to believe that they were to work under the guidance of a supervisor whose chances of winning a cash prize depended upon their performance. When the supervisor was the same person who had voluntarily helped them previously, subjects worked harder than those who had received compulsory help. Subjects who were least willing to work for the dependent supervisor were those who had been refused help. Again both the social responsibility norm and the reciprocity norm could be used to explain these behaviors.

Another test of the two norms combined a comparison with the relative effectiveness of exposure to a beneficent model was carried out by Weinbach. This research also examined the effect of increases in costs upon the probability of the actual occurrence of an altruistic act.


Direct mail communications were sent to 1800 subjects asking them to send birthday cards to youngsters in a children's home. Three different appeals were used representing the three conditions; reciprocity, social responsibility, and beneficent model, combined with three levels of cost conditions. The results provided substantial support for the hypothesis that an increase in costs to the donor reduces the likelihood of the occurrence of philanthropic behavior. No confirmation was found for the prediction that the norm of reciprocity would be a more potent determinant of altruistic behavior than the social responsibility norm or models of beneficent behavior. The lack of significant difference in overall effects between the dependency appeal and the models appeal led the investigator to question conclusions from previous studies that had found modeling behavior more effective in producing altruism than the perception of dependency alone. No support was given to the hypothesis that the greater the cost to the donor in the performance of an altruistic act, the greater is the likelihood that the norm of reciprocity will be the most effective determinant in eliciting altruistic behavior though the differences were in this direction.

The possibility that society emphasizes the development of prohibitive norms at the expense of prescriptive
norms was suggested when Staub showed that seventh graders who had previously been told they could go into another room responded more frequently to distress signals from a child in that room than did those youngsters who had not received such information. Staub suggested that learning to behave according to the rules may actually decrease the willingness to help others when the rules are unknown.

That inhibitory social norms do serve to curtail much misanthropic behavior was shown in a study by Burnstein and Worchel. One hundred male subjects from an introductory college psychology course were divided into small groups and asked to make decisions from a case study of "Johnny Rocco" under conditions of arbitrary, nonarbitrary, and no frustration. A confederate who had blocked the group's progress in the first two conditions could subsequently be rejected under public, private punitive, or private non-punitive conditions. The results showed that with a decrease in the strength of inhibitory social norms (private rather than public rejection) there was an increase in direct aggression (rejection) of the confederate.


When inhibitions are relied upon to prevent misanthropic behavior, such behavior may reappear when punishment does not materialize. In an experiment conducted with twenty-three nursery school children, Chasdi and Lawrence discovered that children who were punished for aggressive behavior by reproofs did lessen their aggressive behavior during the experimental sessions but showed an increase in hostile acts when punishment was not continued.

Sorokin emphasized that factors of similarity and dissimilarity play an important part in the generation of altruistic and egoistic relationships but the role is very complex and depends upon personal as well as situational factors. In a seven-point analysis, he described the operation of these factors as conditioners of interpersonal and intergroup relations. These seven considerations are:

1. Among the thousands of traits in respect to which persons or groups may be similar or dissimilar, not all are potent in generating either altruistic or egoistic relationships.


2. Only those similar or dissimilar traits that are regarded as important by the parties exert such influences.

3. Which of the traits of similarity and dissimilarity are important for given persons and groups depends not so much upon the inherent biological and physical nature of these traits as upon the system of values of their persons and groups.

4. If the systems of values of the parties are similar, then an important similar trait may generate both the altruistic and antagonistic relationships between the parties.

5. An important sociocultural dissimilarity may generate both solidarity and antagonism between the parties with different sets of values.

6. The combination of a basic similarity in the main values of the parties with a supplementary diversity in their secondary values is the most conducive to solidary relationships provided the main values are abundant or are distributed by all parties according to their concordant norms.

7. An opposite and diverse character of the values and norms of the parties, when they are considered important and when the parties have no common system of values and norms, is the most conducive to generating intense antagonisms. 43

The evidence Sorokin used to support these propositions is descriptive rather than empirical.

