72-14,894

HENLEIN, George Anton, 1929-
FACULTY ATTITUDES IN CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION TOWARDS PROFESSIONAL IDEOLOGICAL VALUES AND THE IDENTITY OF THE CATHOLIC COLLEGE.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1971
Education, higher

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

FACULTY ATTITUDES IN CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION TOWARDS PROFESSIONAL IDEOLOGICAL VALUES AND THE IDENTITY OF THE CATHOLIC COLLEGE

by
George Anton Henlein

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Education)
in The University of Michigan
1971

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Robert T. Blackburn, Chairman
Professor Gerald Gurin
Professor Howard Y. McCluskey
Assistant Professor William Neenan

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages have indistinct
print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many individuals assisted the writer in completing this study by their encouragement, constructive criticism, and provocative questioning of the issues examined. A special acknowledgement is owed to the administration and faculty of two Illinois Catholic colleges who permitted the writer to conduct the pilot testing of the research instrument and methods.

To Dr. Robert T. Blackburn, Chairman, and all other members of the doctoral committee, a very special thanks is extended for their assistance and cooperation.

A large share of the gratitude owed belongs to the writer's wife and relatives who so generously provided assistance in many small details, not the least of which was their patient forbearance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
Chapter		
I.	THE PROBLEM OF MEANING	5
	Overview of the Problem	8
	The Professional Ideology	12
	The Central Thesis	16
	Definitions and Objectives	19
II.	THE SUBJECT POPULATION AND THE HYPOTHESES	22
	Background on Catholic Faculty	23
	The Hypotheses	28
III.	THE SAMPLE AND THE RESEARCH DESIGN	38
	The Institutional Sample	38
	The Subject Sample	43
	Characteristics of the Respondents	45
	The Research Instrument	53
	Analysis of the Results	60
IV.	ANALYSIS OF THE IDENTITY ISSUE	65
	The Identity Statements	65
	Summary for Identity Statements	85
	Respondents' Comments	88
	Vignette on Theology Requirements	93
	Conclusion	99

Chapter Page

V. ANALYSIS OF THE IDEOLOGICAL ISSUE 101

The Ideology Statements 102

Faculty and the Central Thesis 120

Summary of Faculty Issues 137

Vignette on Faculty Selection 140

Vignette on Academic Freedom 144

General Summary 152

VI. ANALYSIS OF THE PROFESSIONAL CLIMATE 157

Students and the Catholic College 159

Faculty and the Catholic College 162

Religious Aspects 168

Professional Aspects 173

Conclusions 177

VII. SUMMARY COMPARISONS OF PROFESSIONAL CLIMATE AND IDEOLOGY 180

VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 195

Overview of the Study 195

Recommendations for Further Research 209

Concluding Remarks 212

APPENDICES

Appendix A--DATA COLLECTION AND SAMPLING RESULTS 216

Appendix B--INTERCORRELATION MATRICES 222

Appendix C--THE QUESTIONNAIRE 224

BIBLIOGRAPHY 231

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Respondents by Institutional Types	47
2.	Respondents by Disciplines	47
3.	Respondents by Religious and Lay Status	48
4.	Respondents by Age	49
5.	Respondents by Age and Status	50
6.	Definitions--Respondents by College Categories	71
7.	Definitions--Respondents by Status	72
8.	Definitions--Respondents by Age	74
9.	Definitions--Respondents by Status and Age	76
10.	Definitions--Respondents by Religious Preference	79
11.	Definitions--Respondents by Degree Sources	81
12.	Definitions--Respondents by Academic Ranks	83
13.	Definitions--Respondents by Academic Fields	84
14.	Academic Freedom--Respondents by Institutions	106
15.	Academic Freedom--Respondents by Status	108
16.	Academic Freedom--Respondents by Age	109
17.	Academic Freedom--Respondents by Status and Age	111
18.	Academic Freedom--Respondents by Religion	112
19.	Academic Freedom--Respondents by Degree Sources	114
20.	Academic Freedom--Respondents by Ranks	115
21.	Academic Freedom--Respondents by Academic Fields	117

Table		Page
22.	Faculty Issues--Respondents by Institutions . .	124
23.	Faculty Issues--Respondents by Status	126
24.	Faculty Issues--Respondents by Age	128
25.	Faculty Issues--Respondents by Status and Age .	129
26.	Faculty Issues--Respondents by Religion	131
27.	Faculty Issues--Respondents by Degree Sources .	133
28.	Faculty Issues--Respondents by Ranks	134
29.	Faculty Issues--Respondents by Academic Fields .	136
30.	Student Issues--Respondents by Institutions . .	161
31.	Student Issues--Respondents by Age and Status .	163
32.	Faculty Issues--Respondents by Institutions . .	166
33.	Faculty Issues--Respondents by Age and Status .	167
34.	Religious Aspects--Respondents by Institutions .	170
35.	Religious Aspects--Respondents by Age and Status	172
36.	Professional Aspects--Respondents by Institutions	174
37.	Professional Aspects--Respondents by Age and Status	176
38.	The Environment Index	182
39.	The Ideology Index	183
40.	Indices--Respondents by Institutions	184
41.	Indices--Respondents by Status	185
42.	Indices--Respondents by Age	186
43.	Indices--Respondents by Age and Status	187
44.	Indices--Respondents by Religious Preference . .	190
45.	Indices--Respondents by Degree Sources	191
46.	Indices--Respondents by Academic Fields	192

Table | Page

47. Indices--Respondents by Academic Ranks 193

48. Questionnaire--Response Percentages by Institutions 220

49. Questionnaire--Response Percentages by Disciplines 221

50. Environment Index--Item Intercorrelations . . . 222

51. Ideology Index--Item Intercorrelations 223

INTRODUCTION

American higher education owes much of its roots and traditions to the emphasis placed upon education by many churches and denominations. For many historical and sociological reasons, however, the church-related college has diminished in overall importance from what was a dominant role on the American scene. Today, as well as in the less pressing fiscal past, a crucial problem is the necessity for these colleges to adapt to the needs and requirements of an everchanging American society. Colleges that succeed in making the needed accommodations, survive; those that do not, perish.

Catholic colleges and universities are no different. In terms of simple physical survival, there is no reason to believe that the Catholic record is better than that of other church-related colleges. In terms of ideological survival, the Catholic colleges appear remarkably enduring and resistant to the secularizing forces in American society which have caused many a Protestant college to disavow its origins.

Today, Catholic colleges are undergoing changes that seem similar to the historical Protestant pattern. Since Vatican II, for example, the ideological unity assumed to be characteristic of Catholicism has suffered

severe blows.

During the 1950's, even before the Council, American Catholicism had begun a period of self-examination and self-doubt. The prime issue was intellectualism or, more accurately put, the purported deficiency in the quality of the intellectual life among American Catholics.

The Catholic college and university came in for a large share of the blame and criticism. Deemed at fault in Catholic colleges were the traditional values enforced by a pattern-maintenance set of attitudes which somehow had failed to adapt to secular and professional realities. In short, an "identity crisis" beset Catholic higher education.

Whether personal or institutional, to question identity is at the heart a value dilemma. A lack of confidence in self-worth occurs in relation to some other value held to be at least an equal good. For Catholic colleges the basic dilemma can be stated by the query: Can a college be distinctively "Catholic" and a "college" simultaneously? Though the question begs qualifications, it must be assumed that "Catholic" and "college" are both representative of values which a Catholic college prizes, albeit not to a necessarily equivalent degree.

Perhaps the identity problem is mostly theoretical, particularly in its religious dimension. At least the issue appears very abstract when rather lofty rationales for purpose are considered. A few lines on a page in a college catalog may pay dutiful service to such noble

concepts, as "educating the whole man" or "educating young women for immortality, infinity, for the Beatific Vision."

What matters in pragmatic terms for any college is its ability to give its clientele what they want and what they need to live successfully in this world. The other considerations indicated by the traditional rhetoric may indeed be "added value." There may be a "Catholic vision of man" which distinguishes the intellectual life of a Catholic college from its secular counterpart. To demonstrate that these abstractions can be reified as part of the day-to-day life of a college seems difficult. The possibility cannot be dismissed, however.

No matter how difficult the complexities of the identity problem, and some would argue there is no such problem, the issue is an important one for the study of American higher education. The Catholic "subsystem" is of considerable consequence with its almost 250 lay-oriented colleges and over 400,000 student enrollment. Equally, the manner whereby Catholic colleges make social and ideological adjustments to the American society sheds light on the processes of social and institutional change.

These considerations provide sufficient reasons to undertake a research study directed, exclusively, at Catholic higher education. The research, to be described, examines a selected sample of Catholic colleges from the

perspective of their ideological accommodation to the normative frames of reference deemed prevalent in American higher education. The focus is aimed at uncovering the opinions and underlying attitudes held by faculty in these Catholic colleges toward Catholic higher education in light of the prevailing professional norms. It is assumed that the attitudes of faculty are, in large measure, substantive indicators of both the problems and the changes occurring in Catholic higher education.

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM OF MEANING

Introduction

Catholic higher education with its profound historical and theological links to the Roman Catholic Church is a complicated phenomenon. The colleges themselves appear almost as complex, since among them a wide range of disparities exist in the way of institutional types, student bodies, patterns of governance, and even in their degree of adherence to Catholicity.[1] Catholic colleges and universities[2] still represent a distinct class of institutions, however large the differences among them. They do share a common heritage and they do maintain the Catholic qualification of their status as institutions of higher learning.

Most observers seem to agree that there are two crucial problems facing the modern Catholic college.

---

[1]The most recent and systematic overview of Catholic higher education is also the first of a series of profiles sponsored by The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. See, Andrew M. Greeley, From Backwater to Mainstream (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969).

[2]The term "college(s)" will often replace "colleges and universities," unless the context of the text indicates otherwise.

First, there is the financial plight of many of these colleges, similar to that facing a large part of the private sector of American higher education. Second, there is the problem of definition which, in essence, means the adequate conceptualization of "What is a Catholic college?" during a time of transition in which the previous justifications no longer appear persuasive.

In the final analysis, the economic problem may be the real determinant of the future direction of Catholic colleges. However, the concern of this study is with the ideological problem in the belief that exploring the meaning placed by individuals in a relevant group of social institutions has the intrinsic merit of enabling a greater understanding of the values people live by.

The subject for this research is the problem of meaning for Catholic colleges from the perspective of the degree of accommodation made by faculty in these colleges towards the values and norms of professionalism. The intent is to examine and interpret the opinions held by faculty in two broad areas: (1) the identity issue or "What is meant by a Catholic college?," and (2) the ideological issue or the set of beliefs undergirding professionalism, including the existent professional atmosphere of Catholic higher education.

Before clarifying the research problem, two caveats need mentioning. First, no generalization is asserted that faculty in Catholic colleges are a

qualitatively different breed of academic man in comparison with faculty on other campuses, public and private. Second, no bias is intended that there is some ineluctable contradiction between Catholic affiliation of a college and what is regarded as "professionalism."

Some people, of course, do make the charge of "unprofessionalism" against Catholic colleges.[1] The issue for this study remains open, precisely because it is the basis of the identity problem for Catholic colleges and as such specifies an aspect of the research problem. Moreover, it is simply a truism that not all academicians accept without qualifications such statements of "professionalism" embodied in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure by the American Association of University Professors.[2]

It is expected, however, that faculty in the colleges of this study will show varying degrees of acceptance of the normative considerations of professionalism and that there is a relationship between their attitudes and the contemporary identity crisis in Catholic higher education.

---

[1]For example, the famous remark of Dr. Rosemary Lauer of St. John's University concerning the incompatibility of the Catholic Church and "running" a university.

[2]Leaders of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities are considering withdrawal of their endorsement of the AAUP statement. Chronicle of Higher Education, May 18, 1970, p. 1.

Overview of the Problem

The identity crisis in Catholic higher education is only one dimension of a much larger problem. Peter Berger, in referring to the so-called "secularization hypothesis," speaks about the "alleged demise of the supernatural" in our society and that "those to whom the supernatural is still, or again, a meaningful reality find themselves in the state of a minority, more precisely, a cognitive minority."[1] To maintain a supernaturalist position in the modern milieu is extremely difficult. Believers are perceived as cognitive deviants and are subject to strong social and psychological pressures against their beliefs. In Berger's view, the fundamental option is a choice between hanging on, perhaps by forming a counter-community of like-minded deviants, or simply surrendering.

However Catholicity is defined, whether loosely or narrowly, the basic issue for Catholic colleges appears much like Berger's presentation. Does the Catholic college really have any other choices than to either identify itself as a Catholic subculture of academia and running the risk of being considered "deviant" or, in fact, surrendering Catholicity by absorbing and accepting fully the philosophy and values of an essentially secular professional ideology?

---

[1]Peter L. Berger, A Rumor of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969), pp. 2-21.

While some answer that a distinctive Catholic and fully professional identity is possible and even exists,[1] others are less sure. Christopher Jencks and David Riesman have written: "While a single individual may simultaneously be both a devout Catholic and a distinguished scholar, it does not follow that a single institution can long meet both religious and professional payrolls."[2] They express doubt that a college can be "Catholic" in any significant sense, if it accepts without qualifications the philosophy and ideology of the professional value set. Their provisional opinion is a nagging one, not only because terms like "Catholic" and "professional" are replete with ambiguities, but also because their opinion suggests a possible contrariety between the two.

Certainly Jencks and Riesman are not asserting the cliche that Catholic colleges are "contradictions in terms." They are saying, however, that if Catholic colleges are de facto behaving like everyone else in academia, then the question of a distinct Catholic identity is perforce answered. There is none.

Whatever "Catholic" means as a qualifier of "college" the reader assumes that the college, more or

---

[1]Greeley gives examples of Catholic colleges which he believes to be distinctively Catholic and professional, such as Immaculate Heart College of Los Angeles. Greeley, op. cit., pp. 23, 162.

[2]Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968), p. 400.

less, adheres to a tradition of values consonant with a Christian view of man. Underlying this view exists "a belief that there is another reality, and one of ultimate significance for man, which transcends the reality within which our everyday experience unfolds."[1] In some distinct manner, this Christian belief (or Catholicism) must be "perceptibly present and effectively operative"[2] without compromising either Catholicity or the dedication to the standards and norms of academic professionalism.

The issue is a clear concern for faculty in Catholic colleges. A recent study by Charles Ford and Edgar Roy found Catholic faculty and administrators presenting questions like the following:

> What kind of relationship to the Catholic Church itself is essentially established because a college or university calls itself "Catholic"?
>
> Does the "Catholicity" essentially necessitate faculty or student policies unlike those expected in non-Catholic institutions of higher learning?[3]

The first of these questions implies that there may be a Catholic commitment which is unique and even normative and from which each college draws its inspiration and raison d'être. The second question is, however,

---

[1]Berger, op. cit., p. 2.

[2]See, The Idea of the Catholic University, a statement made by twenty-six Catholic educators at Land O'Lakes, Wisconsin, July 23, 1967.

[3]Charles E. Ford and Edgar L. Roy, Jr., The Renewal of Catholic Higher Education (Washington, D. C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 1968), pp. 24-5.

the most interesting from the perspective of this study. If Catholicity does mean something essentially different in the way of faculty and student policies, then the entire problem of academic freedom with its attendant concern for the rights of faculty and students enters the picture.

At issue are views such as those of Robert MacIver and his concept of "the university as first and foremost an association of scholars for the advancement and the spread of knowledge."[1] His view is that of secular humanism and, in a real sense, is just as doctrinaire as any other ideology.

Walter Metzger, in fact, seems to perceive academic freedom as a form of religious commitment. He says: "Academic freedom has come to signify the brotherhood of man in science that is akin in aspiration to the brotherhood of man in God."[2] Thus as an underpinning to the secular values of academia, academic freedom provides for individuals an ideology that can apparently serve as a "functional alternative to religious identification."[3]

---

[1]Robert M. MacIver, Academic Freedom in Our Time (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 287.

[2]Walter P. Metzger, Academic Freedom in the Age of the University (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 92.

[3]From the preface to, Joseph Zelan, "Religious Apostasy, Higher Education, and Occupational Choice," Sociology of Education, XLI (Fall, 1968), 370.

For Catholic colleges, it is difficult to see how such a functional alternative can be accepted if widespread among faculty without compromising the institution's religious orientation. Yet Catholic colleges do accept academic freedom, apparently as this concept is understood and specified by secular norms. Robert Hassenger writes:

> Those who chart the demise of Catholic higher education from their armchairs often fail to grasp the incontrovertible fact: there are Catholic colleges where freedom prevails--at least no less freedom than is found in American higher education generally.[1]

Still the issue is by no means closed. The ultimate answer will rest in large part on the attitudes the faculty of Catholic colleges have towards the problem.

At this point, it is necessary to clarify what is meant by the ideology of professionalism and to explain why it is part of the identity problem for Catholic higher education.

The Professional Ideology

Catholic higher education is increasingly becoming more professional.[2] However, this fact reaches beyond the procedures and styles of academia by encompassing a fairly distinct set of philosophical values. These are,

---

[1]Robert Hassenger, ed., The Shape of Catholic Higher Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 318.

[2]This point is stressed in a study of Catholic colleges by the National Opinion Research Center in 1965-66. See, Andrew M. Greeley, The Changing Catholic College (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967).

in short, a particular view of man and his search for truth. By itself, the ideology of professionalism has become an institutionalized phenomenon in American higher education. As Burton Clark says: "The stirring ideologies of community of scholars and academic freedom are forces to be reckoned with when one is dealing with faculties and in understanding their organization."[1]

The principal values of professionalism are well-known. First, professional authority is considered to be based upon expertise or specialized competence. Second, the professional academic needs autonomy for decision-making and scholarship. Third, there is a stress on individuality and a resistance to rules and regulations beyond those necessary for the sake of coordination. Fourth, and above all else, the professional must have freedom to teach, to learn, to research, and to submit his professional work to the judgment of his academic peers.

Clearly these values are idealistic. The notion of a detached scholar who is autonomous and engages in completely value-free teaching and research has a mythological quality about it. Nonetheless, these are the values the teacher-scholar-researcher is presumed to live by. They are indeed "stirring ideologies."

In the terms so far stated, a real problem does

---

[1]Burton Clark, "Faculty Organization and Authority," in The Study of Academic Administration, ed. by Terry Lunsford (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963), pp. 38-9.

not appear to exist for Catholic higher education, at least no more than for other institutions of higher learning. But there is also a fundamentally secular Weltanschauung that underlies these values. Metzger makes this point clear by his statement concerning the critical assumption subsumed under the concept of academic freedom:

> . . . all beliefs are tentatively true or tentatively false, and only verifiable through a continuous process of inquiry . . . all seeming errors must be tolerated, for what is truth is never fully known and never finally knowable.[1]

As a mode of searching for truth, this viewpoint is essential to secular humanism. It virtually states that there is no way to objectively distinguish truth from error. Moreover, the implicit ideology is that of agnosticism which, at the very least, is suspicious of the existential phenomenon of faith, the basis for theological truth.[2]

For the Catholic college, the theoretical problems involved seem evident. A commitment to "moral excellence" as well as "academic excellence" does not decisively settle the issue; neither does the fact that academic freedom prevails in the Catholic college to the same degree as in a college without religious commitment. At

---

[1]Metzger, op. cit., p. 90.