43 ibid., pp. 778-81.
Dohrenwend offered a conceptual analysis of Durkheim's four types of social conditions—egoism, altruism, anomie, and fatalism, and proposed that these are states of the most important norms in social aggregates of two or more individuals. However, his work was primarily concerned with differentiating among the four norm states rather than examining the validity of the explanations as a means for understanding interpersonal behavior. He did indicate, however, that this "concept of social norm... may be of use in the analysis of the wider environmental conditions affecting such aggregates, the process of conformity and deviance which indicate tendencies toward one or another of the polar types, and the effects of the latter on individuals."  

Sextyping is also the source of basic normative patterns within societies. The study by Magee investigating defiant classroom behavior of elementary school boys yielded a J-curve for the population under study.

---

45 ibid., p. 473.
suggesting that this kind of behavior is subject to strong social constraints. With boys in particular, because of their high incidence of aggressive and often anti-social behavior, there have been numerous studies investigating the possible influence of sextyping in contributing to these responses.47

When nursery school children were subject to mild frustration and then exposed to aggressive models, both boys and girls imitated physically aggressive acts to a greater degree when the model was a male rather than a female.48 A study by Fryrear and Thelen49 with both males and females showed that both sexes imitated females only when the behavior was perceived by the observer as being sex appropriate. When the behavior was not sextyped, there was little evidence of any modeling effects. Zeleny50 showed that both boys and girls in the fifth

47 See pp. 55-59.


grade were able to live up to the expectancies of their own sex better than those of the opposite sex. This finding appeared to have significant implications for the relationships across sexes since the demands of the sex roles were different. Boys who were always teasing girls or girls who were overly dominant were often accorded low status presumably because their behavior did not conform to sex role expectations. Rejection and low social status then led to continued and increasing antisocial behaviors by these children.

Starting with the assumption that the cultural norms approve physical aggression for males and that the possibility of retaliation is perhaps the chief inhibiting factor, Edwards$^{51}$ predicted and found that males who were less aggressive became more so in a non-retaliation condition than in a retaliation condition. These findings give some support to the effectiveness of threat and retaliation as control mechanisms of significance among males.

Cultural values. That cultures differ with respect to the kinds and extent of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior of their members has been well-established.

Gorer's study of the Lepthas in the Himalayas indicated these people were characterized by a general lack of aggression and self-assertion. Mead's analysis of primitive societies showed a varying emphasis upon competition, cooperation, and individualism. The village of Tepoztlan in Mexico, studied in 1943 and again in 1956 by Lewis, changed from a primarily agricultural region to an urbanized tourist center and during this time significant differences were observed in child-rearing practices. In the earlier study parents were found to emphasize passive, submissive behavior and the use of fear and physical punishment as behavioral controls. They discouraged impulsive activity, aggression, independence, and competition. The latter study showed a change to more permissive parental procedures including less severe methods of punishment, increased permission for play, and considerably more child-centered behavior.

Romney's study of another traditional, highly


agricultural village also indicated similar parental practices which discouraged competition, achievement striving, and aggressive behavior and included severe methods of punishment.

An experimental study was designed by Madsen\textsuperscript{56} to compare the cooperation and competition motivation of children from urban middle class backgrounds with those from urban lower class families and supplement the naturalistic observations of Romney and Lewis. In this study in which children were exposed to three experimental conditions involving (1) simple altruism, (2) work output, (3) solution of a problem in which competition maximized the reward, significant differences were found between the two groups. The results indicated that children raised in different subcultural settings in Mexico did differ with respect to competition and cooperation motivation. The investigators suggested that the motivation of the rural and urban poor was to avoid conflict, while the urban middle class not only did not mind conflict but seemed to enjoy it. Although there was not adequate evidence to support a conclusion that schools confounded this effect, Madsen indicated that evidence suggested that along with the "reinforcement milieu" in which the children developed

outside the school, the greater emphasis upon athletics and competitive games may have contributed to the more competitive behaviors.