[2]An excellent discussion of these points can be found in, Patrick H. Ratterman, S.J., The Emerging Catholic University (New York: Fordham University Press, 1968), pp. 27-48.

bottom, there is still the question of whether a college can have a commitment to religious truth, to faith as a source of that truth, and accept a set of professional values which implicitly regard all truths to be a matter of hypothetical inquiry.

In the abstract, the problem of meaning for the Catholic college appears formidable and perhaps unresolvable. A college, however, does represent a set of attitudes undergirding the obvious institutional and physical structures. It is particularly in terms of faculty attitudes that the problem comes into sharper focus. Philip Gleason writes:

> In what sense is a Catholic university Catholic if it is composed predominantly of lay professors who employ, in their teaching and research, the same methods and norms as their counterparts in secular universities, and who are engaged in the pursuit of knowledge in autonomous spheres that are in no way dependent upon any over-all "Catholic position"? What, in short, is the reason for being of the Catholic college or university?[1]

Gleason's question underlies this study. Although this research cannot resolve the problem of meaning, it can shed light on the crucial question by examining the attitudes of faculty with respect to the normative ideology of professionalism.

To establish the particular perspective of this study, a central thesis is now presented and discussed.

---

[1]Philip Gleason, "American Catholic Higher Education: A Historical Perspective," in The Shape of Catholic Higher Education, ed. by Robert Hassenger (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 52.

The Central Thesis

A central thesis provides a framework for interpreting the attitudes of faculty. It is, in effect, an assumption having an "ought" quality, rather than a "must." The proposed thesis is as follows: A faculty member in a college having a religious orientation should share with the collectivity of faculty the institutional values, especially a common purpose that rationalizes the unique existence of the college.

There are two facets to the thesis. First, faculty ought to share with each other a similar set of attitudes which are fundamental to the character of the college. Second, a common purpose implies that a faculty member is turned in the same direction as his fellows. As used here, common purpose is a goal which fuses the college's educational and religious commitments.

The thesis does not imply that faculty must think alike in all respects or that ideological conformity is essential to have a Christian college. It does mean, however, that the college is able to draw to itself faculty who at some fundamental level share attitudes which are consonant with their colleagues. For example, some faculty may accept explicitly the existence of God and a supernatural order of reality. Others may only acknowledge the possibility. But both types of scholars are open to each others' viewpoints. There is, at bottom, an intellectual compatibility without requiring a

dogmatic or ideological conformity.

Common purpose assumes that faculty recognize, and are not opposed to, the particular modality whereby the Christian college defines its search for truth, such as is implicit in the ideas underlying Christian humanism. In addition, as Chester Barnard points out with respect to organizations in general, common purpose demands an objective act of co-operation by the individuals within an organization.[1] The cooperation is objective to the extent individuals positively acknowledge the common purpose serving as the institution's raison d'être, although such purpose is always subject to the personal interpretations of the individuals. Common purpose is therefore a unifying principle which when collectively held by a faculty can be assumed a source of mutual and individual gratification. A lack of unifying purpose cooperatively believed in may be a source of individual and group tension.

That such tension exists in Catholic higher education appears evident. Greeley, for example, notes that many older religious faculty see "everything they stood for in Catholic higher education going down the drain."[2] Younger faculty, however, are apparently less concerned with what Catholic higher education was and

---

[1]Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938), pp. 86-89.

[2]Andrew M. Greeley, The Changing Catholic College (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967), p. 129.

are more concerned about what it should become.

If the goal of common purpose is perceived as necessary, its practical implementation becomes reduced to the selection of faculty. Manning Pattillo and Donald MacKenzie make this observation: "The appointment of faculty members who are sympathetic with this purpose [religious commitment] and can make a contribution to such a community [Christian] is an important factor in selection . . . . The selection of personnel is, of course, the indispensable means by which an institution carries out its purpose."[1]

Since Catholic colleges, and especially Catholic universities, are unlikely to have defined policies on faculty selection that imply a religious "badge," the assumption of the central thesis has an "ought" quality. Nonetheless, the philosophy underlying faculty selection appears to be both the way out of the dilemma of the identity crisis and a source of the dilemma itself.

In this perspective, faculty attitudes are critical determinants of the meaning of "Catholic" in Catholic colleges. Not the only ones, of course, but the basic understanding among faculty towards the institutional values goes a long way in establishing or identifying common purpose and, ultimately, may lead to the resolution of the identity crisis.

---

[1]Manning M. Pattillo, Jr. and Donald M. MacKenzie, Church-Sponsored Higher Education in the United States, A Report for the Danforth Foundation (Washington: American Council on Education, 1966), p. 63.

Definitions and Objectives

Two definitions are given which serve as generalized statements clarifying the interpretations of this study. The definitions are:

Religious Value Dimension--An emphasis on values associated with Christian humanism. These values focus on faith as a mode of knowing truth, moral rectitude, the interdependence of institutions and individuals, and the stress on the responsibilities and obligations of individuals.

Professional Value Dimension--An emphasis on values associated with secular humanism. These values focus on reason as the mode for knowing truth, the freedom and autonomy of individuals, and the stress on the rights of individuals.

The two dimensions are not of course perceived in some kind of total opposition. Both Christian and secular humanism are concerned with the dignity and rights of individuals, although from a different perspective. The term "dimension" implies a continuum whereupon individuals can take a stance or be perceived to take one in the sense of emphasizing one side of the coin more than the other. It is the degree of emphasis, the shading given to an interpretation that counts, not some absolute dichotomy.

The Religious Value Dimension is concerned with the meaning of the Catholic college with respect to the "Catholic" character of the college. The Professional

Value Dimension is concerned with the meaning of the Catholic college with respect to the "professional" character of the Catholic college. These are obviously very broad distinctions, but they provide a suitable framework for clarifying the ideological perspectives of this study.

The following objectives phrased as questions delineate the research aims:

1. What are the opinions of faculty in Catholic colleges and universities towards the religious value dimension of Catholic higher education?
2. What are the opinions of faculty in Catholic colleges and universities towards the professional value dimension of Catholic higher education?
3. What differences exist among faculty with respect to their acceptance of the values associated with the professional ideology as this acceptance is affected by the religious dimension of Catholic higher education?

These questions are explored by means of a number of group variables, such as institutional differences, socio-religious characteristics of faculty, and academic differences pertaining to rank and specializations. It is assumed that group differences among and within a carefully selected sample of Catholic colleges and teaching

faculties offer a basis for interpreting the current state-of-the-question regarding the meaning of a Catholic college.

Since the study has obvious limitations in that it is a selected sample of faculty whose opinions are explored at one point in time, no definitive conclusions can be expected. However, as a bench mark study, the research does expect to contribute in a substantial manner to the on-going dialogue concerning the meaning of a Catholic college.

Having set the background and theoretical perspectives, the following chapter discusses the characteristics of the subject population and then presents the research hypotheses.

CHAPTER II

THE SUBJECT POPULATION AND THE HYPOTHESES

If a college represents a distinct philosophical orientation, it follows that the selection of similarly-oriented faculty will be an important consideration. Such selection need not be exclusive, of course, but some persuasive congruence between an institution's goals and those of its faculty appears obviously necessary.

Self-selection may, in fact, obviate a formalized policy. It stands to reason that an instructor hostile to religion is unlikely to select a church-related college as the locus for his professional identification. At the very least, a benevolent neutrality may suffice. Even so, such neutrality begs the question of the college's meaning in the ideological sense. Assuming that a shared-value commitment does underlie the definition of a Catholic college, then the college must attract faculty (and others, of course) who do share a mutually-influenced and compatible set of values.[1]

The above argument is particularly applicable to faculty who are Catholic in religious persuasion, since

---

[1]Cf. footnote in, Robert Hassenger, "Conflict in the Catholic Colleges," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXXCII (March, 1969), 107.

Catholic college administrators are most likely to presume a value-compatibility with these faculty. To examine the characteristics of Catholic faculty is, in effect, the most significant measure of faculty attitudes in Catholic higher education.

Background on Catholic Faculty

Apart from the relatively few high-quality institutions in the United States, faculty on most other campuses appear only slightly more liberal on social and political issues than the mainstream of the American public.[1] It seems, however, that Catholic colleges are a particularly conservative breed of institutions.

The study by Paul Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens of social scientists in the early 1950's found faculty in Catholic colleges to be the most conservative, or least permissive, regarding civil liberties.[2] Perhaps their finding was not too surprising considering the ethos of American Catholicism prior to Vatican II. In referring to various research studies on the Catholic mentality, James Trent writes: "A consistent picture of anti-intellectualism or lack of intellectual disposition among Catholics has resulted, characterized by

---

[1]Laurence Veysey implies this is especially so when Roman Catholic colleges are included in studies of socio-political liberalism. See, Laurence Veysey, "The American Professor: A Study in Long-Term Deviance," Paper prepared for the American Historical Association (December, 1969). (Mimeographed.)

[2]Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., The Academic Mind (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958), p. 128.

authoritarianism, dogmatism, and dislike for ideas and critical thinking."[1] The same issue was similarly stated by Gerhard Lenski in his study of Detroit area religious groups. He concluded that Catholics stress obedience and authority over intellectual autonomy and that "involvement in the Catholic group apparently fosters a de-emphasis of intellectual independence which is ill-adapted to the more creative and responsible positions in our rapidly changing social order."[2]

Given this background, it seems clear that any discussion of Catholic faculty hinges upon the socio-religious group to which they belong and that some distinction must be made between the recent past and the current situation. For these reasons, the studies of two Catholic sociologists are emphasized--John Donovan writing before Vatican II and Andrew Greeley, after.

Donovan examined the socio-religious background of 267 male Catholic faculty members in 22 Catholic colleges and universities (1958-1959).[3] Some of his pertinent observations are: (1) Catholic faculty are the products

---

[1]James W. Trent with Jenette Golds, Catholics in College: Religious Commitment and the Intellectual Life (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 27.

[2]Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor, Anchor Books (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1963), p. 345.

[3]The points that follow in the above text are drawn from specific analyses made by Donovan. John Donovan, The Academic Man in the Catholic College (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964), pp. 55, 80, 94, 117.

of a common and life-long set of religious orientations rooted in their families. Their homes were mother-centered and of an authoritarian family structure; (2) the Catholic academician was "uncompetitive, uncommitted, and uninspired" as a college student; (3) once committed to Catholic higher education, institutional stability for the lay professor is the rule, "because they want to and because outside this market their professional value depreciates;" (4) the major source of career satisfaction is in teaching, heavily weighted with morally-oriented dispositions.

Overall, Donovan's portrait of Catholic faculty is a depressing one since it suggests a provincial, professionally insecure group of men who are products of a rigid and authoritarian closed-belief system. However, Donovan noted evidences of change, particularly in the cases of young lay faculty who had received their Ph.D. degree from secular graduate schools. Nonetheless, he predicted that intellectual maturity could be slow in coming to Catholic colleges, because, for one reason, the composition of faculty was unlikely to undergo rapid change and become more professional.[1]

Change in the direction of increased professionalism, however, has apparently occurred much more rapidly than Donovan predicted. This trend is documented by

---

[1]Ibid., p. 202.

Greeley's 1965-66 study of 36 Catholic colleges and universities.[1] His impressions are now briefly described.

Greeley distinguishes the "old professors" from the "new professors." The older ones (in spirit, if not always chronologically) are quite similar to Donovan's description. The older professor is a product of the Catholic system and often has only a master's degree. He is a "local" who thinks of himself as a teacher and denigrates the "publish or perish" research orientation. While this professor may feel he is "stuck in Catholic higher education," he is very loyal to his school and to its sponsoring religious order.

The new professor, on the other hand, is more likely to have a doctorate from a secular graduate school. He is cosmopolitan and perceives himself as a professional rather than a teacher. He is interested in research, is highly mobile, and oriented to his professional colleagues rather than to his school. In short, the new professor is attuned to the modern realities of first-class scholarship; and he demands, accordingly, a competent administration and an environment which facilitates his professional aspirations.

From Greeley's descriptions, it appears that the older faculty look backward at the way things used to be, while the newer faculty look forward at the way things ought to be. Conflict between the faculty "types" may

---

[1]Greeley, The Changing Catholic College, pp. 106-9.

not occur to any serious degree, but the differences in academic styles and professional outlooks are surely a part of the Catholic college's identity crisis.[1]

In summary, two points are discussed relative to this faculty overview. First, while newer faculty members may be a new breed of professional, this does not mean that they are less committed to teaching. Perhaps, like their counterparts on other campuses, they are only more oriented towards research than their older colleagues.[2] But, at least in the liberal arts colleges and for almost all the universities, Catholic institutions regard themselves as "teaching institutions." Thus they do attract faculty who want to teach. What is important, however, is that the newer faculty are accepting teaching positions in Catholic colleges on the same terms which are prevalent in the rest of academia.

Second, and as already referred to, the professional values of the academic mainstream are essentially secular. The intellectual value of cognitive rationality is primary. It is not surprising then that Robert McNamara calls attention to the intellectual tendencies

---

[1]How large a part is difficult to say. Unquestionably, the world of Catholics has undergone substantial changes since Vatican II. These broader societal changes and the reactions to them by the faculty "types" are clearly part of the larger picture.

[2]See, Hope L. Klapper, "The Young College Faculty Member--A New Breed?," Sociology of Education, XLII (Winter, 1969), 38-49.

of professors, lay and religious, "who give only secondary importance to moral formation and vocational training."[1]

If these are the dominant trends of Catholic higher education, then the differentiation of Catholic colleges from other campuses appears to consist only of extraneous factors, such as the form of the legal governing body or the sociological mix of the faculty. This seems so, because in joining the so-called mainstream of academia, Catholic colleges become part of a single value system insofar as a primary stress is given to cognitive rationality.

Analysis of faculty attitudes in Catholic colleges with a particular focus on subgroup differences is the paramount feature of this study. A presentation and discussion of the hypotheses is now given.

The Hypotheses

From the purview of professional values and ideology, faculty in Catholic colleges are expected to differ by two broad perspectives: (1) in the degree of favorableness expressed to the existent professional value environment of Catholic higher education; and (2) in the degree of liberalism shown towards the

---

[1]Robert M. McNamara, S. J., "Higher Education and American Catholicism: A Review Article," Sociological Analysis, XXV (Winter, 1964), p. 243.

ideologically-based values associated with professionalism.[1]

These perspectives represent to a large extent the "is" and "ought" aspects of an individual's attitudinal set. Clearly, the perspectives are not categorically or unambiguously distinct. However, they serve as a reasonable scheme for sorting out attitudes among individuals and groups and for examining possible relations between them. For example, individuals who are very "liberal," who "run up the flag" of academic freedom, are likely to perceive the existent professionalism of the Catholic college in different terms than faculty who are at the other end of the ideological spectrum. This expected relationship provides the basis for the principal hypothesis.

The Primary Hypothesis

The background review has suggested that Catholic faculty are, in the main, a conservative group of academicians. Also, part of the difficulty in resolving the identity problem for Catholic higher education stems from the existence of two subcultures of faculty--the "old professors" and the "new professors." Older faculty, for the most part, are not likely to endorse the "stirring ideologies" of professionalism without qualifications and reservations. This assumes that the older professors

---

[1]Terms such as "favorable" and "liberal" are meant to describe positions of emphasis along a continuum of opinion. No evaluation is implied that one "position" is better than another.

are indeed place-oriented and emphasize loyalty to their schools, while the new professors tend to be professionally-oriented and more mobile.

A primary hypothesis is now stated:

> Faculty who are more liberal in their acceptance of the professional ideology are less favorable to the professional environment of the Catholic college. Conversely, faculty who are less liberal in their acceptance of the professional ideology are more favorable to the professional environment of the Catholic college.

The Secondary Hypotheses

Differences among faculty are interpreted in terms of their academic, social, and religious groups. Two divisions are made with respect to these independent variables. Some variables may be considered the "manifest social identities" of the faculty. These are, as Alvin Gouldner says, "consensually regarded as relevant in a given setting."[1] These variables pertain to the professional roles and qualifications of the faculty. For this study, they are:

1. Institutional type--university or college level
2. Academic rank
3. Academic field of specialization

Other variables concern Gouldner's "latent social identities" which supposedly are irrelevant to the academic setting, but are likely to be strong, if not

---

[1]Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles--I," Administrative Science Quarterly, II (December, 1957), 284.

principal, determinants of attitudes. For this study, these variables are:

4. Status--priest/sister or lay person
5. Age
6. Sex
7. Educational socialization--Catholic or non-Catholic source of undergraduate and highest degrees

In stating the secondary hypotheses, the phrase "more professionally liberal" is used. This means that the first referent group in the hypothesis is expected to be more to the right of a conservative-liberal continuum than the second with respect to the professional ideology. It also means, in accordance with the supposition of the primary hypothesis, that the first referent group is expected to be less favorable on the appropriate continuum to the existent professional environment of the Catholic college than the second referent group.

The secondary hypotheses are now stated with a brief rationale given for each.

Hypothesis One: Faculty in Catholic universities are more professionally liberal than faculty in Catholic colleges.

It is commonplace to distinguish colleges as "teaching institutions" and universities as professional and research-oriented. However, few, if any, Catholic universities have really made it in terms of the "academic revolution" associated with the most prestigious American

universities. Nonetheless, Catholic universities tend to be much like the second- and third-level non-Catholic ones in their efforts to obtain research funds, foundation grants, and to compete in the market-place for new Ph.D.s from the better and usually secular graduate schools.[1] The Catholic liberal arts colleges are far more likely to maintain a teaching orientation with emphasis upon a distinctive Catholic atmosphere. Moreover, the pressures resulting from lay professionalism are substantially less in the smaller Catholic college where administrators are largely religious and so also is a significant portion of the teaching faculty. It is expected that the university and college milieux will differ on research issues.

Hypothesis Two: Faculty of the lower professional ranks are more professionally liberal than faculty of the higher professional ranks.

Academic rank is closely associated with age and length of professional service. Assistant professors tend to be more liberal on social and political issues than associate and full professors.[2] For Catholic colleges, the older professors are more likely to have attained tenured status without evidence of publication or research ability. Their promotions, as Donovan points out, were often rewards for teaching competence,

---

[1]Cf., Jencks and Riesman, op. cit., p. 363.

[2]Cf., Howard Schumann and Edward O. Laumann, "Do Most Professors Support the War?" Trans-action, IV (November, 1967), 32-5.

seniority, and loyalty.[1] In general, tenured faculty tend towards greater conservatism than non-tenured.[2]

Hypothesis Three: Faculty of the humanities and the social sciences are more professionally liberal than faculty of the natural sciences.

Disciplines are often differentiated by their cognitive styles and patterns of academic socialization. Natural scientists are presumed to be less concerned with people and more with things; humanities and social science faculty construe reality in terms of people and their organizations.[3] Historians and sociologists are found to form friendships more often on the basis of disciplinary identification than do English faculty, economists, and physicists; and, in general, social science and humanities faculty are more concerned over their interaction with students than are the natural science faculty.[4]

Hypothesis Four: Lay faculty are more professionally liberal than clergy and religious faculty.

---

[1]Donovan, op. cit., p. 96.

[2]Cf., Ellen Kay Trimberger, "Why a Rebellion at Columbia was Inevitable," Trans-action, V (September, 1968), 28-38.

[3]Cf., Dianne S. Peters, "Speech, Attitudes, and University Faculty" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969), pp. 147-8.

[4]Cf., Talcott Parsons and Gerald M. Platt, The American Academic Profession: A Pilot Study, NSF Grant GS513 (March, 1968), p. IV-2.

Hypothesis Five: Younger faculty, whether lay or religious, are more professionally liberal than older faculty, whether lay or religious.

These two hypotheses are placed consecutively, since status and age, or some combination of the two, are expected to be the most critical variables. Hassenger, for example, found in his 1963 study of "Mary College" that "communication barriers were not between sisters and layman, or between female and male faculty members, but between the younger and older faculties."[1] Similarly, Donovan's earlier research found many older lay faculty who considered teaching in a Catholic college to be akin to a priestly vocation, while young Catholic Ph.D.s stressed commitment to professional over religious values.[2] And Jencks and Riesman have opined that "many enterprising priests and nuns are already doing everything in their power to promote secularization of the same kind that lay professionals generally want."[3]

While it seems logical to expect clergy and religious faculty, because of their religious commitments, to be more conservative than lay faculty, the crucial question is whether the younger and newer religious faculty are more similar to their lay counterparts than

---

[1]Robert Hassenger, "Portrait of a Catholic Women's College," in The Shape of Catholic Higher Education, op. cit., pp. 94-5.

[2]Donovan, op. cit., p. 92.

[3]Jencks and Riesman, op. cit., pp. 374-5.

to their older religious colleagues.

Hypothesis Six: Male faculty, religious or lay, are more professionally liberal than female faculty, religious or lay.

Donovan's study excluded the female academician. Though data are not available for the proportion of female faculty in Catholic colleges as a whole, the Catholic women's colleges comprise some 47 percent of the total number of Catholic institutions of higher learning.[1] To a large extent, the administration and faculty of the women's colleges are female.

It is expected that the females are more inclined toward the expressive role rather the instrumental and more likely to be "Homeguard" (Gouldner) than Cosmopolitan.

Hypothesis Seven: Faculty professionalized in non-Catholic undergraduate and graduate schools are more professionally liberal than faculty professionalized in Catholic schools.

Donovan's study found the Ph.D.s to be the research oriented and publishing professors. Those faculty who had their degrees from non-Catholic graduate schools were especially so in comparison with faculty who were more completely socialized within the Catholic educational system.[2] Greeley asserts that the "new professor" is much more likely to be a graduate of a

---

[1]Ford and Roy, The Renewal of Catholic Higher Education, p. 51.

[2]Donovan, op. cit., pp. 146-8.

secular school and he is either finished with his Ph.D. or is in the process of doing so.[1]

Hypothesis Eight: Faculty who are Protestant or "None" in religious preference are more professionally liberal than faculty who are Catholic.

Parsons and Platt's pilot study of eight non-Catholic colleges and universities found that 48 percent of the responding professors disclaimed religious affiliation. Of the 12 percent who reported a childhood Catholic faith, only 8 percent still maintained Catholic affiliation.[2]

Catholic colleges, on the other hand, have predominantly Catholic faculties who can be expected, for the most part, to maintain their Catholic religious identification. However, in terms of the research issues, it seems that the Protestant faculty members and those who are apparent non-believers are likely to have attitudes much closer to those generally found in academia.

In completing the statements on hypotheses, one point needs mentioning. The research is concerned with a general profile of faculty based upon commonly-accepted academic, social, and religious groupings. These variables are considered in this study to be the most likely

---

[1]Greeley, The Changing Catholic College, p. 107.

[2]Parsons and Platt, op. cit., p. V-2.

determinants of attitudes bearing upon the acceptance of the professional value set by faculty. While the addition of more narrowly-defined groupings would be of interest, they would not benefit the more limited scope of this study.

CHAPTER III

THE SAMPLE AND THE RESEARCH DESIGN

A survey approach was employed to investigate the opinions of faculty members on the research dimensions. Some 550 faculty members in sixteen Catholic colleges and universities responded to a mail questionnaire. The usable response rate was 54 percent. Questionnaires were mailed in the Fall of 1969 with data collection completed by December.[1]

A description of the sampling method, the population characteristics, the research instrument, and the methods of analysis are now discussed.

The Institutional Sample

Institutions were selected principally by stratifying according to well-known types. Universities were considered by the highest degree offered, that of doctoral and masters-level institutions. Colleges were considered by student clientele patterns--for men, for women, and coeducational. Within these strata, a base measure of academic quality was used to assist in the selection process. In addition, other pre-selected

---

[1]See Appendix A for details, page 216.

criteria were: (1) a four-year liberal arts college or undergraduate division of a university, (2) regional accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges, (3) location in or near a large urban area, and (4) an enrollment of, at least, 800 students.[1]

It is clear from these criteria that no attempt was made to have a representative national sample of Catholic higher education. In particular, regional variations, if any, are lost because of the geographic restriction to the North Central accrediting region.[2] In terms of the diversity of institutional types and of academic quality, however, the midwestern Catholic colleges are certainly not atypical of Catholic higher education. In fact, given the large Catholic population centers of the midwest, their associated colleges do represent and reflect much of the ethos and style of the Catholic higher educational "system."

To assist in selection within the stratification levels, a simple measure of academic quality was devised. This measure is based upon Alexander Astin's 1961 institutional rating criteria which utilized data from the entering freshman class of 248 colleges and

---

[1]These criteria reflect the urban orientation and small size of many Catholic colleges.

[2]Pragmatic reasons for the restriction were the need to facilitate communications with the colleges during the preparatory phases and the lack of funds for a more extensive study.

universities.[1] His estimates of a college's "Intellectualism" and "Prestige" are added together to obtain a rank-order measure. With this simple index, each potential institution in the study was evaluated for "quality." Colleges were then selected with an eye to this index in order to insure a spread in academic quality without, however, interpreting this measure as a definitive evaluation.

The number of institutions was determined by the desire to have a faculty universe of about 1000 potential subjects and, also, the objective of having at least two institutions within a category. It was found that sixteen institutions were needed to obtain a satisfactory subject population.

Of the sixteen, five are universities. These include three major institutions granting at least 30 doctorates a year and possessing three or more professional schools, and two masters-level institutions having, at least, one professional school. Brief descriptions follow. (The institutions remain anonymous since this guarantee was extended to the respective administrators when permission was sought to survey the

---

[1]Alexander W. Astin, Who Goes Where to College? (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1965). While these data are out-dated, the relative positions of colleges vis-à-vis each other appear to change only slightly over the years. This was observed by checking more recent data, such as SAT scores for 1966-67 freshmen.

attitudes of their faculties.)[1, 2]

Doctoral-level Universities

1. A foremost national university distinguished for its search for academic excellence. Academic pressures considered "intense." Quality Index: 126
2. A national university among the four or five Catholic "best." Substantial pressures for academic excellence. Quality Index: 122
3. A locally-oriented university. Large diversity of graduate and professional programs. Academic pressures moderate. Quality Index: 113

Masters-level Universities

4. A medium-sized coeducational university, local in orientation. Offers eighteen master's programs. Four professional schools. Moderate academic pressures. Quality Index: 113
5. A small university offering ten master's programs. One professional school. Moderate academic pressures. Quality Index: 109

The eleven colleges in the sample comprise three

---

[1]The research does not intend to compare one institution against another. Since respondents may have thought this to be the case, despite disclaimers, it seemed best to guarantee anonymity.

[2]Statements on institutions are drawn from, James Cass and Max Birnbaum, Comparative Guide to American Colleges (New York: Harper and Row, Inc., 1968-69).

coeducational colleges, three colleges for men, and five colleges for women.[1] The larger number of women's colleges was intended chiefly to insure an adequate representation of female faculty members, religious and lay. The colleges represent seven midwest states. Brief descriptions follow.[2]

Coeducational Colleges

6. Coeducational since the early 1930's. Objectives emphasize Christian witness and involvement in society. Quality Index: 109
7. Coeducational since the early 1950's. Objectives specify the liberal arts tradition of Catholic scholarship. Quality Index: 101
8. Coeducational since the 1930's. Objectives stress the philosophy and spirit of the sponsoring order's founder. Quality Index: 98

Colleges for Men

9. Somewhat exclusive and oriented towards a national student body. Moderate academic pressures. Quality Index: 104

---

[1]The sex-segregated pattern has deep historical roots; mostly since many Catholic colleges were originally begun as boarding-schools for younger members or members-to-be of the religious order. Ford and Roy report that of the 252 lay-oriented Catholic colleges, 55 percent are for laywomen, 20 percent are for laymen, and 25 percent are coeducational. These figures do not reflect, of course, the proportionate student enrollment in Catholic higher education. See, Ford and Roy, op. cit., pp. 51-52.

[2]Objectives, when mentioned, are taken from the college's catalog.

10. Objectives strongly emphasize adherence to the Catholic-Christian belief system. Quality Index: 100
11. Objectives emphasize the importance of Christian truth as a basis for an integrated body of knowledge. Quality Index: 94

Colleges for Women

12. Selective, oriented towards a national student body. Academic pressures moderately strong. Quality Index: 105
13. Selective. Objectives emphasize intellectual growth, including the examination of religious beliefs. Quality Index: 103
14. Objectives simply stated as the intellectual and moral formation of young women. Quality Index: 98
15. Objectives emphasize a search for truth and the need for interaction with other cultures and creeds. Quality Index: 90
16. Objectives emphasize intellectual and ethical development for students. Quality Index: 90

From these sixteen selected colleges and universities, the population universe of potential subjects was obtained. The method of selection for faculty members is now discussed.

The Subject Sample

Following the pattern used by the Parsons and Platt pilot study, faculty members were selected by

disciplines included in the liberal arts program for most colleges and universities.[1] These disciplines are: (1) the natural sciences of physics and biology, (2) the social sciences of economics and sociology, and (3) the humanities represented by history and English. Theology was also added to the discipline sample because of its obvious and important relevance to Catholic colleges.

The selected disciplines represent a range of knowledge from the "extreme" sciences to the "extreme" humanities. In this, they are a cross-section of the spectrum of courses central to the educational heart of a college. Of course, the disciplinary distinctions are not all that precise; and it may be argued whether history, for example, should be considered social science, rather than one of the humanities.[2] However, the discipline sample serves its purpose principally by providing a comparative base of faculty within and among institutions.

A final criterion for faculty selection was the condition that they be full-time faculty. This assumes that such faculty have their primary professional interest

---

[1]Parsons and Platt, op. cit., p. II-7.

[2]It was necessary to make some adjustments with respect to the disciplines. For example, chemistry teachers are included to substitute for the lack of physics teachers in certain women's colleges. Also, some anthropologists and political science faculty are included with sociologists and economists, respectively.

located in their teaching and associated duties for a particular college.

All faculty members within a discipline area were chosen as potential subjects for the study.[1] Thus, the characteristics of the subject sample were determined by the institutional and discipline sampling criteria. It can only be assumed, however, that the subject population who responded to the questionnaire is reasonably representative of Catholic higher education.[2] But as the next section will show, the characteristics of the respondents do not display any untoward deviancy from what is known or can be expected about faculty in Catholic higher education.

Characteristics of the Respondents

Responses to the questionnaire produced a sample of 551 respondents.[3] They are almost evenly divided between university faculty members (51 percent) and college faculty members (49 percent). Some 90 percent

---

[1]In one large university, some potential respondents were omitted on an every other basis in order not to unduly disproportion this institution's representation.

[2]Little substantive data exists on the composition and characteristics of faculty in Catholic higher education. Greeley does provide some important data on faculty by teaching areas and ranks. See, Greeley, From Backwater to Mainstream, pp. 45-52.

[3]The sample (54 percent of total mailed) consists of usable questionnaires received by a cut-off point in December, 1969. Lack of funds prevented a desirable second mailing to insure a larger proportion of responses.

identified themselves as teaching faculty, while about 10 percent indicated having administrative positions, wholly or in part.[1] Tables 1 and 2 list the composition of the subject population according to the principal selection criteria.

By rank, the sample includes 123 professors (22 percent), 120 associate professors (22 percent), 183 assistant professors (33 percent), 115 instructors (21 percent), and 10 not identified by rank (2 percent).

By highest earned degree, there are 319 doctorates (58 percent), 218 degrees at the master's and licentiate levels (40 percent), and only 13 bachelor's (2 percent).

Academic socialization data show that 305 respondents (56 percent) earned their highest degrees at non-Catholic colleges and universities, but 366 respondents (66 percent) had attended Catholic colleges for their undergraduate degrees. Of those who are currently working on advanced degrees, 96 respondents, 72 are doing so at non-Catholic institutions.

Variables relating to socio-religious groupings are considered here to be "critical." Thus, the following descriptions attempt to form a profile of the respondents which leads to the important distinction of "old" professors and "new" professors.

---

[1]The institutional criteria did not intend a proportionate distribution of either institutions or faculty within them according to the national picture of Catholic colleges. Administrative faculty were chiefly department chairmen who described themselves as such.

TABLE 1

RESPONDENTS BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPES

Institutions		N	Percent
All universities	(5)[a]	280	50.8
All colleges	(11)	271	49.2
Total	16	551	100.0
Doctoral univ.	(3)	181	32.8
Master's univ.	(2)	99	18.0
Coed colleges	(3)	90	16.3
Men's colleges	(3)	73	13.2
Women's colleges	(5)	108	19.7
Total	16	551	100.0

[a]Number of institutions is contained in parentheses.

TABLE 2

RESPONDENTS BY DISCIPLINES

Disciplines[a]	N	Percent
Physics	74	13.4
Biology	60	10.9
Economics	51	9.3
Sociology	68	12.3
History	87	15.8
English	114	20.7
Theology	79	14.3
Other[b]	18	3.3
Total	551	100.0

[a]A few adjustments are included--chemistry for physics, anthropology and political science for sociology and economics, respectively.

[b]Includes administrators other than department chairmen, such as presidents and deans of students.

By sex, the sample includes 409 males (75 percent) and 142 females. Table 3 relates the sex differences to the status composition of the sample in terms of religious[1] and lay groupings.

TABLE 3

RESPONDENTS BY RELIGIOUS AND LAY STATUS

Status		N	Percentage
All religious		214	38.8
All lay		337	61.2
	Total	551	100.0
Priest/Brother		120	21.8
Sister		94	17.0
Layman		289	52.5
Laywoman		48	8.7
	Total	551	100.0

Of the university faculty, however, only 77 (27 percent) are religious; of the college faculty, 137 (51 percent) are religious. The women's colleges alone contribute some 63 percent of the religious women. Priests, however, are distributed almost evenly (about 26 percent) among all classes of institutions with the exception of the women's colleges (only 2 percent for these).

The small sample of laywomen has sixteen individuals distributed among the universities and thirty-two among the colleges.

[1]The term "religious" is used in a broad sense to describe all priests, brothers, and sisters.

The average age of the sample is 42.7 years. However, lay faculty have a median age of 37.5 and religious faculty have a median age of 48.2. Before considering status with age in more detail, Table 4 is presented to give the overview of the sample by age.

TABLE 4

RESPONDENTS BY AGE

Age Divisions[a]	N	Percent
20-29	65	11.8
30-34	101	18.3
35-39	79	14.3
40-44	70	12.7
45-49	56	10.2
50-59	107	19.4
60 +	55	10.0
No response	18	3.3
Total	551	100.0

[a]Some age brackets are in units of five for a more detailed profile.

In general, university faculty are younger with 48 percent under 40 years and 42 percent of college faculty for the same. The "oldest" faculties are found among the men's colleges and women's colleges with 39 percent and 37 percent over 50 years of age, respectively.

Table 5 presents the distributions of religious and lay respondents according to age divisions. It is clear from the table that age proportions are skewed in opposite directions for religious and lay respondents. Laymen tend to be younger; religious tend to be older.

This is not surprising, since priests usually complete their clerical training before beginning graduate work. And, many orders of sisters assign young sisters to elementary and secondary schools before advancement to the college level.

TABLE 5

RESPONDENTS BY AGE AND STATUS

Status	Age					
	20-39		40-49		50 over	
	N[a]	%[b]	N	%	N	%
Religious	55	(27)	56	(27)	96	(46)
Lay	125	(47)	74	(28)	66	(25)

[a]Eighteen respondents did not give their age.

[b]Percentages are for rows.

By religious preference, the sample is predominantly Catholic with 411 respondents identifying themselves as such (82 percent). Among the remainder who can be classified, 54 individuals (11 percent) are Protestants. Only six respondents are Jewish. Thirty-four individuals (7 percent) stated their religious preference as "None."[1]

[1]An attempt was made to keep these categories as "pure" as possible. For example, the respondent had to write "Catholic" and not simply "Christian." Unitarians were excluded from the Protestant category. Also, as a point of special interest, a number of Jewish faculty chose to write letters explaining their views, rather than complete the questionnaire.

In summary, the "typical" layman respondent is Catholic, about 37 years old, and has a doctorate from a non-Catholic graduate school. He is as likely to have received his undergraduate degree from a Catholic college as from a non-Catholic one.[1] He is most likely to be an assistant professor who has taught five years or less in a Catholic college.[2] However, the layman brings teaching experience in non-Catholic institutions to his current Catholic college.

The "typical" laywoman is Catholic, as young as her male counterpart, and has a master's degree from a non-Catholic graduate school. She attended a Catholic college for her undergraduate degree. She is much more likely to be an instructor and she teaches in a college rather than in a university.

The "typical" priest or sister is about 48 years old and has a doctorate from a Catholic graduate school. By far, the undergraduate degree was earned at a Catholic college. The priest or sister has taught more than ten years in a Catholic college. However, teaching experience in non-Catholic institutions is almost nil.

In general, the characteristics of the sample tend to agree with Greeley's descriptions of the "newer" and

---

[1]The actual proportion for the entire sample of laymen splits 50:50 on source of undergraduate degree.

[2]Data on teaching experience were collected. However, there is some question about its reliability since some respondents apparently answered in terms of their current college experience, rather than total experience.

"older" professors. For the most part, it is the younger lay faculty member who fits the pattern characterized by the new professor, while the religious faculty member, even the younger ones, fits that of the older. Obviously, these categorizations overlap. Nonetheless, it appears that this study can assume with reasonable confidence that the opinions of the respondents are likely to be representative of those found elsewhere in Catholic higher education.

The descriptions do, however, point out some possible areas of bias. For example, the sample does have a larger proportion of doctorates than is known to be the general case, but this reflects the inclusion of two large and distinguished universities.[1] Also, the university return rate for questionnaires is lower than that obtained from the colleges, although the proportions of university and college respondents are almost equal.[2] Results may, therefore, be weighted in favor of the older scholars as well as by the attitudes of college faculty.

These, and other possible sources of bias, suggest that careful attention should be given to the subgroups of the principal respondent variables and, of course, care must be given to the hazards of over-generalizing.