In a survey of forms of aggression in fifty-eight non-literate societies, Palmer found that a positive relationships existed among all forms of aggression within those societies. Those tending to be high in one form also showed high incidences of other forms.

Murphy's statement cited earlier begins to take on fuller meaning:

We may indeed say that sympathetic behavior increases relatively in any individual or group, in so far as the situation is conducive to it.

or Bandura and Walter's observation:

... one can readily produce a highly aggressive child by merely exposing him to successful aggressive models and rewarding the child intermittently for aggressive behavior...


IV. SUMMARY

It seems impossible to deny the very pervasive effect of the non-school environment upon the incidence of both philanthropic and misanthropic behavior. That parental practices are highly significant in influencing the behavior of children is no longer open to question. The exact means by which this occurs is as yet not clearly understood. That punitive behaviors on the part of parents encourage anti-social behavior in young children seems clear. That punishment is incompatible with the development of pro-social behavior is highly doubtful. That love, affection, firm and rational discipline contribute to the development of children who can monitor their own behavior on the basis of internalized standards is given strong support by the empirical evidence. That internalization of a moral code will result in behavior that reflects consideration for the needs of others holds no certainty.

There do seem to be certain implicit considerations which guide people in behaving in helpful ways toward each other. Whether they do so because they have accepted a responsibility for the welfare of other humans who like themselves are not completely self-sustaining, or whether they act upon the principle that balancing out self and other oriented behaviors is the most satisfactory means for maximizing benefits for all concerned - including
the self - the evidence does not say.

There is a strong possibility that people are only imitative in their behavior. They behave as they do because others behave as they do. Thus given certain models, certain behaviors are likely to occur.

Regardless of the means by which it is accomplished, the evidence points to the overwhelmingly strong influence of culture in the shaping of behavior. It, however, gives very little indication of how or if individuals can escape their own culture. That change occurs is evident. Lewis' children were not the same upon his revisit. But did the times change the people or the people change the times?
CHAPTER X

PHYSICAL MEDIUM?

With this chapter, the inquiry comes full cycle. It began by asking the question whether there were not within the organism basic states which govern the behavior of the individual. It closes with these questions: Are there not within the environment certain physical states which govern the actions of men? Does the physical environment influence individuals to act in either philanthropic or misanthropic ways toward one another? Does the physical medium of the school influence students to help or to harm others?

Students of animal life have recognized for some time the influence of the physical environment upon animal behavior. Hall, Eibl-Eibesfeldt, Tinbergen, Lorenz, and Crooke are names which represent years of exploration into the nations of density, distance, and space and their significance for animal survival.

The importance of climate and land formation has also long been understood as a factor in shaping human lives. Studies of peoples throughout the world illustrate the
differential effects of availability and scarcity of resources in terms of density of populations. Though empirically difficult to test, worth consideration is Storr’s claim that “to reduce world population, or at least to stem the flood of its increase, is the most important single step which can be taken by mankind to reduce hostile tension.”

The recent work of anthropologist Edward Hall has emphasized the significance of the spatial dimension of the environment for understanding human behavior. Educational research, however, affords only sporadic attention to such questions. There have been innumerable studies which have attempted to measure relationships between class size and the achievement of students, make tests of the relative durability of furniture, the visibility of the chalkboard, and the height of water fountains, and prescribe the most economical way to build school plants. Although this information may be vital for decision-making in some areas, it offers little utility for relating the state of the physical environment to the display of hostile or helpful behaviors.

---


Some progress is being made. A testimony to this effect is the recent issue of the Harvard Educational Review which pursues the question of "if and how the physical environment informs and shapes and liberates the human spirit."\(^3\)

The dimension of the physical medium appears to be a valid one. The model is not at fault. The question, however, lacks empirical validation. There is so little evidence which is of use with respect to the central questions: Does the physical environment impinge directly upon the student and influence him to behave in helpful, supportive, unselfish ways toward others? Or does it exert an influence toward the demonstration of harmful, hostile, and self-centered behavior? There is not sufficient evidence to draw inferences, and only a scant amount from which to project implications. For this reason the commentary has been presented first; perhaps as justification, but hopefully to validly identify a vital need.