---

[1]Greeley estimates that 34 percent of full-time faculty in all ranks hold the doctorate. This contrasts with 58 percent for the respondents in this study. See, Greeley, From Backwater to Mainstream, pp. 47-48.

[2]For details on response rates, see Appendix A, pages 219-20.

The Research Instrument

The questionnaire was constructed to survey the opinions of faculty on the research dimensions. Forty-two short statements were prepared for the final version of the instrument.[1] To these, subjects were asked to make forced-choice responses of the Likert-type pattern. In addition, the instrument included three vignettes which describe situational value-conflict cases. These were intended to elicit written position statements from the respondents.[2]

The questionnaire is organized into five parts: (1) statements concerning the professional value environment of the subject's own college, (2) statements concerning professional values with respect to the whole of Catholic higher education, (3) statements referring to the identity or character of a Catholic college, (4) the value-conflict vignettes, and (5) an inventory for the respondent's personal background and current professional status. No names were required for the questionnaire; however, a code number was used to facilitate the mailing and receipt of the questionnaires.

---

[1]Statements were written by the author and based upon issues and problems discussed in the literature of Catholic higher education. Some statements were paraphrased from the writings of others. A pilot test was conducted at two Illinois Catholic colleges during the spring of 1969. This testing brought about substantial revision. The final version incorporates many of the criticisms and suggestions received from faculty of the pilot colleges.

[2]See Appendix C for the questionnaire, pages 224-230.

Each of the research dimensions are now discussed, following for the sake of easy reference, the order described above. Emphasis is placed on the rationale for each dimension. Detailed listing of statements with relevant commentaries is deferred until the results of the study are presented.

Professional Value Environment

Part I of the questionnaire consists of a series of twelve statements which probe a respondent's opinion on the professional value atmosphere of his own college or university.[1] Two general assessments are considered. First, the respondent is asked to evaluate the climate of his college in relation to the students. For example, the college may be a place where students are treated as adults, where students are influenced by their teacher's values, and where social commitment and involvement are encouraged. Second, the respondent is asked to evaluate the climate of his college in relation to faculty. For instance, the college may be a place where faculty receive their full professional rights, where faculty decision-making on college policies is honored, and where commitments to disciplines are encouraged to the fullest extent.

This dimension of the study assumes that subjects

---

[1]See Appendix C, page 225. Item nine of Part I is omitted from the analysis. Respondents from some colleges pointed out that their colleges do not have such off-campus regulations.

are responding non-ideologically to some degree. That is, the perception of what "is" does not necessarily correspond to what "ought" to be. It is expected that variations in opinion among respondents are related to their ideological viewpoints, and, in turn, to the independent variables. Thus, the primary hypothesis predicts not only a correlation between perceptions of the professional environment and the individual's ideology, but that the correlation will be negative. This means that the more "professional" faculty, ideologically-speaking, tend to view the value-environment of their college less favorably, and vice versa.

The statements are highly generalized, and, hence, contain an amount of ambiguity.[1] For example, one item reads: "Students are little influenced by the values of their teachers." This item could have been made very precise by writing: "Some students are little influenced by the values of some of their teachers." In this totally logical form, it is doubtful that any faculty member would disagree with the statement. The argument, however, is that the actual statement discriminates faculty responses according to the individual's own critical evaluation of his college's environment. In other words, it is less the content of a specific item which is of import, but more the pattern of attitudinal responses to

---

[1]The problem of ambiguity is cited most often by respondents. When relevant, interpretation problems will be discussed.

a series of items which concerns this study.[1]

Scoring of responses is from the point of view of professional favorability to the Catholic college. Within a Likert-type continuum of Agree, Agree Somewhat, Disagree Somewhat, and Disagree, items are scored on a 5-4-2-1 points basis, if agreement is considered to be more favorable than the reverse. Otherwise, scoring is on a 1-2-4-5 points basis. A neutral category was intentionally omitted. Those who either did not respond or indicated ambivalence were excluded from aggregate measures.[2]

The Professional Ideology

Part II of the questionnaire comprises, in the main, the ideological dimension of the study. Twenty-one statements[3] probe the subject's qualitative opinions. Two broad perspectives are distinguished.

First, a survey of faculty opinion on a medley of

---

[1]The use of "attitude" is based upon Thurstone, who writes: "The concept 'attitude' . . . denotes the sum total of a man's inclinations and feelings, prejudices or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specified topic." L. L. Thurstone, "Attitudes Can Be Measured," in Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement, ed. by Martin Fishbein (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967), p. 77.

[2]These remarks on scoring apply similarly to other dimensions of the study.

[3]Three statements were omitted from analysis. These are items 5, 15, and 18. Comments by respondents indicated a large degree of concern in their interpretations of the statements. In particular, item 18 was considered by many to be "loaded" and even insulting.

issues derived from the literature on Catholic higher education. Ten statements in Part II, interspersed among others, explore opinion on democratic and moral values in the context of the Catholic college, on the status of Catholic higher education in relation to the rest of American higher education, and on the possible "secularization" of Catholic higher education due to the influence of lay administrators. While influenced, of course, by their current experiences, it is assumed that faculty can and will project their views in a generalized fashion to all of Catholic higher education.

Second, a survey of faculty attitudes towards the critical issues of academic freedom and the autonomy of collegiate institutions. Eleven statements in Part II are thus heavily weighted with ideological overtones. A strong emphasis is placed by these items on the issues of faculty selection, the relation of an individual's beliefs to Catholicism as a condition of employment, and the application of possible "Catholic" norms for behavior and teaching.

From the above statements, an index "measuring" attitudes towards the professional ideology is derived. Scoring, by the point system already explained, is in the direction of favorability to the universal values of professionalism.

The Identity Issue

Part III of the questionnaire includes three

statements concerned with the definitional problem of the Catholic college.[1] This section also encourages an open-ended response, whereby subjects can express their views as these are presumably stimulated by the pertinent statements.

Specifically, the meaning of the adjective "Catholic" in relation to "college" is explored according to three degrees of emphasis. First, that the Catholic college primarily reflects the tradition of Christian humanism. The college should be a "community of Christian scholars" whose members share basic value-commitments centered on the person of Jesus Christ. Second, that the Catholic college should be strongly "Catholic" in reflecting the pastoral and educational missions of the Roman Catholic Church. Third, that the Catholic college is, above all else, a "college." In this view, the religious orientation is secondary or subordinate to the primary educational role of a college in a pluralistic society.

These statements are clearly over-simplified. They bypass the complexities of institutional arrangements with religious orders and dioceses, including the question of who really owns a Catholic college.[2] Furthermore, it

---

[1]Items two and four of Part III are omitted from the analysis. Both created problems of interpretation with respondents.

[2]John McGrath argues that the general public really owns a college. John J. McGrath, Catholic Institutions in the United States: Canonical and Civil Law Status (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1968), p. 33.

is possible for respondents to agree with all of the statements, some, or none. What is important, however, is that these statements discriminate subjects along the general lines represented by the respective orientations. For example, while most respondents are likely to agree with statement three--the educational mission is primary--it can be expected that the neutralist tone of the statement will induce disagreement from those who perceive a threat to the "Catholicity" of the college.

In summary, this section does not intend a definitive examination of the identity issue. But the responses to the statements and, most important, written commentaries, provide an important perspective for the views of respondents on the professional issues.

Value-Conflict Cases

Part IV of the questionnaire presents three situations suggesting a possible conflict on principles. The cases describe, in a very contrived manner, problems within a hypothetical Catholic college. First, a problem in choosing a new faculty member where the choice lies between religiously-neutral scholar and a committed Christian but unproven scholar; second, a problem with an appointed faculty member who is thought to be teaching views unacceptable to Catholicism; and, third, the problem of compulsory theology requirements.

Underlying these cases is the principle that individuals reveal their values more clearly when choices

must be made. However, it is not the forced-choice responses, but the written comments of subjects explaining their positions that is to be emphasized for these vignettes.

In brief, the vignettes are intended to allow the respondents to "speak for themselves." From their written viewpoints and observations, it is expected that a spectrum of representative thought on Catholic colleges and their problems can be presented.

Analysis of the Results

All statements in the questionnaire call for responses along the Likert-type continuum of Agree to Disagree. Each item is scored in the direction considered to be favorable to the professionalism of the subject's own college or to the professionalism of Catholic higher education. The general perspective is always the ideological set of values associated with professionalism, however narrowly these may be defined in academia.

For each statement, mean scores are calculated for the set of subjects belonging to each independent variable related to their academic, social, and religious groupings. These aggregate measures provide the basis for statistical tests of the hypotheses. The one-way analysis of variance method is employed consistently throughout the study. Levels of significance, beginning with the usual .05 probability, are determined by the use of F-ratios and t-tests for simultaneous group means comparison.

All written comments from respondents are recorded.

These are frequently quoted in an appropriately anonymous fashion. Selection of pertinent comments follows a simple content analysis format. All written statements are sorted, first, by reference to the specific statement in the questionnaire, and, second, by the internal content or thrust of the comment, itself. For the latter point, two general objectives are considered. In the case of open-ended responses associated with the identity issue of the value-conflict vignettes, the spread of opinion along the ideological dimension of conservative-liberal is looked for. A fair representation of the respondents' views without pejorative or biased sampling is given. For shorter comments, usually associated with the forced-choice statements, those that clarify the subject's interpretation are looked for.

The analytical methods employed for the hypotheses are now specified. The primary hypothesis was stated as:

> Faculty who are more liberal in their acceptance of the professional ideology are less favorable to the professional environment of the Catholic college. Conversely, faculty who are less liberal in their acceptance of the professional ideology are more favorable to the professional environment of the Catholic college.

As already mentioned, the terms "liberal" and "favorable" imply points on a continuum and do not mean in this study that one position is "better" than another.

It is expected that a negative correlation will be found between the ideological attitudes of respondents and their attitudes towards the professionalism of the

Catholic college. To test the hypothesis, two indices or rough scales are formed, one relating to the Ideology and the other to the Environment.[1] A negative correlation for responses to the two indices suggests the verification of the hypothesis. In addition, each independent variable is tested on the indices by comparing the group means by the one-way analysis of variance technique.[2]

The secondary hypotheses are tested by comparing the relevant groups of respondents according to their mean scores on the questionnaire items. Faculty subgroups having higher mean scores than their comparison groups are, in the broad sense, considered to be "more professionally liberal." The F-ratio and t-test are used for statistical analyses.

To recapitulate these hypotheses, they are now stated in the null hypothesis format. It is predicted that the sample of respondents will show with respect to the research issues:

> No significant differences between faculty in Catholic universities and faculty in Catholic colleges.
>
> No significant differences between faculty of lower professional ranks and faculty of higher

---

[1]Responses to the statements in the questionnaire were factor analyzed. Two distinct and strong factors resulted from a varimax rotation. Details on the formation of the indices from these factors is given in Chapter VII.

[2]For example, religious faculty are compared with lay faculty on each of the indices. The indices, themselves, are not statistically compared, except for a correlation based upon the whole sample population.

professional ranks.

No significant differences between faculty of the humanities and the social sciences and faculty of the natural sciences.

No significant differences between younger faculty, lay or religious, and older faculty, lay or religious.

No significant differences between lay faculty and religious faculty.

No significant differences between male faculty, lay or religious, and female faculty, lay or religious.

No significant differences between faculty professionalized in non-Catholic undergraduate and graduate schools and faculty professionalized in Catholic undergraduate and graduate schools.

No significant differences between faculty who are Protestant or "None" in religious preference and faculty who are Catholic.

The first referent in each hypothesis is predicted to be "more professionally liberal" than the second or third. This inference, of course, states only a relative measure of professionalism.

The following chapters present the results and their analyses according to the principal issues of this study. A brief synopsis of each chapter is given in order to establish a procedural overview.

Chapter IV examines the views of respondents on the identity issue for Catholic higher education. Besides presenting an analysis of responses to specific statements of the questionnaire, an emphasis is placed upon the written commentaries made by respondents to "What is a Catholic college?" A vignette is discussed on the problem of compulsory theological requirements.

Chapter V describes the views of respondents on the issue of professional ideology. Two vignettes are discussed; one, relating to the selection of faculty in Catholic colleges, and the other, relating to the problem of academic freedom and Catholic higher education.

Chapter VI discusses the respondents' opinions on the existent professional climate of Catholic higher education. Particular attention is given to the value environment with respect to both students and faculty.

Chapter VII summarizes the respondents' opinions in terms of the relationships between their views on professional climate and professional ideology. Two indices on Environment and Ideology are explained; the respondent variables are examined in relation to each index.

Chapter VIII concludes the presentation of the study. An overview of the research and its findings are given. Conclusions are summarized and recommendations for further research are indicated.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE IDENTITY ISSUE

In this chapter, the problem of definition for the Catholic college is examined by presenting the viewpoints of the respondent faculty. The reference framework is that the issue is primarily ideological, arising from the necessity for Catholic higher education to make adjustments to the prevailing values and norms found in the broader system of academia. How faculty view this problem is assumed to be inextricably connected with the extent of their acceptance of the professional ideology.

The chapter has two major divisions. The first presents and discusses responses to three "identity" statements in the questionnaire. The second presents an impressionistic survey of the written comments made by respondents to the identity issue and to the related vignette on compulsory theological requirements.

The Identity Statements

One result of the Second Vatican Council was to accelerate the need for definition by Catholic colleges. The Council's declarations, especially those concerning religious freedom, ecumenism, and Christian education, are significant factors in the current pressure for

re-examination and clarification of goals and purpose. Furthermore, much of the pressure for redefinition comes from students and faculty. As Ford and Roy point out, "There is now less passive internal acceptance of institutional definition and policy."[1]

It seems indisputable that Vatican II marks the dividing-line between what can be termed a traditional view of the Catholic college and a modern view, with the latter more in keeping with dynamic and adaptive institutions.[2] Hence, two "definitions" were presented to the subjects. They attempt to summarize the pre- and post-Vatican II perspectives. The third "definition" was related to neither of the first two, but attempts to present a viewpoint consistent with secular professionalism. Each of the statements are now given and briefly discussed.

Statement 1

> The Catholic college should assist the Roman Catholic church in its teaching mission by combining strong professional goals with permeative religious and moral values.

This statement suggests a close association between the Catholic Church and the Catholic college, similar to the "agent of the Church" role. Donovan had expressed this view: "In the United States, Catholic colleges

---

[1]Ford and Roy, op. cit., p. 23.

[2]This is not an exclusive distinction, of course. Many faculty in Catholic colleges would presumably argue that financial considerations are a prime mover for redefinition.

are extensions of the Church established and directed by religious authorities in order to fulfill its traditionally defined teaching mission."[1]

Given the pre-conciliar aura of the above statement, it is expected that it will find scarce acceptance among faculty. The tone is sufficiently conservative to distinguish, in a relative way, the "older" professors from the "newer."

Statement 2

> The Catholic college should be a community of Christian scholars who, in their thorough commitments to professionalism and the service of man, witness Jesus Christ in society.

This statement reflects the perspective on Catholic higher education as expressed by the Second Vatican Council.[2] It is similar to the conception of a Catholic university as described in the Land O'Lakes document, which, to quote the Reverend James Burtchaell, perceives the Catholic college not as "an enclave of orthodoxy to defend the faith," but as a community which possesses faith and in which truth can be freely pursued without imposing religious commitment.[3]

As a generalized statement of a persuasive Christian value orientation for the Catholic college,

---

[1]John Donovan, op. cit., p. 25.

[2]See, Walter M. Abbott, S.J., gen. ed., The Documents of Vatican II (New York: America Press, 1966), p. 648.

[3]James T. Burtchaell, C.S.C., "The Restless Christian College," National Catholic Educational Association College Newsletter, December, 1968, p. 11.

the above statement can be expected to receive a strong endorsement from faculty.

Statement 3

> Though Roman Catholic agencies happen to operate colleges, these colleges should be regarded primarily as educational institutions serving the general public and providing educational "choice."

This statement suggests that the educational function, similar to that of other colleges, is primary, although allowance is made for the alternative role played by private institutions. By inference, Catholic colleges are a "public trust"[1] and, as such, do not serve a dominant religious function or role.

The tone of religious de-emphasis is such that the statement can be agreed with by faculty who regard religion as irrelevant in an academic setting. On the other hand, among faculty more concerned with religious values on campus, those who emphasize strongly religious affiliation are likely to be negative to the statement.

These three statements serve as the reference points on the identity issue in order to discriminate attitudes among the faculty subgroups. It is, of course, the variance in the degree of acceptance of each statement and by whom which is of interest.

For convenience, the first statement will be referred to as "Roman Catholic" or RC; the second, as "Catholic-Christian" or CC; and the third, as "Professional"

---

[1]James McGrath, op. cit., p. 35.

or PR. These labels do not imply or intend a pejorative comparison.

Presentation of Results

Reporting the results begins by listing the percentage proportion of assent to the statements based upon the entire sample of 551 respondents. Next, the referent groups of the hypotheses are compared by the statistical analysis of group means using the analysis of variance technique.[1] These data are usually reported in table form. Statistical tests of significance based upon the F-ratio are given only for results at or less than the .05 level of confidence. A summary discussion of the results completes this part of the chapter.

For the sample as a whole, 56 percent (309) of the respondents gave at least qualified assent to the "Roman Catholic" statement; 69 percent (378) agreed to the "Catholic-Christian" statement; and 80 percent (443) assented to the "Professional" statement. Thus, in overall terms, faculty accepted favorably all three positions on identity.

All statements, however, received written notations from a number of respondents. On the RC statement, some faculty commented that the Catholic college should represent the Catholic Church in its official teachings, but

---

[1]Group means are the mean of the individual mean scores. Scoring is on a 5-4-2-1 points basis from Agree to Disagree. Those who did not respond to an item are eliminated from the total "N" used.

not exclusively so. In similar vein, others agreed with the statement, but indicated that they did not believe the Catholic college was a pastoral arm of the Church.

On the CC statement, a few faculty included "Jews and non-Catholics" with the statement phrase, "a community of Christian scholars." For the most part, the PR statement was apparently taken at face value, although some respondents queried the meaning of "educational choice."

Despite some ambiguities, the results for the entire sample are in accord with the expectations. It seems, then, that the interpretations given to the identity statements can be regarded as reliable.

The largest subdivision of the sample comprises the institutional category of university and college faculties. Table 6 presents the results by the levels and divisions of colleges according to the institutional selection pattern.

It is apparent from Table 6 that the "Professional" statement meets with substantial[1] agreement from faculty in all institutional categories, while responses to the other statements indicate a considerable range of opinion.

---

[1]Qualifiers such as "substantial" and "appreciable" are consistently used to indicate notable agreement or disagreement by the sub-groups of faculty. Mean scores of 4.00 or more and 2.00 or less are particularly indicative of responses in one direction by a large majority of the respondents. A mean score of 3.00 suggests a divided opinion by the weights given to the "Agree" and "Disagree" responses. Since no neutral response was afforded respondents, the median score of 3.00 should not be considered a "no opinion" type of response.

TABLE 6

DEFINITIONS--RESPONDENTS BY COLLEGE CATEGORIES

	Univ.		Colleges			Prob.[b]
	Doct. (181)[a]	Mast. (99)	Men (73)	Coed (90)	Women (108)	
RC	2.94	3.14	3.65	3.32	3.69	.001
CC	3.43	3.92	3.79	3.87	4.27	.001
PR	4.28	4.23	4.44	4.52	4.21	ns

[a]Refers to number of individuals in each category. Maximum "N's" are given. Actual "N's" vary slightly due to non-responses.

[b]Probability figures, based on the F-ratio, are always at or less than the indicated level of confidence. "NS" means statistical significance was not reached at the .05 level. All horizontal means are compared.

For the "Roman Catholic" statement, faculty at the university level (doctoral and masters institutions combined) give, on the average, far less assent than faculty of the men's and women's colleges. (Probabilities are less than .001 between university respondents and men's and women's college respondents, respectively.)[1] But, for the "Catholic-Christian" statement, the doctoral-level respondents also differ appreciably from the

[1]Besides the statistical comparisons based upon all horizontal mean scores shown in tables, statistical comparisons by paired t-tests were also performed for all possible group comparisons. The results of particular comparisons are frequently indicated by a statistical note within parentheses following mention of specific subgroup differences. This procedure is followed throughout the study.

masters-level group. (Probability is less than .05 between doctoral and masters subgroups.)

In general terms, the differences between the university and college sample are strong. The most striking differences, however, are between the respondents of the doctoral-level universities and faculty of the women's colleges. Since the former are largely lay (72 percent) and the latter are largely religious (65 percent), the vocational status distinction appears pre-eminently important.

Table 7 presents the mean scores of respondents by vocational status and also distinguishes lay faculty by sex.

TABLE 7

DEFINITIONS--RESPONDENTS BY STATUS

	Laymen (289)	Laywomen (48)	Sisters (94)	Priests (120)	Prob.
RC	2.95	2.80	3.90	3.77	.001
CC	3.32	3.24	4.65	4.49	.001
PR	4.41	4.57	4.24	4.04	.05

Examination of Table 7 indicates the wide disparity in the degree of assent to the "Roman Catholic" and "Catholic-Christian" statements. For the former statement, lay faculty are virtually disagreeing in comparison with the more favorable response of religious

faculty. The "Catholic-Christian" statement receives a greater degree of assent from the lay group, but, for the religious (especially the sisters) the statement received very strong support. The "Professional" statement has a reversed pattern of scores from the previous two. Here, the lay faculty support this religiously "neutral" statement to a larger degree than do the religious. (Probability is less than .01 between lay and religious respondents.)

On none of the statements are there appreciable differences between laymen and laywomen or between sisters and priests. This suggests strongly that the lay and religious distinction is, indeed, a critical variable in distinguishing attitudes towards the Catholic college.

From Table 7, it can also be seen that sex differences have little effect on the identity statements, if lay and religious faculties are separated. Disregarding status, however, male and female differences are appreciably different, with females giving a greater assent to the two religiously-oriented statements.[1]

Another variable expected to be critical is that of age. The following discussion presents, first, the mean responses based on age for the entire sample, and,

---

[1]This is affected, of course, by the much greater number of religious women as respondents. It is much more interesting to note that laywomen tend to be slightly more critical of the identity statements than do laymen.

then, a combined age-status category.

The average age for the respondents was 42.7 years with, as already pointed out, more lay faculty in the "younger" age brackets than clergy or religious faculty. Table 8 presents the mean scores on the identity statements by age in units of 10 for the extremes and in units of five for the proportionately larger middle ranges.

TABLE 8

DEFINITIONS--RESPONDENTS BY AGE

	20-29 (65)	30-34 (101)	35-39 (79)	40-44 (70)	45-49 (56)	50-59 (107)	60 plus (55)	Prob.
RC	2.74	2.83	2.97	3.19	3.39	3.70	4.49	.001
CC	3.16	3.37	3.64	3.86	3.89	4.20	4.57	.001
PR	4.40	4.33	4.29	4.09	4.42	4.28	4.35	ns

There is little doubt about the significance of age. With the exception of the "Professional" statement, an almost linear relationship exists with increasing age. The older the respondent, the greater the likelihood of assent to the first two propositions.

For faculty under-40, the largest amount of dissent, proportionately, is registered for the "Roman Catholic" statement; while, interestingly enough, faculty over-60 strongly agree with all the statements and in about the same proportions.

Another way to look at Table 8 is to note that the younger faculty give priority to the "Professional"

statement (in terms of greater assent), while the older faculty tend to agree with the "Professional" and the "Catholic-Christian" statements to almost the same degree.

Since age may also be linked with vocational status, an analysis is presented that combines status with age. The sample population was divided into "younger," "middle," and "older" groupings of lay and religious faculty (by ages, the 20-39 group, the 40-49 group, and the over-50). Table 9 presents the appropriate mean scores.

For convenience, discussion of Table 9 will follow the age groupings. For the younger faculty, the religious favor most the "Catholic-Christian" statement, whereas the lay favor the "Professional." The latter disagree, on the average, with the "Roman Catholic" statement. In addition, the younger religious and lay faculty differ appreciably on each of the statements. (Probabilities are less than .001 for RC and CC; .01 for PR.) There is the beginning of a suggestion here that the religious status may be more influential in forming attitudes than is the academic status by itself.

With the middle group of faculty, differences between religious and lay are also large for the religiously-oriented statements. (Probabilities are less than .01 and .001, RC and CC, respectively.)

TABLE 9

DEFINITIONS--RESPONDENTS BY STATUS AND AGE

	20-39		40-49		50-over		
	Rel. (55)	Lay (182)	Rel. (55)	Lay (73)	Rel. (96)	Lay (64)	Prob.
RC	3.51	2.66	3.70	2.95	4.10	3.77	.001[a]
CC	4.35	3.11	4.44	3.43	4.73	3.71	.001
PR	3.90	4.47	4.07	4.35	4.29	4.33	.05

[a]Probability figures are for all mean scores in the pertinent horizontal rows.

However, it is the older faculty, religious and lay, who give the most assent, proportionately, to these statements. Older religious virtually give a complete endorsement to the "Catholic-Christian" statement. But only on this statement do the older lay faculty differ appreciably from their religious counterparts. (Probability is less than .001.)

To summarize the results as presented in Table 9, the following observations can be made. First, both religious and lay faculty show increased assent to the "Roman Catholic" and "Catholic-Christian" statements as the respective age groupings get "older." Second, among the younger and middle age groups, religious and lay faculties differ appreciably from each other on both religiously-oriented statements. Older faculty, on the other hand, tend to be similar in their views on all but the "Catholic-Christian" statement. Third, religious faculty, regardless of age, give their greatest degree of assent to the "Catholic-Christian" statement, whereas lay faculty, regardless of age, do the same for the "Professional" statement.

In the analysis above, lay faculty were considered collectively, whether or not they happened to be of the Roman Catholic persuasion, or, for that matter, of any religious belief. Of the lay faculty reporting their

religious preference, however, 62 percent (208) are Catholic; 16 percent (54) are Protestant; and 10 percent (34) are "None."[1] While their numbers are small, the views of the non-Catholic portion of the faculty sample are clearly of interest. It can be expected that their views correspond more closely to those of academia in general, since they are less likely to have a socio-religious influence affecting their employment by a Catholic college.[2]

For the following analysis, the Catholic portion includes both religious and lay faculty. This provides a rough composite of a "Catholic" position on the identity statements to be compared with the views of non-Catholic faculty. Table 10 presents the mean scores for the religious preference categories of faculty.

It is apparent from Table 10 that the "None" group of faculty for religious preference disagree emphatically with the religiously-oriented statements. Their average opinions are also considerably different

---

[1]The Protestants represent the established denominations, principally, Episcopalians, Lutherans, and Baptists. Unitarians were excluded in order to maintain a Protestant-Christian cast to this grouping. The "None" group comprises those faculty who reported themselves as such or listed their religious preference as atheist or agnostic.

[2]This simply means that Catholic colleges have predominantly Catholic faculties as a rule. It seems unlikely that non-Catholic faculty choose a Catholic college for employment because it is a Catholic college. The possibility also exists that more negative attitudes on the part of some non-Catholics employed in Catholic colleges may be an expression of anti-religion comparable to the "village atheist" notion.

from the Catholics and the Protestants who are in agreement, although, for the Protestants, not very much so on the "Roman Catholic" statement. (Probabilities are less than .001 between Catholics and "None" and between Protestants and "None" for both statements.)

TABLE 10

DEFINITIONS--RESPONDENTS BY RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE

	Cath. (411)	Prot. (54)	None (34)	Prob.
RC	3.55	2.93	1.69	.001
CC	4.16	3.55	1.43	.001
PR	4.17	4.70	4.88	.001

Catholics agree to a greater extent than do Protestants with the widest discrepancy on the "Catholic-Christian" statement. (Probability is less than .001.) In this sense, Catholics are closer to the Protestants in giving a minimum endorsement to the "Roman Catholic" statement.

For the "Professional" proposition, it is clear that the "None" group gives almost a perfect endorsement. The Protestants also give a high endorsement. The "Catholic" posture on this statement is less emphatic.

While hardly conclusive, these results suggest that Catholic faculty, religious and lay, have some basic agreement on the religious dimension of the Catholic college, as difficult as definition is. On the other

hand, non-Catholics, in their strong endorsement of the religiously-neutral "Professional" statement also appear to make clear where their priorities lie.

Another variable considered is the academic socialization experience of the respondent faculty. Specifically, the influence of a Catholic or a non-Catholic educational experience as sources for the undergraduate degree and the highest degree earned is looked at.

Almost all religious respondents, 92 percent (198), received their undergraduate degrees from a Catholic college, and a large proportion, 68 percent (140), also earned their highest degrees from a Catholic college or university. On the other hand, among the lay respondents, some 50 percent (169) received undergraduate degrees from a Catholic college, while only 23 percent (87) earned their highest degrees from a Catholic college or university.[1]

Table 11 presents the results on the identity statements according to the Catholic or non-Catholic source of undergraduate or highest degree earned.

It can be observed from Table 11 that the patterns on the "Roman Catholic" and "Catholic Christian" statement

---

[1]These figures appear reasonably representative, since religious faculty have been the backbone of many a Catholic university's graduate program, while lay faculty can be expected to have done their graduate work in the better developed graduate schools of non-Catholic institutions. Also, the figures for religious include degrees in theology which are more likely to have been received in Catholic schools.

are similar to the previous variables considered. Graduates of Catholic institutions score higher and differ appreciably from graduates of non-Catholic institutions.

TABLE 11

DEFINITIONS--RESPONDENTS BY DEGREE SOURCES

	Undergrad.			Highest		
	Cath. (366)	Non-C. (184)	Prob.	Cath. (227)	Non-C. (305)	Prob.
RC	3.53	2.76	.001	3.77	2.93	.001
CC	4.17	3.05	.001	4.29	3.43	.001
PR	4.18	4.60	.001	4.26	4.38	ns

For the "Professional" statement, the substantial difference in assent between the undergraduate sources for degrees is notable, especially the virtually complete assent given by respondents who graduated from non-Catholic institutions. (Mean score is 4.60.) This latter group comprises, though, most of the "Protestant" and "None" faculty in terms of religious preference whereas almost all religious faculty received their undergraduate degrees from Catholic institutions.

Of special interest, however, is the higher proportion of assent given to the religiously-oriented statements in the highest degree category as compared with the undergraduate degree category. In part, this result reflects the increase in the number of religious faculty for the non-Catholic institution total. (Only

15 religious respondents received undergraduate degrees from a non-Catholic college, but 140 religious earned their highest degrees from a non-Catholic institution.) Nonetheless, it appears difficult to give an explanation why the proportion of assent is higher for that portion of the sample receiving graduate degrees from Catholic institutions than for that portion of the sample receiving undergraduate degrees from Catholic institutions.[1]

Two strictly academic variables conclude this section of the analysis. First, respondents are compared according to their professorial rank; and, second, respondents are compared according to their teaching fields.

Professorial rank is a rough index of the age of faculty. Thus, it is expected that attitudes on the identity statements will resemble "older" and "younger" categorizations of faculty.

Table 12 presents results according to the four academic ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor.

The progressively increasing proportion of assent, from instructors to professors, can be observed for the religiously-oriented statements. All ranks, however, agree

---

[1]The problem may be primarily methodological. A more pertinent analysis may have compared Catholic faculty only, religious or lay, according to whether they received their highest degrees from Catholic or non-Catholic institutions.

at about the same level for the "Professional" statement.

TABLE 12

DEFINITIONS--RESPONDENTS BY ACADEMIC RANKS

	Inst. (115)	Asst. P. (183)	Assoc. P. (120)	Prof. (123)	Prob.
RC	3.06	3.15	3.21	3.73	.01
CC	3.51	3.72	3.82	4.27	.05
PR	4.39	4.22	4.33	4.37	ns

The critical difference occurs between the full professors and all other ranks on the "Roman Catholic" and "Catholic-Christian" statements. For the "Roman-Catholic" statement, all lower ranks differ widely from the professors. (Probabilities are less than .01 between each lower rank and the professors, respectively.) For the "Catholic-Christian" statement, the ranks of instructor and assistant professor also differ appreciably from the professors. However, no notable differences in attitudes on these statements exist between and among the three lower ranks.

The final variable to be considered is that of academic disciplinary identification. Respondents were grouped into the three broad areas of the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. The selected disciplines of English and history comprise the humanities; sociology and economics comprise the social sciences; and biology and physics comprise the natural

sciences. In addition, the discipline of theology completed the disciplinary sampling.

Table 13 presents results on the identity statements according to the broad academic fields of the respondents.[1]

TABLE 13

DEFINITIONS--RESPONDENTS BY ACADEMIC FIELDS

	Human. (202)	Soc. Sc. (121)	Nat. Sc. (133)	Prob.	Theol. (79)
RC	3.35	2.91	3.41	.05	3.36
CC	4.01	3.41	3.53	.01	4.32
PR	4.28	4.35	4.56	ns	3.96

It is apparent that the social science respondents are least favorable to the "Roman Catholic" statement and differ appreciably from the humanities and natural science respondents. (Probabilities are less than .05, respectively.) However, humanities faculty (and theologians) are substantially in favor of the "Catholic-Christian" statement. (Probabilities are less than .001 and .01, comparing humanities with social sciences and natural sciences, respectively.) No appreciable differences occur for the "Professional" statement between the three academic fields.

[1]Scores for theologians are given for comparison purposes. They were not included, however, in the analysis of variance applied to the three academic fields.

Summary for Identity Statements

Of the three identity positions, respondents tended to agree most positively with the "Professional" statement. Not only was agreement consistently high among the various referent groups, but least often on this statement was there a statistically significant difference between the mean scores for the groups. Since this statement sought to emphasize professionalism without religious overtones, one inference from the results seems clear. This is that faculty in Catholic colleges are insisting that their colleges are indeed professional, full-fledged institutions of higher learning. In a word, it is "college" that receives the primary emphasis.

However, the three identity positions, as oft mentioned, are not mutually exclusive. A primary emphasis does not exclude other, presumably compatible, orientations. Thus, high favorability is also given to the "Catholic-Christian" statement. In particular, the idea of Christian witness from a scholarly community is rated with special favorability by religious faculty of all ages. It is on this statement that substantive differences appear between the religious faculty and the lay faculty. While religious agree more with the Christian-oriented statement than with the religiously-neutral "professional" one, lay faculty reverse this pattern.

There appears little doubt, however, where the respondents stand with regard to the "Roman Catholic"

statement. With its suggestion of a close association between the Roman Catholic Church and the Catholic college (the "agent of the Church" role), the statement was given only a barely favorable acceptance by most referent groups. Some groups, such as the "None" group in religious preference, simply rejected the statement out-of-hand. But groups that, on the whole, approved did so with consistently the lowest mean scores among the identity statements.

Throughout the statistical analysis, two different response patterns were generally evident. In one pattern, the "Professional" statement receives an almost unequivocal endorsement; the "Catholic-Christian" receives somewhat less, but still a relatively substantial acceptance; and the "Roman Catholic" statement receives a very limited approval, if not virtual rejection. In the other pattern, the "Catholic-Christian" statement receives the most approval as a rule. However, the "Professional" statement also receives a strong endorsement, while the "Roman Catholic" statement receives what is apparently a qualified approval on the whole.

When these patterns are examined in terms of the referent groups, it is possible to dichotomize significant groupings, as the following outline shows.

Pattern One	Pattern Two
Universities (especially the doctoral-level)	Colleges (especially the women's colleges)
Laymen and laywomen	Priests and Sisters

Under 50 in age	Over 50 in age
Protestants and "None"	Catholics
Social and Natural Sciences	Humanities and Theology
Instructors, assistant professors, and associate professors	Professors
Graduates of non-Catholic colleges and universities	Graduates of Catholic colleges and universities

These patterns based upon observation of the data only represent trends. The "fit" is not unequivocably perfect for each referent group or subgroup.

It seems apparent, however, that the referent groups in Pattern One appear to be more liberal in the sense that their responses to the identity statements are closer to what could be expected of secular professionalism. It would be a gross exaggeration to imply that these referent groups view religion as being irrelevant in the academic context. Yet, on the whole, the results indicate that the pattern of responses for these groups does approach such a secularized view of academia.

For the referent groups in Pattern Two, inferences from the data are harder to draw. The focus for these groups is professionalism, also. But clearly religion is not irrelevant in their academic context. They are less liberal, if the reference point is secular professionalism in its narrowest and irreligious sense. Their responses suggest a strong stance on the Christian dimension of their colleges along with professionalism, broadly defined.

All generalizations are, of course, hazardous to make. None of the foregoing can be regarded in any way as conclusive. What is needed to supplement the previous discussion are the opinions of faculty, themselves, expressed in their own language and reflecting their own thinking.

Respondents' Comments to the Identity Issue

The questionnaire provided space for respondents to make their own written personal observations and remarks. Most did so, with their comments ranging from brief expressions of opinion to lengthy position statements.[1]

The following discussion presents an impressionistic survey, including some direct quotations. The intent is simply to provide a "feeling" for the diversity in points of view found among faculty, though quotations were carefully selected to represent a set of similarly-oriented remarks.

Coming almost entirely from priests and sisters are expressions of firm commitment to the "Catholic" dimension of the college. Many of these opinions are of the either/or type. For example,

---

[1]Written comments were classified by a content analysis based upon a continuum of religious orientation--from a strong religious emphasis to that of neutral or negative religious emphasis. It was surprisingly easy to sort comments into groups of similar frames of reference, although there were some 400 separate remarks.