The evidence. The research evidence does indicate that group size has an effect upon interpersonal relationships. Members of small groups were found by Slater\(^4\) to


have much more positive evaluations of other members of the group. Members of larger groups tended to see other members as too aggressive, impulsive, competitive, and inconsiderate.

Johannesson's analysis of 114 Swedish classrooms showed that more positive tendencies among students as measured by higher sociometric means were present in smaller classes.

Density of population may also have a direct relationship to people's willingness and feelings of responsibility for helping each other. Darley found evidence to support his hypothesis that the responsibility of the individual to help another in distress is lessened when many bystanders are present. These findings were supported in a similar investigation carried out by Korte.

---


factors predictive of altruism Friedrichs found in the "sacred construct" was a factor related to low population density.

Anonymity also appears to have consequences in the lessening of inhibitions to aggress. Festinger, Pepitone, and Newcomb found students more critical of parents when they were less able to identify persons who made such comments during a discussion.

Living conditions may also be a factor in philanthropic-misanthropic behavior. In a study reported by Jackson, teachers' observations indicated that children who had moved from slum housing to public housing in an urban area demonstrated less antisocial behavior than a control group who still lived in the slum dwellings.

Several studies of nursery school children have reported factors about physical conditions which seem to have a relationship to the demonstration of aggressive


aggressive behavior. Two groups who showed such differences in Body's 11 observations had access to different playgrounds. She noted that the more aggressive groups shared a large, shaded, cool space which provided opportunity for more social interaction and suggested this condition may have been related to the increased aggression shown among the members. The other group had a hot, sunny playground which appeared to discourage children from becoming involved with each other in active ways.

In observing social interaction during the play of two- and three-year old children, Updegraff and Herbst 12 found that sociable and cooperative behavior occurred more frequently during play with clay and non-sociable, non-cooperative behavior was more predominant during play with blocks.

Murphy 13 also found a difference in the instances of aggressiveness according to the type and availability of


equipment with respect to the number and interests of the children. She found fewer sympathetic responses and more quarreling among children confined in a small play space equipped with relatively few play materials.

Lewin and White concluded their report of the autocratic-democratic group relationships tested in experimentally created situations by attributing the aggressive patterns which were demonstrated to four underlying factors one of which was "restricted space of free movement."

The evidence, however, clearly demonstrates the lack of evidence.

---

CHAPTER XI

CONCLUSION: HYPOTHESES, QUESTIONS

Evidence from 277 studies drawn from the published research of the past forty years has been utilized in an effort to describe the interrelationships among the personal and institutional dimensions of the school context and the demonstration of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior.

Seven dimensions were shown to be useful in describing these influences: the individual, the person, the organism, the institution, the character, the ethos or culture, and the physical medium. Behavior was regarded as the function of the interaction among these dimensions.

I. THE PERSONAL DIMENSION

The potentialities of the organism, which are the primary physiological and genetic tendencies, were found to be relatively powerless in explaining positive or negative social behavior. Although recently considerable attention has been given to the possibility that instinctual tendencies can explain man's humanity and inhumanity to man, there is little evidence to support the existence of such innate "drives."
There is considerable evidence which indicates that there may be a basic activity level or tendency to be outgoing, demonstrate high magnitude responses, and seek stimulation. Information about these tendencies is helpful in predicting the degree of intensity which will characterize a particular individual's behavior. Whether that behavior is harmful or helpful depends upon the social interpretation accorded it within the value structure of the society.