> When and if Catholic colleges give up commitment to Catholic ideals--theology and Thomistic philosophy--they abandon the fundamental reason for existence and they should close up business.
> (Priest, university, history, age: 50's)

Respondents of similar views as that above expressed their remarks in all-or-none categories, such as: "You are with me or against me," or "If it is not a Catholic college, then it has no reason to exist." The fundamental issue is apparently perceived in terms of a conflict between the sacred and the profane. The issue is not limited to Catholics, however; an older Protestant faculty member writes:

> This is one of the most crucial questions of modern times: Can a college serve two masters, the academic and the spiritual? Experience has shown that most Protestant colleges have been unable to do so, and Catholic colleges seem to be moving in the same direction.
> (Layman, university, economics, age: 50's)

Some respondents, however, disagree with any notion of a restrictive Catholic identification. One comments: "The Catholic college should not be a tool of the Roman Catholic Church." This negative view towards ecclesial orientation is shared by others, as the following two comments illustrate:

> The Catholic college is not primarily a pastoral arm of the Church. Less so is the Catholic university. You get into dialectic trouble whenever you put an adjective in front of "university," just as you do when you put an adjective in front of "Catholic."
> (Priest, university, English, age: 50's)

> The Catholic college should not be a funnel for hierarchical commands and/or viewpoints. Its value commitment ought to be based on intellectual inquiry and openness to the best in religious and cultural tradition.
> (Priest, college, theology, age: 40's)

In what is apparently their interpretation of the "Catholic-Christian" statement, some respondents place emphasis on a Christian witness exemplified by the personal life-styles of individuals in the academic community. For example,

> Not every individual member of the community must personally share the Christian commitment; rather, the life style of the community at large must exemplify such commitment, as it works through the pure professional ideals of the academic profession. Thus, an honest agnostic could be a valued, full-fledged member of such a community at large. On the other hand, an old-fashioned rationalist, for whom all religious commitment reflects only ignorant superstition, would not seem to have a place at such a Catholic college, no matter how good his academic credentials might be.
> (Layman, university, economics, age: 40's)

Similar to the above view, there is a strong focus on the total value environment or atmosphere. The following two comments reflect this concern by respondents.

> I believe in Catholic higher education as providing a Christian atmosphere where all academic disciplines, including theology, are presented in a highly professional way with very effective teachers who lead the students to fully respond in freedom to the Gospel message of the Beatitudes.
> (Sister, college, theology, age: 40's)

> In addition to the purely academic, the Catholic college has for its concern the establishment of a true Christian community--an environment and atmosphere of mutual love and fraternal concern which, at the same time, instill an incentive to transform a sick society.
> (Priest, university, theology, age: 30's)

It appears that faculty who emphasize a personalist orientation for the meaning of the Catholic college also may perceive a narrow vocationalism in the current standards of professionalism. The following comment is

particularly blunt, but it seems representative of an attitude found among younger faculty, both lay and religious.

> If I have any understanding of what student protest is about, it is precisely that "professionalism" which your questionnaire so obviously accepts as valuable. "Professionalism" is egocentric pursuit of supposedly value-free research--which produces grantsmen, germ warfare research, and moral quietism in public affairs. Catholic colleges could offer a point of resistance to all that (they don't, but you asked for "ought")--but only if staffed and led by men and women whose commitment to "profession" and "man" is bracketed in the pursuit of Christ. (Layman, university, English, age: 30's)

A substantial number of faculty, however, chose to make it clear that these institutions are primarily colleges. Religious distinctiveness is apparently a secondary or additive consideration. The following two comments suggest this point of view.

> We are academic and educational <u>first</u> and "Catholic" second. Students come for a secular <u>college</u> education, not for seminary theology training. (Layman, college, biology, age: 50's)

> A Catholic college should first of all be a college. This means an emphasis on scholarship and all that implies. What should be unique about a Catholic college is that it should have a strong department of religious studies where true scholarship exists. (Layman, university, biology, age: 40's)

Perhaps closer to the religiously-neutral end of the spectrum of opinion are those faculty who stress pluralism and are apparently fearful of any missionary or indoctrinal purpose to be associated with the Catholic college. Again, two comments delineate this focus by some respondents.

> The Catholic college should be a community of scholars, not necessarily Christian, seeking truth. These institutions should never serve as propaganda agencies for any point of view. Nor is evangelism a valid function of these institutions, especially in view of the substantive federal funds made available to them. Providing choice is essential in maintaining vitality in higher education in the United States.
> (Layman, university, history, 30's)

> No college ought to be a vehicle of sectarian propaganda. The pluralism which is America's great strength should also infect Catholic institutions.
> (Layman, college, theology, age: 20's)

Finally, a few comments simply disavowed, apparently, any distinctive function for the Catholic college. For example:

> I can see no difference in the role of a Catholic college or of a private or state college in society.
> (Layman, university, economics, age: 40's)

One impression, however, dominates all others. This is that the respondents do not believe there is an essential incompatibility or irreconcilability between "Catholic" and "college." Put another way, while faculty differ considerably in the perspectives they chose to emphasize in their remarks, most would agree that the Catholic college has or ought to have a distinctive presence among American institutions of higher learning. The following selected comment from a Jewish professor illustrates well this impression.

> I find nothing incompatible between being a devoted Christian, Roman Catholic, Christian witness, or what have you, and being a serious dedicated scholar-teacher in search of truth. The only incompatibility comes when one is so dedicated to a particular position that he is unwilling to listen to other points of view or to accept members into the

> community who have other points of view. In other words, Roman Catholicism, practiced in a restrictive, and parochial sense is antithetical to the idea of a university. Fortunately, at _____ University, Roman Catholicism is practiced in its best sense and enhances the dedication of its faculty. (Layman, university, English, age: 20's)

Whatever the difficulties of formulating a "definition" or of identifying the nature of a Catholic college or university, it seems safe to say that, by and large, most faculty are convinced that the religious dimension contributes effective meaning to the college or university. From the remarks of the respondents, at least, no conclusion could be drawn that these institutions represent a religiously moribund subculture on the road to total secularization.

Theology Requirements

Almost all Catholic colleges are typified by the centrality of theological studies, usually as part of the prescribed curriculum. In this, Catholic institutions follow the suasive argument of John Henry Newman that a true university cannot exclude religious doctrine as a legitimate body of knowledge.

To obtain, indirectly at least, the opinions of faculty on the importance of theology to the Catholic college, a vignette was phrased which pertained to the subject of compulsory theology requirements.

This vignette (Part IV of the questionnaire) is as follows:

> A policy committee for Catholic College is debating a possible change in compulsory requirements

for theology.

> Group A argues to retain the requirements, subject to some revisions. Since students have chosen to attend this college, they should expect to be exposed to the total range of values important for true human development. As long as the courses are taught liberally, theology should be a necessary part of the liberal arts core for all students, non-Catholic and Catholic. For a college committed to the exploration of ultimate values, waiving requirements raises a more serious question on goals than the fact of requirements.
>
> Group B argues for the abolition of requirements. Though students have chosen the college, they tend to be conditioned to equate theology with the catechism and, worse, with Catholicity, itself, an attitude strengthened by waiving requirements for non-Catholics. When the young today show such seriousness about personal freedom and value-commitments, the intellectual approach to theological truth needs broad encouragement and college goals are better served by not requiring theology courses.
>
> Assume your opinion is needed; would you prefer the position of Group A or Group B?

Group A's position was meant to suggest the traditional view of theology in Newmanian terms and raised the issue that excluding non-Catholics from the requirements would, if practiced, be illogical or inconsistent for a college committed to a religious orientation.[1]

Group B's position, on the other hand, argues for a non-coercive approach to theology. Partly, the argument is pragmatic, playing upon dissatisfactions found among students. But there is also the suggestion that theology, when required, may not be consonant with the academic

---

[1]For a similar view, see, William J. Sullivan, "Theology for Undergraduates," America CXXI (November, 1969), pp. 463-466.

character of the institution. This is not to assert that theology is not a legitimate discipline, but that requirements imply an indoctrination into specific confessional beliefs, whether or not such is actually done.

Respondents were asked to check whether they definitely or probably favored Group A's position or Group B's position. Percentage comparisons of responses for the total sample and for the religious and lay respondents are given by collapsing the "definite" and "probable" categories into a preference for one or the other position.[1]

Of 528 respondents to the vignette, 302 (57 percent) favored the position of Group A on maintaining the requirements and 226 (43 percent) preferred the position of Group B on abolition of requirements.

Among the religious and lay respondents, however, a decidely greater preference was given by the religious to maintaining the requirements. Group A's position was favored by 141 religious faculty (69 percent of 205 respondents) and by 165 lay faculty (50 percent of 327 respondents). Group B's position was preferred by only 64 religious respondents (31 percent) and by 162 lay respondents (50 percent).

In the either/or situation of the vignette, the forced-choice response as indicated by the percentages does not adequately account for the qualifications made

---

[1]Detailed statistical analyses of responses on the variables are omitted for the vignettes in order to emphasize the written comments made by many respondents.

by faculty to the issue. Having requirements, after all, is a curricular issue, unrelated by itself to the centrality of theology in the Catholic college. Thus, some respondents explained their choice by stating that if the college did have prescribed courses, in one form or another for liberal arts, then theology had every right to be included. However, many respondents did address written comments to the importance and position of theology for the Catholic college. A sampling of these remarks now follow.[1]

For some respondents, the compulsory requirements for theology are linked to the nature and purpose of a Catholic college. The following comments are representative.

> No requirements make the college's church affiliation trivial.
> (Layman, college, theology, age: 50's)

> A private school exists for a purpose! Why water down our objectives. For those who want to study anything--go to a state school--our very existence depends upon our values transferred to the young!
> (Layman, university, economics, age: 50's)

> On the undergraduate level, I don't always think that the student is capable of knowing how badly he or she needs a solid theology course. If the course content is of high quality, I think the "catechism idea" will be substantially weakened and the student will be helped to grow toward Christian adulthood.
> (Sister, college, biology, age: 20's)

> A distinction must be made between theology as an academic discipline and the Christian commitment and spirit of the college. There is an interaction

---

[1]Comments in the form of direct quotations were selected to represent the range of opinion, as well as those opinions which seemed to typify the view of many respondents.

> here and the religious objectives of the college require the fusing of the curricular and co- or extra-curricular activities. Otherwise, a kind of bifurcated, split personality results. We must return to the rationale for the Catholic college. Not merely education, but education infused with religious objectives.
> (Priest, university, history, age: 40's)

A number of comments concerned the quality of theology courses, while otherwise favorable to the position of Group A. The following remark is a more mild criticism of theology departments.

> This position A would be contingent upon a concerted effort by the college to improve the theology department. If compulsory theology meant subjecting the students to the usual band of rejects and retreads, I would be against it. But in principle, I am for theology--otherwise why should the church spend its energy trying to run a state school in all but name?
> (Layman, university, history, age: 20's)

Somewhat of an educational compromise was offered by some faculty who favored an elective system within the framework of a general requirement. For example:

> I would not abolish the courses entirely, but would allow free choice to complete a required number of credit hours. The courses might be offered on a Pass-Fail basis. If all courses were optional, professors would endeavor to make their particular offering as interesting and relevant as possible. Students really are looking for human values, and a theology course rightly taught so that students would be voluntarily attracted to it would be an answer to their seeking.
> (Sister, college, English, age: 70's)

Among respondents favoring the position of Group B, the abolition of compulsory theology was seen by some as a means of furthering interest in theology. For example:

> I would, however, try to offer excellent contemporary theology courses, taught by post-Vatican II theologians. My experience suggests that students will elect courses

> in numbers that will approach and perhaps exceed reasonable requirements of the past.
> (Sister, college, English, age: 50's)

> I have found that students highly resent theology requirements for various reasons. I believe that, given their own choices, they would definitely take theology courses. Kids are searching; they do not want prefabricated, forced ideas.
> (Layman, university, biology, age: 30's)

A few respondents stressed an ecumenical approach for a non-compulsory program in theology, as indicated by these comments:

> I'd like to see a theology department where Jews teach the Hebrew tradition; a Quaker, a course in pacifism, etc.. All views--as many as feasible--taught by those <u>who believe in them</u>.
> (Layman, university, English, age: 30's)

> Rather than requiring courses in "theology" (which generally means Catholic theology) a more "catholic" thing would be to teach comparative religion courses. This would give the student more universal education than does the inward-looking "theology" courses.
> (Layman, university, physics, age: 20's, non-Catholic)

As could be expected, some respondents were decidely antagonistic towards theology requirements. The following are representative.

> Let the new Catholic theological professor enter the forum like other professors and win a hearing from students who already resent the badgering they received in previous classrooms at primary and secondary levels, some of it as incompetent and incorrect as it was authoritarian and paternalistic.
> (Priest, university, English, age: 50's)

> Theology courses required turn more students off of religion in general than all the atheism in the world.
> (Layman, university, sociology, age: 20's)

One sweeping impression was drawn from the written comments of respondents--almost none questioned the place of theology in the curriculum and it seems reasonable to conclude that faculty in Catholic colleges

acknowledge a paramount relationship between the Catholic college and its department of theology. While substantial numbers of respondents would favor abolition of compulsory theology courses, such action was interpreted as strengthening the academic character of the college.[1] It is possible, of course, that some faculty perceive abolishing requirements as a means of gaining academic respectability, vis-à-vis the secular "leaders" of American higher education. There is nothing in the data, however, to suggest this is true.

Conclusion

The results on the identity issue have indicated substantial areas of agreement and disagreement among the respondents. There is a consensus that the Catholic college has a primary professional identity. The disagreements reflect the stances held by faculty toward the extent and character of the religious commitment. As a generalization, it seems true that the respondents regard the religious dimension of the Catholic college to be important and valuable, but not to the extent of mitigating the more essential educational values of the college. The academic expression of religious values should, in other words, be thoroughly professional.

Overall, faculty favored the "definition" of a

---

[1]Some Catholic colleges, including two or three in the sample, have or are considering abolishing theology requirements. Whether or not this is an indication of a trend is difficult to say.

Catholic college as a scholarly Christian community. This concept implies a basic congruence among the values shared by the members of the community. One value which is not shared by many respondents would link the Catholic college and the Catholic church in a close association.

The disagreements found among faculty subgroups are of particular interest, since these splits in opinion can have important consequences for Catholic higher education. For example, if theology is not considered a specifically Catholic area of study, more colleges are likely to reduce or abolish compulsory requirements in favor of elective and more ecumenical programs. In such cases, the role and influence, even numbers, of religious faculty will be strongly affected by the position a college takes towards its degree of Catholicity.

The next chapter delineates faculty attitudes more sharply by focusing on the perspective of ideological professionalism. The issue of academic freedom is raised and an assessment is made of faculty opinion towards specifically Catholic norms as distinct from others more generally held in academia.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE IDEOLOGICAL ISSUE

The problem of meaning for the Catholic college has been stated as the extent to which it will accommodate the prevailing ideological posture of American academia. Specifically, it is professionalism as a set of beliefs undergirding and influencing what academic men and women say and do which becomes the focus of this chapter.

The term "ideology" is used in the broad sense of a cognitive system which justifies or rationalizes behavior.[1] There is no way, however, to prove or to disprove the truth of an ideology. Moreover, of those who do "believe," individuals will still differ in the degree of their "faith" in the ideology.

This chapter analyzes the responses of faculty in Catholic colleges to statements deemed to be weighted heavily with the overtones of ideological professionalism. The purpose is to distinguish the referent groups of the hypotheses according to their relative position on a hypothetical continuum of professional beliefs.

The first part of this chapter examines the

---

[1]See, Joseph B. Cooper and James L. McGaugh, Integrating Principles of Social Psychology (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1963), pp. 240-4.

attitudes of respondents with respect to the issue of academic freedom in Catholic colleges. This issue is not whether academic freedom exists, an almost meaningless question, but, rather, the relative stance of respondents towards the ideological underpinnings of the concept of academic freedom. The second part clarifies this issue further by exploring their opinions on the posture the Catholic college has or should have towards the personal beliefs and values of its faculty. Finally, two vignettes are presented and discussed; one, relating to faculty selection, and the other, relating to an academic freedom "case" in a Catholic college. Written expositions of opinion made by respondents to the vignettes are used to complete and clarify the conclusions reached.

The Ideology Statements

In its common meaning, academic freedom is the right of a scholar-teacher to investigate the problems of his discipline and to disseminate the knowledge of his discipline through his writings and instruction of students.[1] His scholarly freedom is guaranteed from interference by extra-academic authority, though his methods and conclusions are subject to the judgement of his professional peers.

---

[1] An excellent discussion of the meaning of academic freedom in relation to Catholic colleges is given by Edward Manier. See his introduction to, Edward Manier and John W. Houck, eds., Academic Freedom and the Catholic University (Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, Inc., 1967), pp. 1-22.

The above is an ideal statement, presenting the image of a detached, impartial, and autonomous scholarship in an atmosphere free from all restraints except those necessary to further a climate of critical inquiry and instruction. The concept of academic freedom is a transcendent idea which incorporates a mode of reaching truth that is forever inquiring about truth and never content that truth has been exhausted. Walter Metzger, as quoted previously, contends the critical assumption of academic freedom to be: ". . . all beliefs are tentatively true or tentatively false, and only verifiable through a continuous process of inquiry . . . ."[1]

It can be assumed that college faculty are generally familiar with the ideological presuppositions of academic freedom. The research design presumed this familiarity. Thus, the following statements were presented to the subjects in order to explore their general attitudes towards the ideological character of academic professionalism.[2]

Statement 1

A modern Catholic college can accept, without restrictions, the philosophy of academic freedom espoused by the AAUP. (Agree)

Of the 551 respondents, 457 (83 percent) agreed

---

[1]Metzger, op. cit., p. 90.

[2]Statements are followed by "Agree" or "Disagree" to indicate the direction of coding and scoring of responses. For the percentage figures given, the categories of "Agree" and "Agree Somewhat" are combined. Similarly, "Disagree" and "Disagree Somewhat" are combined.

with the above proposition. It can be considered that these faculty accept the thinking of the American Association of University Professors on academic freedom. In particular, the strong agreement suggests that these faculty do not accept the so-called "restrictive clause," whereby church-related colleges could limit academic freedom because of religious or other aims.

Statement 2

> Classroom discussions that raise disturbing controversy over religious beliefs, should, at the very least, be watched carefully by the administration. (Disagree)

This somewhat biased statement was rejected by 468 respondents (85 percent). In general terms at least, the right to discuss controversial issues without the administration's possibly censorious concern is strongly supported by the respondents.

Statement 3

> For the scholar in any discipline, all beliefs are tentatively true or tentatively false and subject to continuous inquiry for verification. (Agree)

This paraphrase of Metzger's critical assumption was agreed with by 435 respondents (79 percent). The endorsement is a bit misleading, however, since some respondents qualified their agreement by annotations such as "except for religious beliefs" or "not theology, of course." It is not possible, however, to say how many respondents "held back" religious beliefs from their approval of the statement. Apparently, some wished for a clearer distinction between religious faith and perhaps

the scholarly inquiry into the nature of such faith. But agreement is high, nonetheless.

Statement 4

> Students should be allowed to invite and to hear any person of their own choosing for public discussions on campus. (Agree)

Agreeing with this proposition were 424 respondents (77 percent). The statement extends the concept of academic freedom to students and implies an "open" campus. Despite the political overtones this statement might bring on college campuses today, this ideological extension of academic freedom was accepted favorably by most respondents.

Statement 5

> To be a "critic of society" a college must assert its freedom from all authority, be it clerical or lay. (Agree)

This idealized statement was accepted by 325 respondents (59 percent). As expected, some objected to the apparent exclusivity. As one respondent wrote: "I know what you mean, but I wish you didn't say 'all.'" Nonetheless, the ideological premise of no extra-academic interference in the affairs of a college or university seems obvious enough.