Personality, or the organization of need dispositions, is a key factor of particular importance in determining how a particular individual will perceive a situation, in whether he will view the stimuli impinging upon him as hostile, obstructing, or threatening and thus be more prone to respond with behavior which is harmful to others. Personalistic tendencies to respond in ways that are helpful and nurturant of others appear to depend upon the combination of factors having to do with the development of a "conscience," the ability to identify with others (often called empathy), the tendency to be active and outgoing or to approach rather than withdraw, and a feeling of adequacy or control over one's experience.

Tendencies to respond in ways that are harmful and non-supportive of others and centered about one's own needs also include clusters of factors related to control and adequacy of the self and those concerned with
maintenance of relationships with others.

These tendencies toward philanthropic-misanthropic behavior can be described by a pattern of need dispositions which represent an autonomy-dependency complex and have to do with the development of the self (autonomy) and the union with others (dependency). It is hypothesized that the individual who demonstrates a positive-autonomy and positive-dependency need structure is less likely to perceive situations as threatening, hostile, or obstructing, will have more alternatives for responding, and will tend to manifest more helpful, supportive behavior toward others. In contrast, the individual with a negative-autonomy and negative-dependency pattern will typically interpret situations as hostile, threatening, or obstructive and thus more frequently demonstrate harmful, disrespectful, aggressive behavior. Responses of those whose need structure is a combination of positive-autonomy and negative-dependency or negative-autonomy and positive-dependency will more frequently be determined by the particular stimulus cues in the situation than by the need dispositions of the individual.

Since the behavior of concern in this investigation is behavior that may exemplify judgments about the "rightness" of behaving, the evidence was also examined for any indication that there are generalized bases or belief
systems upon which people make judgments about the moral nature of their behavior. On the basis of the data available, it is hypothesized that the criterion measures for these judgments may be organized into five major types: Self, Authority, Situation, Rationality, and Humanism. In each case the name of the type indicates the criterion reference for making a judgment about a particular choice of behavior. For some individuals the "goodness" and "rightness" of an act is determined by an appeal to the self; no other measure of its appropriateness is required. Often individuals turn to some external source of validation; parents, leaders, reference groups, significant others - to an authority. This appeal to authority can be internalized so that the individual is guided by a rigid set of standards and rules which originated outside the self but, once internalized, are not adaptive to situational mediation.

Few people, however, make judgments entirely upon the basis of self or authority; instead, for many persons the judgment about an act is made in the context of a particular situation. Thus a person may do the "moral" thing and aid another in distress in one context and in a different setting fail to respond to another's need. The behavior in this case is determined by the nature of the situation rather than by a consistently applied criterion measure.
Judgments based upon rationality serve to resolve dissonance and ambiguity. The rightness of the action is based on its adequacy in reducing conflict. Untempered by other bases for decision-making, rationality can result in what Marcuse has called "irrational-rationality" in which the logic of the behavior creates a closed and circular structure immune to any outside considerations. This kind of rationality was demonstrated in the experiment in which boys justified their use of shock by regarding it as an aid to learning. Without this interpretation, their aggressive behavior would have been inconsistent with their high evaluation of themselves and their "pupils."

Individuals who use humanism as the base for decisions define the "rightness" of behavior in terms of its consistency with human needs. Such subjects tend to make judgments upon affective rather than cognitive grounds. Acts are right because they "feel" right in terms of the individual's sentiments.

Probably very few people represent pure types. Nor is any one type necessarily associated with either philanthropic or misanthropic behavior. However, it is unlikely

that the person who relies chiefly upon self will be consistently philanthropic. When authority is the dominant criterion, helpful, supportive behavior may be displayed if the persons or groups to whom the individual turns for validation represent philanthropic models. The responses of the person who makes decisions based upon the situation vary from event to event and prediction of behavior is difficult except when situations have high similarity. This person will also be much more responsive to the influence of need dispositions. The highest incidence of philanthropic behavior is to be expected from the person who uses a combination of rationality and humanism for judging the "rightness" of a particular behavior. Humanism will temper the cold logic of rationality, and rationality will insure that the person does not perceive situations in such highly affective terms that he cannot distinguish actions which are realistically helpful and responsive to others' needs from expressions of his own feelings.