The five statements are now presented in table form with discussion according to the subgroups of the referent hypotheses.[1] The original statements, however,

---

[1]The procedure is the same as with the identity statements. Mean scores for each subgroup are based on the five-point scale of Agree to Disagree. The direction of coding is indicated by an "A" or "D" following each abbreviated statement.

are shortened in the tables to their keywords for ease of table preparation and conciseness.

Table 14 presents the mean scores of the respondent subgroups for the institutional divisions.

TABLE 14

ACADEMIC FREEDOM--RESPONDENTS BY INSTITUTIONS

	Univ.		Colleges			
	Doct. (181)	Mast. (99)	Men (73)	Coed (90)	Women (108)	Prob.
Accept philosophy of AAUP (A)	4.40	4.55	4.20	4.39	4.26	ns
Watch disturbing discussions (D)	4.44	4.22	4.27	4.41	4.38	ns
All beliefs tentative (A)	4.28	3.99	4.21	4.28	3.97	ns
Students invite any person (A)	4.17	4.04	3.62	3.80	3.83	.01
Freedom from all ext. authority (A)	3.63	3.44	3.13	3.63	2.81	.001

The first three statements in Table 14 meet with a high degree of similar responses from all subgroups of faculty. The philosophy of academic freedom for Catholic colleges is endorsed. Likewise, and to the same degree, the putative watchfulness of administrations over controversial discussions is rejected. For the critical assumption of academic freedom, the tentative nature of belief, the endorsement, although high, begins to suggest some reservations held by faculty.

With the last two statements, appreciable differences exist. Student freedom to invite speakers

receives substantial approval only from university-level faculty. (Probability is less than .01 between university and college faculty.) But the final statement on freedom from extra academic authority receives the least support at all institutional levels. Faculty in women's colleges virtually reject the statement. (Probabilities between women's colleges and each other college category are less than .01, respectively.)

It appears evident that these faculty in Catholic colleges do accept in principle the ideological generalizations of academic freedom. Yet, the differences that exist on the issues of student academic freedom and of institutional autonomy are, at least, suggestive of some deeply-held reservations. Considering the range of institutional types, however, the mean scores shown in Table 14 demonstrate that the widest disagreements, proportionately, exist between the doctoral-level faculty and those in the women's colleges.

Table 15 shows the mean scores of the important subgroups, lay and religious faculty. As shown in Table 15, the theoretical acceptance of academic freedom receives high agreement from each of the referent groups, while all other issues display a notable range in the degree of opinion expressed. Specifically, the differences are between lay faculty and religious faculty. (Probabilities for mean differences between lay and religious faculty are less than .01 on the philosophy of academic freedom statement and less than .001 on each of the other

statements.)

TABLE 15

ACADEMIC FREEDOM--RESPONDENTS BY STATUS

	Laymen (289)	Laywomen (48)	Sisters (94)	Priests (120)	Prob.
Accept philosophy of AAUP (A)	4.48	4.47	4.24	4.17	ns
Watch disturbing discussions (D)	4.52	4.49	4.18	4.07	.001
All beliefs tentative (A)	4.49	4.58	3.93	3.32	.001
Students invite any person (A)	4.11	4.44	3.46	3.74	.001
Freedom from all ext. authority (A)	3.61	3.34	2.70	3.30	.001

On none of the statements are laymen and laywomen appreciably different and only on the critical assumption, beliefs tentative, do sisters and priests appreciably differ. (Probability is less than .01 between sisters and priests on the critical assumption.) Overall, it appears that lay faculty are more accepting of these specific issues related to academic freedom than are religious faculty.

Like status, age has already been found to be a critical variable. Table 16 presents mean scores of respondents by age groupings.

From Table 16 it can be observed that the younger the faculty member, the more likely a higher response in the expected directions for each of the academic freedom statements. Conversely, it is the older faculty, especially

TABLE 16

ACADEMIC FREEDOM--RESPONDENTS BY AGE

	20-29 (65)	30-34 (101)	35-39 (79)	40-44 (70)	45-49 (56)	50-59 (107)	60-Over (55)	Prob.
Accept philosophy of AAUP (A)	4.33	4.58	4.47	4.39	4.44	4.29	3.90	.05
Watch disturbing discussions (D)	4.70	4.82	4.78	4.38	4.50	4.05	2.98	.001
All beliefs tentative (A)	4.77	4.36	4.39	4.40	4.26	3.62	3.43	.001
Students invite any person (A)	4.48	4.28	4.30	4.20	3.98	3.34	2.96	.001
Freedom from ext. authority (A)	3.83	3.76	3.85	3.10	3.53	2.81	2.56	.001

those over-60, who seem to display the most reservation by lower proportionate responses to the statements. A rough line of division can be drawn between those faculty who have not reached their mid-40's and those older.

Table 17 further details the age distinction by including a separation of religious and lay responses.

In general, Table 17 shows that the younger the faculty member, religious or lay, the statements have a greater degree of endorsement in the coded directions than older faculty, religious or lay. Moreover, within the age brackets, appreciable differences are not found with the one exception of the statement concerning the critical assumption of academic freedom. Here, religious and lay respondents differ substantially. (Probabilities are less than .001 between religious and lay for both the 40-49 and 50-plus age groups.) It seems fair to assume that the middle and older groups of religious are particularly critical of the statement's implication that religious beliefs could be tentative.

On these statements, then, religious and lay respondents are generally more alike each other within the respective age groupings; however, religious faculty appear somewhat less supportive of the statements, at least when the magnitude of their mean responses is compared with lay faculty.[1]

---

[1]Observation of Table 17 shows that religious faculty are generally lower than lay faculty in mean responses within age groups, although these differences are not statistically significant, with the exception of the beliefs-tentative statement.

TABLE 17

ACADEMIC FREEDOM--RESPONDENTS BY STATUS AND AGE

	20-39		40-49		50-over		Prob.
	Rel. (55)	Lay (182)	Rel. (55)	Lay (73)	Rel. (96)	Lay (64)	
Accept philosophy of AAUP (A)	4.27	4.55	4.35	4.43	4.04	4.32	.05
Watch disturbing discussions (D)	4.77	4.79	4.46	4.40	3.53	3.92	.001
All beliefs tentative (A)	4.29	4.52	3.87	4.71	3.07	4.24	.001
Students invite any person (A)	4.15	4.39	3.91	4.27	3.10	3.36	.001
Freedom from all ext. authority (A)	3.49	3.92	3.13	3.39	2.67	2.80	.001

The self-reported religious preferences of the respondents are likely to clarify the supposition that differences on the ideological issues have roots based on attitudes towards a religious belief system. Table 18 shows the mean scores by religious preference.

TABLE 18

ACADEMIC FREEDOM--RESPONDENTS BY RELIGION

	Catholics (411)	Protestants (54)	None (34)	Prob.
Accept philosophy of AAUP (A)	4.32	4.38	4.73	ns
Watch disturbing discussions (D)	4.27	4.54	4.79	.05
All beliefs tentative (A)	3.98	4.56	4.97	.001
Students invite any person (A)	3.80	4.33	4.56	.001
Freedom from all ext. authority (A)	3.19	3.85	3.85	.01

The Catholic group, religious and lay faculty, evidently give the least approval of all towards the ideological direction of the five statements in Table 18. On all but the first statement, the Catholic response is proportionately much less than the Protestants. (Probabilities are less than .05, .01, .01, and .01 for the latter four statements in order.) The same is true between the Catholics and the "None" group of faculty. (Probabilities are less than .05, .001, .01, and .05 for the latter four statements.)

With such wide differences between the religious

groupings, it appears apparent that the religious factor is of substantial influence. In a rough generalization, a divergence of attitudes towards the ideological values of professionalism seems to separate faculty along the lines of religious preference.

Further support for the above view comes from consideration of the institutions from which the respondents received their highest degrees. Table 19 presents the mean scores of respondents according to the Catholic or non-Catholic institutional source of their undergraduate and graduate degrees.

Examination of both parts of Table 19 suggests that it makes little difference whether the undergraduate or graduate source of degrees held by respondents is considered. However, the distinction in degree source is related to the known characteristics of the respondent sample in that almost all of the religious faculty attended Catholic colleges, while only one-half of the lay faculty did so. For the graduate institutions, about 30 percent of the lay and 65 percent of the religious received their highest degrees from Catholic universities. Thus, while the Catholic institution graduates are more reserved in their acceptance of the ideological statements than the non-Catholic institution graduates, the difference appears largely a religious-lay distinction.

Table 20 examines the group scores of respondents according to academic ranks attained.

TABLE 19

ACADEMIC FREEDOM--RESPONDENTS BY DEGREE SOURCES

	Undergraduate			Graduate		
	Cath. (366)	Non-Cath. (184)	Prob.	Cath. (227)	Non-Cath. (305)	Prob.
Accept philosophy of AAUP (A)	4.38	4.38	ns	4.33	4.41	ns
Watch disturbing discussions (D)	4.27	4.54	.01	4.18	4.49	.01
All beliefs tentative (A)	3.89	4.68	.001	3.82	4.39	.001
Students invite any person (A)	3.79	4.27	.001	3.71	4.14	.001
Freedom from all ext. authority (A)	3.19	3.73	.001	3.09	3.60	.001

TABLE 20

ACADEMIC FREEDOM--RESPONDENTS BY RANKS

	Inst. (115)	Assist. (183)	Assoc. (120)	Prof. (123)	Prob.
Accept philosophy of AAUP (A)	4.10	4.54	4.77	4.31	.05
Watch disturbing discussions (D)	4.61	4.57	4.38	3.81	.001
All beliefs tentative (A)	4.51	4.21	3.96	3.95	.01
Students invite any person (A)	4.29	4.11	3.92	3.42	.001
Freedom from all ext. authority (A)	3.34	3.59	3.39	3.06	ns

An over-all assessment of respondent opinions by professional ranks reveals, as shown in Table 20, an expected higher degree of ideological approval among the lower-ranked faculty than among the higher. The instructors, however, do show a surprisingly low approval relative to the other ranks on the statement concerning the philosophy of academic freedom.[1] (Probabilities are less than .01 between instructors and assistant professors and less than .05 between instructors and associate professors.)

The professors, on the other hand, are notable relative to the other ranks in their low approval of the statement on student freedom. (Probabilities are less than .01 between professors and each other rank, respectively.)

[1]Some lower-ranked faculty did express evident cynicism with this statement. One wrote: "Catholic colleges should accept academic freedom, but they won't."

The pattern of scores by ranked faculty suggests differences by age distribution, but by no means a clear-cut "young" and "old" division of opinion. This seems particularly apparent by the proportionate responses with respect to institutional autonomy. All ranks on this statement give only a moderate degree of approval.

Finally, for this set of statements, Table 21 presents the scores of respondent according to their academic fields, including a specific mention of responses from the theologians in the sample.

The results indicate few appreciable differences among the disciplinary groupings. On the one statement concerning administrative watchfulness over controversial discussions, the natural scientists did give a lower proportionate degree of disapproval. (Probabilities are less than .01 between natural scientists and each other disciplinary group, respectively.) This may only suggest, however, that the scientists are least concerned with such problems.

Theologians, as a group, were not found to be different in their opinions on these issues, except for the low approval given by theologians to the statement on the critical assumption of academic freedom--that all beliefs are tentatively true or false. Again, the ambiguity of the religious implications of this statement seems most likely to have concerned the theologians. Generally speaking, then, the disciplinary divisions of the sample appear inconclusive for distinguishing

TABLE 21

ACADEMIC FREEDOM--RESPONDENTS BY ACADEMIC FIELDS

	Human. (202)	Soc. Sci. (121)	Nat. Sci. (133)	Prob.	Theology (79)
Accept philosophy of AAUP (A)	4.39	4.46	4.37	ns	4.28
Watch disturbing discussions (D)	4.46	4.45	4.05	.01	4.56
All beliefs tentative (A)	4.18	4.28	4.27	ns	3.80
Students invite any person (A)	3.93	4.07	3.83	ns	4.05
Freedom from all ext. authority (A)	3.46	3.23	3.28	ns	3.53

ideological attitudes.

With this analysis of the referent groups completed, a summary and discussion now follows.

Summary on Academic Freedom Attitudes

The set of statements previously examined explored attitudes towards the ideological values and presuppositions of academic freedom. It was found that the most generalized agreement among the respondents was given to two of the statements. First, that Catholic colleges can accept without restrictions the philosophy of academic freedom received a consistently high level of agreement from all referent groups. Second, that the administration should carefully watch classroom discussions raising disturbing controversy over religious beliefs received a generally high level of disagreement. This statement is mediated by the finding that the older respondents, particularly, were less emphatic in disagreeing.

Two other statements, the paraphrase of Metzger's critical assumption of academic freedom and the issue of student freedom to hear and to invite any speaker, received substantial agreement from university-level faculty, younger faculty, lay faculty, and from those who reported their religious preference as Protestant or "None." A considerably lower degree of agreement was found among college faculty, older faculty, religious, and Catholic faculty.

The statement concerning freedom from all extra-

academic authority clearly received a mixed response from all referent groups. Agreement was generally low with older faculty, both religious and lay, and the sister subgroup virtually rejected the statement.

Analysis of the pattern of responses suggests that these faculty in Catholic colleges accept, in principle, the concept of academic freedom with its ideological bases, but with some definite reservations directed at the absolutism of the postures presented. For example, it seems that the component of religious faith must be taken into account when considering the apparent conservative responses of religious faculty, and, probably, older lay faculty.[1] But, on some issues, such as student freedom to hear speakers and freedom from all extra-academic authority, the words "any" and "all" in these statements, respectively, were apparently sufficient to dissuade many respondents from agreeing. Here the perspective would appear to be more of a political character, in the sense that the day-to-day reality of many colleges and universities does not allow conformance to the more idealistic notions of academic ideology.

The inference seems strong that the respondents accept the concept of academic freedom, as ideologically-

---

[1]Though religious beliefs, perhaps any belief properly so-called, cannot be verified by scientific inquiry. It would seem that the scholar, as scholar, does not make an absolute commitment to the truth or falsity of any belief. A theologian can hardly deny that God exists and still be a theologian. But to the extent that the theological premise is subject to scholarly inquiry from anyone else, the theologian remains open to the argumentation of the contrary premise.

interpreted, up to a point. This is another way of saying that academic freedom is a limited concept and subject to constraints. These constraints may be perceived as stemming from the religious character of the Catholic college, or they may simply reflect the view that no institution and individual can truly be autonomous anyway.

Faculty and the Central Thesis

The next part of this chapter continues the exploration of faculty beliefs and attitudes towards the ideology of professionalism. Specifically, the focus is on the Catholic college and the stance such an institution should have with respect to the personal beliefs and values of individual faculty.

The central thesis of this study has argued that a college with a defined philosophic orientation ought to select faculty who are in accord with the related goals and objectives of the college. Selection of faculty who share such common purpose and commitment is, at least, consonant with the exercise of religious freedom.[1]

Religious freedom, however, is not the same as academic freedom. Hence, the thesis does not imply that the Catholic college must limit the academic freedom of its faculty to teach positions contrary to the philosophic commitments of the college. Nor does the thesis imply that the Catholic college must or should exclude faculty who do not share its peculiarly religious or philosophic values.

---

[1]See, David Fellman, "Academic Freedom and the American Political Ethos," in Academic Freedom and the Catholic University, op. cit., pp. 76-77.

But if a distinctive identity is to be maintained in any meaningful manner, the Catholic college must be concerned with the selection and retention of faculty who do acknowledge or accept the basic value commitments for which the institution presumably describes itself as "Catholic." What these commitments are and their extent will probably be a matter of self-definition by individual institutions. The presumption, however, is that the "committed" Catholic college does have a unique philosophic underpinning, even if ill-defined.

The set of statements, now described, explore faculty opinions on "Catholic character" and attempt to bring out some of the ramifications of this expression with respect to faculty, themselves.[1]

Statement 1

> Faculty who show serious and continuous disrespect for the Catholic character of the college should not be reappointed. (Agree)

Agreeing with this statement were 358 respondents (65 percent). The spirit of the statement can still be found today in the faculty handbooks of some Catholic colleges and universities and amounts to a definition of serious cause for the dismissal of a faculty member.

Statement 2

> The personal attitude of a faculty member towards Catholicism is not an important consideration for appointment, even if he should teach a "sensitive" discipline. (Agree)

---

[1]Presentation of results continues to follow the pattern and methods already used. "Agree" or "Disagree" in parentheses indicates the coded direction of the responses for the 551 respondents.

This statement found some written qualifications from respondents who agreed. The reservation was typically with respect to theology, though the qualifier "sensitive" was intended to include this discipline. Agreement was given by 348 respondents (63 percent).

Statement 3

> To be true to its purpose, a Catholic college has a right to question the personal beliefs of a faculty member if unusual circumstances warrant such action. (Disagree)

To this statement which perhaps strikes at the heart of a faculty member's personal values and convictions, 331 respondents disagreed (60 percent). Since this statement includes an extreme clause, "if unusual circumstances . . . ," it would seem that those who disagree are saying that no circumstances warrant such an invasion of individual rights.

Statement 4

> It is pointless for a Catholic college to maintain rules that insist faculty respect Catholic norms for teaching and/or conduct. (Agree)

Agreeing with this statement were 314 respondents (57 percent). Some respondents did object to the inclusion of the double concepts of teaching and conduct, questioning, in particular, whether there are Catholic norms for teaching. This is a legitimate objection. However, the general sense of the statement refers to the possible imposition of some uniquely Catholic standards. Whether such standards exist in some normative sense is part of the problem of meaning for the Catholic college.

Statement 5

There should be a definite policy on faculty selection to insure having faculty who share the distinctive values and objectives of a Catholic college. (Disagree)

This statement summarizes the central thesis that a philosophically-oriented college should select faculty who support the distinctive aims of the college. Disagreeing were 310 respondents (56 percent). This degree of divided opinion suggests that faculty are sharply separated in their views.

The methods and pattern of analysis already used are continued for the presentation of responses by the referent subgroups. Table 22 begins the specific analyses for the ideological issues related to faculty according to the institutional categories of the respondents.

Observation of the mean scores in Table 22 shows that, for the most part, only a moderate level of consensual agreement or disagreement can be found across the range of statements. This would appear indicative of substantial differences in opinion within the faculty subgroups, regardless of the institutional type.

However, university-level faculty do take a consistently "liberal" position in contrast to college-level faculty on three of the issues. The former agree substantially less with the non-reappointment of "disrespectful" faculty, disagree strongly with the questioning of personal beliefs, and disagree with the propriety of a definite faculty selection policy.

TABLE 22

FACULTY ISSUES--RESPONDENTS BY INSTITUTIONS

	Univ.		Colleges			Prob.
	Doct. (181)	Mast. (99)	Men (73)	Coed (90)	Women (108)	
No reappointment if serious disrespect (A)	3.31	3.67	4.04	3.48	4.03	.001
Personal attitude not important (A)	3.56	3.36	3.63	3.84	3.43	ns
Right to question beliefs (D)	3.90	3.45	3.17	3.09	3.31	.001
Catholic norms pointless (A)	3.54	3.14	2.86	3.78	3.18	.001
Policy on faculty selection (D)	3.59	3.26	3.25	3.29	2.74	.001

(Probabilities are less than .001, .01 and .01 between university and college respondents on each statement, respectively.)