The interaction of potentialities, need dispositions and belief systems is a crucial element in the determination of behavior. For example, the mere existence of a belief system does not insure its application. In a particular context the individual may act differently than he believes. Given a situation of moral conflict in which a person is motivated to act in two or more ways that
differ in the degree to which their consequences promote or harm another's welfare, the individual may resolve the decision on a non-moral rather than a moral base.

Being able to describe the individual in terms of the interaction of potentialities, personality, and belief systems is necessary but far from sufficient to explain his philanthropic-misanthropic behavior. Understanding the individual is understanding the energy dimension of behavior, the creative force which is the humanity inherent in each human being. But behavior has direction as well as intensity, and that understanding requires examination of the environment.

II. THE CONTEXTUAL DIMENSION

Evidence from the empirical research has vividly dramatized the power of the environment in shaping man's behavior. It is not possible even to discuss philanthropic-misanthropic behavior except in an environmental context. To help or harm another is a social act, and by the very use of the word "help" or "harm" values have been assigned to the behaviors. Helping and harming behavior can only be understood in terms of the things in the

---

environment which have value. If human life has no value, then saving a life has no meaning. If human dignity is not given power in the normative structure of a culture, then prejudice and disrespect do not exist.

The evidence presented here indicates that these value-based behaviors are first learned through the parent-child relationship. No other influence seems to be so direct in determining how human beings learn to relate to one another. The relationship between the parent and the child shaped largely by the parent's influence upon the child's capacity to love (through being loved) and his capacity to control his own experience (through being firmly but not punitively controlled) more than any other single determinant in the environment is indicative of the nature of the interpersonal behavior the child will exhibit.

The larger social milieu also has tremendous influence in determining the incidence of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior. The ways in which people have related to one another over time are not easily altered and have tremendous power over the relationships of the future. Values may be accepted rather than examined, and the predispositions or habits which restrict and guide the behavior of the members of society may become ends rather than means. People who have learned to hate may come to
value hate for its own sake. By the same token, people who have learned to love may value it also.

Caught somewhere in the middle of these interactive influences of family and society is the institution called the school. The results of this research indicate the relative impotence of the school as a major determinant of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior. Although there is no indication that schools plan to influence students to behave in negative, harmful, inconsiderate ways toward others, the evidence shows that the influence the schools do exert is primarily in this direction.

Because the school is a status hierarchy, it teaches students to regard each other according to status rather than on any equivalent base of common humanity. The school acts primarily as a reinforcer of the instrumental values of the larger society. Achievement and success are accorded high value in the school context. Philanthropy and misanthropy, the effect one person's behavior has upon the welfare of another, are incidental values. Because status is a valued goal, students are impelled to "succeed" if not in the achievement hierarchy of the school, then in the peer system of their own counter-culture, or in the non-system of anomie and alienation. By emphasizing status, but refusing to recognize the validity of alternate routes to status, the school actually encourages the proliferation of inimical social orders based on disjunctive
value systems. It seldom examines its own practices except to maintain their congruence with past decisions. Finally, it encourages the separation of rationality and humanism by itself denying and also asking students to deny the validity of sentiments as evaluative criteria. Whatever impact the school does have upon the demonstration of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior thus occurs not by design but by default.

The school as an institution is part of the man-made environment. Like all of this environment, it lacks creativity. Once created it cannot go beyond its own level. It can provide direction on that plane only. If the school is intended to secure in children the conditions necessary for the continued existence of society and if the continued existence of society requires that new directions emerge, only human energy can accomplish that.

III. THE TRANSACTIONAL REALM

If no other factor than personality determined philanthropic-misanthropic behavior, prediction would be relatively simplified. If societal norms could be relied upon to guide the actions of all individuals in every situation, the task of explanation would be immensely lessened in difficulty. If people responded consistently from situation to situation, generalizations would be reliable. If institutional expectations were well-defined and met
unquestioningly, behavior could be easily understood. Behavior, however, requires complex rather than simple interpretation.

Seven dimensions have been hypothesized as having relatively more or less influence upon this class of behaviors. Each dimension has been explored and its relationships to philanthropic-misanthropic behavior made more specific. The structure of these domains of influence has been defined as clearly as possible on the basis of available evidence. (See Figure 3.) Instances of behavior, however, are conceived in the union of these influences in the transactional realm. Unless the relative effect of each dimension can be measured in proportion to all others, the utility of any construct presuming to explain the incidence of a class of behaviors in situ is limited. Although the empirical evidence suggests that certain relationships among variables may be especially critical in explaining philanthropic-misanthropic behavior, further investigation is obviously needed to determine more fully the relative efficacy of these interrelationships as descriptive measures.

IV. PROGNOSIS

If it can be assumed that the school as an institution needs to be concerned about interpersonal relationships, then there are certain questions which must be
FIGURE 3

RELEVANT VARIABLES IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE DIMENSIONS OF PHILANTHROPIC-MISANTHROPIC BEHAVIOR
given priority in future educational research.

Of particular importance is the fuller description of personalistic tendencies which provide an orientation toward philanthropic or misanthropic behavior. The clusters of need dispositions which define the autonomy-dependency complex need to be mapped more fully and their interrelationships studied. Especially important for explaining philanthropic behavior is the delineation of the delicate balance to be achieved between self and other if the individual is to be neither so occupied with achieving identity nor so immersed in gaining acceptance that he will be insensitive to others' needs. Although the parent, rather than the school, seems to be the more powerful influence upon the child's personality development, the evidence presented in this research indicates that a large proportion of students demonstrate personality patterns which are indicative of no predetermined disposition to behave in philanthropic or misanthropic ways. These students are especially responsive to the external cues in situations. Given this consideration, control over situational cues can be crucial in shaping behavior. Whether the school as a stimulus serves to instigate philanthropic responses or misanthropic responses will depend, for these groups at least, more upon the external (school-related) cues and less upon the internal (person-related) cues that the student brings to the situation.
More attention must also be given to the ways in which individuals develop belief systems. Of the five bases for validating behavior, the combination of rationality and humanism appears most productive of philanthropic acts.

The findings in this research suggest that parental practices are also highly instrumental in shaping children's belief systems and that the same love-oriented but firm and consistent guidance patterns of child-rearing which are associated with the development of balanced self-other orientations are vital for the development of a philosophy combining rationality with humanism.

Whether the school can have a significant effect upon the shaping of these systems is open to question. However, the school may be a particularly critical variable in influencing the behavior of the individual who relies upon authority and of the person who turns to the situation for validation of behavior. For the person who allows the particular considerations within a situation to guide his practices, the school can either draw attention to the development of awareness of the moral cues extant in the situation and the consequences of behavior for the welfare of others, or it can emphasize other cues which encourage decision-making based upon such criteria as convenience, personal advancement, conformity, or popularity.

Much more careful attention also needs to be given to the interaction of personality and philosophy, especially
to determine the relevant factors which are brought to bear in situations of moral conflict. It may be that fuller description of the two orientations will indicate the oversimplification of explanations which rely upon either-or choices between needs and morality and suggest the existence of synergistic constructs which arise from the interaction of the two variables and mediate behavior.

Very little is known about the relationship of the physical medium to the demonstration of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior, but there is a suggestion that population density may be a significant variable.

That the quality of relationships among individuals is an indication of the quality of life within a social order is hardly worth debating. Yet the quality of such relationships in the school context is seldom examined for its own sake. Instead such relationships are regarded as instrumental values. Schools as institutionalized bureaucracies define students' roles according to expectations which are consistent with the structure of the organization rather than congruent with humanistic educational outcomes. Research is badly needed which would examine the role expectancies in terms of interpersonal outcomes as goals not means. Such information would be especially relevant for the identification of possible disjunctures between role demands and personalistic tendencies. It would also
provide a means for comparing institutional expectations with actual outcomes in quality of behavior.

Closer examination of the values the school is truly perpetuating is required. Is the character of educational systems so amorphous that schools have no singular identity which is reflected in student behavior or do schools unwittingly or unwittingly present a clear and definite image of a particular orientation in the universe of values? Knowing more fully the character of individual schools and school systems would contribute immeasurably to the unresolved dilemma of whether schools do or do not significantly alter the quality of interpersonal behavior among students.

In comparison with the impact of the larger societal milieu, there is presently little evidence to suggest that the effect of schools on the demonstration of philanthropic-misanthropic behavior is more than minimal. In shaping the ways one human being relates to another, schools as formal educational agencies are much less influential than informal educative agents; the family, the peer group, significant others, reference groups. The effects that are attributable to school influences more often than not encourage misanthropic behavior. What this may indicate, as many critics of the schools have already observed,
is that schools are anachronistic forms, decadent remains of the past which have been unable to keep pace with the needs of a rapidly changing social order. To change may mean to self-destruct; therefore, schools resist change out of self-interest and concern for survival. When individuals who enter the schools bring to that context disjunctive and emergent values reflecting the larger world of which they are a part, the school rewards and encourages those behaviors which are compatible with its own image; it sanctions or ignores those which are not.

But what if schools could and did become structures devoted to the critical examination of the quality of life rather than to their own self-perpetuation? Would they then make a difference?

There are some indications that it may be possible for this question to be tested. The larger social order is changing in ways that may be more conducive to giving attention to quality of life style than to quantitative values which emphasize striving for unequally distributed rewards. The energy of human creativity is available for changing the direction to which some schools have been committed for so long. Students, educators, and communities are learning to share participation in redirecting the school. Educators are finding ways of escaping the rigidities of bureaucratic systems. More people than
ever before are coming to realize that the problems of individual and community are human problems and cannot be met with impersonal, dehumanized, mechanistic structures. These persons are also realizing that the most critical concerns of the future are problems growing from the quality of human relations. But whether schools can become significant influences in increasing the humanity of man, and if they can, whether they will, is a question which this research can pose but not answer. It can only say that so far they have not.
EPILOGUE

Humpty-Dumpty sat on a wall.
Humpty-Dumpty had a great fall.
All the king's horses
And all the king's men
Couldn't put Humpty-Dumpty
Back together again.

The delight of a jig-saw puzzle is that the pieces finally all fit so nicely into shape. Even that most peculiar configuration with the strangely shaped appendages and the innocuous shading of gray to grayer eventually finds its place and takes on unmistakable identity.

Such is not the case with the exploration into human behavior. One reason is that some of the pieces are always missing. But even more of a problem is the undeniable realization that once the dynamic flow of behaving is stopped and the autopsy performed, it is never possible to bring the body back to life.

The analytic model which served to guide this research separated the various dimensions of the person and the context in an organized and comprehensible manner. The empirical evidence attested to the validity of the model as a descriptive device. The model has helped to talk about human behavior, but it cannot create behavior.
Neither can schools, or homes, or institutions of any kind, or for that matter, can any part of the environment. The environment can only provide direction for behavior.

It is the individual who is the creator, the energizing force. His potentialities, needs, and belief systems provide the thrust; the environment gives shape to that energy.

The reason man is human is that he creates his own environment. Thus, unlike other forms, he need not be constrained by either time or space. He has a past, a present, and the possibility of a future; he can generate a culture which will in turn provide direction for his behavior. If he chooses to create an environment that will deny his own humanity and abrogate his right to create, he can do so. If he chooses to create an environment that will recognize that humanity, he can do that also.

These are considerations which are not reflected in the model. The model can only report what is. It cannot report what can be.
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