Within the specific institutional categories, respondents from colleges for men and from women agree strongly with the inference that faculty should be respectful of the Catholic character of the college. But, in what is perhaps a most noticeable inconsistency, faculty in the women's colleges disagree, on one hand, with the questioning of the personal beliefs of faculty, though they agree with a definite policy of faculty selection to insure a consensus of shared beliefs. (On the latter statement, faculty in women's colleges differ from all other institutional categories by probabilities at least less than .05.)

It can be adduced that examination of responses by lay and religious status will reveal a wider set of differences on these issues, and, perhaps, clarify the seeming inconsistency pointed to.

Table 23 presents the mean scores of the respondent subgroups according to lay and religious status, including the differentiation by sex.

It is readily observed from Table 23 that wide differences exist between lay faculty and religious faculty on the statements. (Probabilities are less than .001 for each statement between lay and religious faculty, groups combined.) On the other hand, no appreciable differences in averaged opinion occur between laymen and laywomen or between sisters and priests.

TABLE 23

FACULTY ISSUES--RESPONDENTS BY STATUS

	Laymen (289)	Laywomen (48)	Sisters (94)	Priests (120)	Prob.
No reappointment if serious disrespect (A)	3.24	3.48	4.31	4.16	.001
Personal attitude not important (A)	3.77	3.96	3.16	3.16	.001
Right to question beliefs (D)	3.79	3.66	2.96	3.06	.001
Catholic norms pointless (A)	3.67	3.87	2.88	2.71	.001
Policy on faculty selection (D)	3.69	3.60	2.70	2.59	.001

Religious faculty tend to support or reject each statement from what appears to be a positive affirmation of the Catholic character of the college and its implicit norms and values. The contrast between religious and lay is particularly evident on the issues of maintaining rules respecting Catholic norms and on a faculty selection policy. On both issues, the polarized opinion is especially striking.

With respect to the right of a Catholic college to question the personal beliefs of a faculty member, albeit an unusual circumstance, the religious faculty give only a low degree of dissent, while tending to agree, on the whole, with the definite policy of faculty selection. This is virtually a consistent posture and helps to resolve the apparent inconsistency noted with the colleges for women.

since it is evident that the proportions of lay and religious faculty affect the averaged opinions.

It can be expected that the age variable will also produce wide differences in the results. Table 24 gives the mean scores of the respondents by age groups.

Observation of Table 24 shows an almost systematic change in the expressed opinions of the respondents according to age. Younger faculty appear particularly opposed to any suggestion that the Catholic college can or should impose on faculty some normative considerations based upon Catholicity. Older faculty, on the other hand, appear far more sympathetic to the institution's Catholic orientation and the concomitant implication of protecting its Catholicity.

A dividing line begins to appear with the early-40 age bracket; but with faculty of age 50 and up, the differences in opinion seem particularly acute in contrast with the younger respondents. Given these wide differences, it seems patently obvious that the younger and older faculty do not interpret Catholic institutional character with reference to faculty by the same ideological perspective.

By combining status with age, Table 25 enables a comparison of religious and lay respondents within the equivalent age groups.

The discrimination of religious and lay faculty by age groups shown in Table 25 gives evidence of two trends: (1) that younger faculty, religious and lay, differ

TABLE 24

FACULTY ISSUES--RESPONDENTS BY AGE

	20-29 (65)	30-34 (101)	35-39 (79)	40-44 (70)	45-49 (56)	50-59 (107)	60-over (55)	Prob.
No reappointment if serious disrespect (A)	2.84	2.99	3.30	3.69	3.85	4.24	4.64	.001
Personal attitudes not important (A)	3.88	3.93	3.86	3.74	3.30	3.30	2.69	.001
Right to question beliefs (D)	3.97	3.80	3.91	3.84	3.37	2.87	2.47	.001
Catholic norms pointless (A)	4.16	3.99	3.85	3.27	3.16	2.62	2.35	.001
Policy on faculty selection (D)	3.89	3.91	3.64	3.20	3.13	2.68	2.25	.001

TABLE 25

FACULTY ISSUES--RESPONDENTS BY STATUS AND AGE

	20-39		40-49		50-over		
	Rel. (55)	Lay (182)	Rel. (55)	Lay (73)	Rel. (96)	Lay (64)	Prob.
No reappointment if disrespect (A)	3.62	2.80	4.02	3.58	4.63	4.02	.001
Personal attitudes not important (A)	3.42	4.03	3.22	3.79	3.00	3.23	.001
Right to question beliefs (D)	3.61	3.96	3.44	3.78	2.39	3.24	.001
Catholic norms pointless (A)	3.55	4.11	3.00	3.42	2.32	2.84	.001
Policy on faculty selection (D)	3.34	3.97	2.73	3.50	2.23	2.98	.001

appreciably in their averaged responses from older faculty, religious and lay; and (2) that within the age brackets, the younger religious and the younger lay, as well as the older religious and the older lay, differ appreciably from each other.

The first trend simply confirms the impression that the older the respondents, religious or lay, they exhibit a greater concern for the Catholic character of the college. The second trend points to the generalization that religious faculty display a greater concern than lay faculty, even when due regard is given to age differentials. For example, the younger religious in the 20-39 age bracket gave responses to each statement which were the closest of all the religious to those of laymen generally. Yet, comparing these young religious with the equivalent group of lay faculty, a substantial difference in the degree of opinion expressed is evident for most of the statements. (Probabilities are less than .01 between youngest religious and lay groups on all statements, except for the "right to question beliefs." Difference in mean scores for the latter statement is statistically non-significant.)

In general, the youngest religious appear to occupy a position, ideologically-speaking, that is closer to the middle group of lay faculty by age, and not to their compeers by age. The younger lay faculty, however, appear to be more distinctive in having far less Catholic-orientation than any other subgroup, lay or religious, considered by age.

The religious preferences of the respondents offer another means of examining the ideological implications of these statements. Table 26 presents the mean scores of respondents by their self-reported religious preferences.

TABLE 26

FACULTY ISSUES--RESPONDENTS BY RELIGION

	Catholics (411)	Protestants (54)	None (34)	Prob.
No reappointment if disrespect (A)	3.90	3.28	2.34	.001
Personal attitudes not important (A)	3.34	4.20	4.35	.001
Right to question beliefs (D)	3.27	3.83	4.62	.001
Catholic norms pointless (A)	3.07	3.92	4.48	.001
Policy on faculty selection (D)	3.04	3.89	4.27	.001

Of the groups by religious preference, Table 26 shows those reported themselves as "None" clearly responded in most emphatic terms towards the statements. These faculty simply reject the proposition that faculty showing serious disrespect for the Catholic character of the college should not be reappointed, unlike the majority assent given by Catholics and Protestants. Also, the strong endorsement or rejection of the other statements suggests that the "None" group of faculty found little difficulty in deciding their positions on the statements.

The Protestants take a mid-way position between the Catholics and the "None" group of faculty on the

propositions that grant to the Catholic college the right to maintain religious norms. However, the Protestants are not appreciably different from the "None" group in considering attitudes towards Catholicism not important for appointment and in the rejection of a definite policy on faculty selection.

In general, while the Catholic faculty show a concern for the Catholic character of the college, the Protestants and the "None" group appear to display a greater concern that the Catholic character not intrude on the personal beliefs and values of individual faculty.

Table 27 presents results by the degree sources of the respondents which separate respondents by different educational socialization experiences.

The pattern of responses by degree sources in Table 27 shows generally the expected Catholic versus non-Catholic differences. These differences are, of course, related to the distributions of religious and lay faculty. Most noticeable, however, is the strong assent given by respondents who graduated from Catholic graduate schools on the statement that serious disrespect for the Catholic character of the college is a probable cause for non-reappointment of faculty. This group of respondents also appears to take a similarly consistent stand in virtually rejecting the idea that Catholic norms are pointless and in agreeing with a definite policy on faculty selection to insure the distinctive objectives and values of the college.

TABLE 27

FACULTY ISSUES--RESPONDENTS BY DEGREE SOURCES

	Undergraduate Cath. (366)	Non-Cath. (184)	Prob.	Graduate Cath. (227)	Non-Cath. (305)	Prob.
No reappointment if disrespect (A)	3.86	3.19	.001	4.01	3.37	.001
Personal attitudes not important (A)	3.35	3.95	.001	3.28	3.77	.001
Right to question beliefs (D)	3.29	3.85	.001	3.08	3.77	.001
Catholic norms pointless (A)	3.07	3.89	.001	2.92	3.67	.001
Policy on faculty selection (D)	3.04	3.76	.001	2.80	3.64	.001

Otherwise, the undergraduate and graduate differences in the sources of degrees do not seem to differentiate respondents, except as they suggest the more critical factors of religious and lay status.

Academic rank variables are the final considerations for this set of statements. Table 28 shows the results according to the academic ranks of the respondents.

TABLE 28

FACULTY ISSUES--RESPONDENTS BY RANKS

	Inst. (115)	Asst. (183)	Assoc. (120)	Prof. (123)	Prob.
No reappointment if disrespect (A)	3.26	3.36	3.94	4.09	.001
Personal attitudes not important (A)	3.75	3.77	3.50	3.12	.001
Right to question beliefs (D)	3.77	3.63	3.36	3.12	.001
Catholic norms pointless (A)	3.84	3.49	3.22	2.84	.001
Policy on faculty selection (D)	3.58	3.46	3.09	2.86	.001

Considered by academic ranking in Table 28, the respondents tend to differ in the degree of their opinion by the lower and upper ranks. No appreciable differences occur between instructors and assistant professors or between associate and full professors on any of the items. The instructors, however, substantially differ, on the average, from the professors on all items and from the associate professors, with the exception for the latter group being the statement that personal attitudes towards Catholicism are not important.

As a generalization, it seems that those who attained the higher ranks, especially of professor, appear more supportive of the issues which protect the Catholic character of the college than are the lower ranked faculty.

Table 29 distinguishes the responses by the broad academic fields of the respondents, along with the responses made by theology faculty for comparison purposes.

Table 29 shows that in terms of their academic fields, the respondents have responded almost similarly on the issues and appreciable discriminations among them are inconclusive. In magnitude of responses, however, the humanities faculty appear to take positions somewhere between the social and the natural scientists on the issues where there is the greatest spread of average scores. Put another way, while the respondents by fields seem to have about the same degree of opinion, they tend to line up with the social scientists at one end, the humanities faculty in between, and the natural scientists at the other end. The continuum inferred here is that the social scientists are somewhat less likely than the natural scientists to show concern for the Catholic character of the college.

Theologians, on the other hand, appear indistinguishable in their views from the other groups with one exception. They tend to disagree much less, on the average, with the statement on a definite policy of faculty selection to insure shared values among the faculty. But on this issue,

TABLE 29

FACULTY ISSUES--RESPONDENTS BY ACADEMIC FIELDS

	Human. (202)	Soc. Sci. (121)	Nat. Sci. (133)	Prob.	Theology (79)
No reappointment if disrespect (A)	3.60	3.34	3.86	.05	3.70
Personal attitudes not important (A)	3.45	3.75	3.62	ns	3.42
Right to question beliefs (D)	3.52	3.45	3.45	ns	3.51
Catholic norms pointless (A)	3.34	3.45	3.23	ns	3.46
Policy on faculty selection (D)	3.30	3.58	3.16	ns	2.88

the theologians (who are mostly religious faculty) reflect the already noted substantial difference between religious and lay faculty.

Summary of Faculty Issues

The previous set of statements examined attempted to assert that the Catholic college has a right to maintain its "Catholic character" with respect to faculty by requiring from them some degree of acknowledgement and adherence to the distinctive values and objectives of the college. These statements ranged from the view that serious disrespect on the part of faculty was an implicit cause for dismissal to the view that a definitive policy was needed to insure having faculty who shared the appropriate values.

In contrast to the above, the position of ideological professionalism implied that the religious character of the college, however defined, should not be a pertinent factor in the selection, appointment, and retention of faculty. In a generalized perspective, then, the statements contrasted the religious freedom of the college, an indisputible right, with academic freedom, a right and point of view considered to be prevalent in American academia.

On none of the statements was there found a particularly high level of consensual agreement or disagreement from the respondents, as a whole. Some substantial disagreement or division of expressed opinion

was found on each statement by at least one referent group in contrast to its comparison groups. In general, religious and lay faculty status, age differentials, and Catholic and non-Catholic distinctions were the dominant variables.

The least amount of disagreement, however, appeared to be with statements phrased in a manner which emphasized faculty "rights." More respondents were likely to agree with the statement that the personal attitude of a faculty member is not an important consideration for appointment; likewise, faculty generally disagreed with the statement that a Catholic college has a right to question the personal beliefs of a faculty member in unusual circumstances. And, over-all, most respondents agreed that faculty showing serious and continuous disrespect for the Catholic character of the college should not be reappointed.

The widest division of opinion occurred on two statements which emphasized Catholic norms and values for faculty. These statements, the "pointlessness" of Catholic norms and a definite policy on faculty selection, provoked the most clear-cut disagreements between critical subgroups of faculty.

Polarization of opinion was most evident between lay and religious faculty and between younger and older faculty. To a lesser extent, the Catholic and non-Catholic distinctions, religious preferences, educational socialization, and the university-college separation of faculty, produced appreciable differences on the statements. This divergence in average opinion was also found to distinguish

the youngest lay and religious faculty from each other, though, generally, the younger and older faculty seemed farther apart in their views.

Two observations can be made. First, the respondents are clearly not agreed on what is meant by "Catholic character" in reference to the Catholic college. Some faculty members do not believe there is such a concept in any meaningful sense. More likely than not, these faculty appear to be the younger lay, graduates of non-Catholic universities, and those teaching at the university level. Those for whom "Catholic character" does make sense are apparently the religious faculty, the older lay faculty, graduates of Catholic institutions, and those teaching at the college level.

Second, whatever "Catholic character" means or does not mean to the respondents, it seems clear that they are not in agreement on a practical administrative implementation of such character with respect to faculty. By the same categories depicted above, faculty are separated by those who believe Catholicism should have some normative and procedural impact on faculty selection, appointment, and retention, and those who, to say the least, are dubious about the whole matter.

These observations need additional confirmation, of course. The following sections look at the responses to two vignettes presenting value-conflict type of decisions. Faculty selection and academic freedom are the subjects of the vignettes.

Vignette on Faculty Selection

The central thesis of this study asserted that a college should select its faculty in accordance with its philosophical goals and objectives. Such selection furthers the aims of the college, precisely because a similar value set is shared among faculty.

It is true, however, that a selection policy having extra-academic norms in addition to the usual academic ones of competency and teaching ability, runs counter to professional thinking. In particular, the implications of a "religious test" for appointment of faculty can be assumed to elicit negative reactions from faculty, akin to that of a "political test."

Yet, to the degree that a Catholic college defines its promotion of religious values in any persuasive way, it seems obvious that the selection of faculty is of critical importance.

A vignette was phrased to obtain responses directed at the issue of faculty selection. Details were left purposefully vague in order to elicit written comments from the respondents. The vignette is as follows:

> Department X of Catholic college has two candidates to consider for an available position and must choose between the two.
>
> Professor A is a good teacher and would clearly be more than an adequate asset to the department because of his proven and continuing scholarship. He is, however, quite indifferent to the Christian character of the college, although he respects the college for its academic values.

> Professor B, younger but also a good teacher, has yet to prove himself as a scholar. Still, he has the reputation of being deeply committed to the concept of a scholarly Christian community and is likely to have a substantial impact on students with respect to Christian values.
>
> Assume that you are involved in an informal faculty debate regarding the two candidates; would you prefer Professor A or Professor B?

Respondents were expected to make their choices of Professor A or Professor B in terms of "definitely prefer" or "probably prefer." The following presentation of results collapses the response categories to give the basic preference for one or the other professors.

For the total sample of respondents (523 making a choice), 314 (60 percent) preferred Professor A, while 209 (40 percent) preferred Professor B.

Among the lay and religious subgroups of faculty, the preferences were substantially opposed. Of 310 lay respondents, 229 (73 percent) preferred Professor A. But, of 185 religious faculty, only 68 (27 percent) chose Professor A. Professor B was preferred by 81 lay respondents (27 percent) and by 117 religious respondents (63 percent). These results indicate that although the respondents, as a whole, preferred Professor A, this is largely due to the higher proportion of lay faculty.

More important than the percentages of forced-choice responses are the rationales and other comments made by faculty to explain their selections. A representative sampling of comments is presented which shows the range and kinds of faculty opinion directed specifically

at the choice of either Professor A or Professor B.[1]

Of those who chose Professor A, the competent scholar, their opinions were quite direct in asserting the primacy of scholarship. The following quotations are typical:

> Intellectual competence, I contend, is the only criterion for appointment to a college faculty. (Layman, college, sociology, age: 30's)

> I think our students are coming to us looking for "scholarship" rather than "Christian community." (Sister, college, English, age: 30's)

> As a scientist, I must favor Professor A. Catholic colleges are in need of good scientists, not pretentiously holy men. (Layman, college, physics, age: 30's)

> The choice of faculty should be no different at a Catholic college than any other institution committed to scholarship. (Layman, university, biology, age: 30's)

> Colleges are academic institutions and faculty should be selected on that basis as first consideration. (Sister, college, history, age: 40's)

The importance of scholarly values to the Catholic college and the respect a scholar should have towards the institutional values was stressed by many respondents. For example:

> Unless the Catholic college esteems scholarship, it shall not survive as a college. A man honestly in pursuit of the truth may be annoying to some but he brings only real value both to the college and the Church. His work will be a challenge needed by the

---

[1]Omitted from presentation are qualified or conditional comments which, in reality, accepted both professors in the vignette as highly desirable. For example, a number of respondents chose Professor A for the sciences and Professor B for theology or the humanities. Also omitted are comments focusing on minor aspects of the vignette, such as the apparent youth of Professor B.

students if they are to grow as intelligent honest scholars.
(Priest, university, theology, age: 40's)

We hire a man on the basis of his academic qualifications, not his religious commitment. If Professor A is a scholar of integrity, he will have a good impact on the students' sense of values. All we ask is that he respect the beliefs the college stands for, not that he agree with them or share them.
(Laywoman, university, English, age: 40's)

As long as the candidate respects the values of the institution, professional competence and productive scholarship should be the only consideration.
(Layman, university, history, age: 50's)

Among respondents choosing Professor B, the dedicated Christian, the character of the Catholic college is a primary reason for selection. For example:

The basic rationale for the Catholic college is the shared vision of its Christian commitment among the students, faculty, and administrators, both lay and religious, Catholic or not. Without this, there is no reason for the continued existence of a Catholic college.
(Priest, university, history, age: 40's)

In the long run, Professor B will make more of a contribution to what I believe Catholic universities should stand for--academic excellence in the midst of a scholarly Christian community which influences students in regard to Christian values. Otherwise, why exist?
(Priest, university, theology, age: not given)

The idea of "added value" coming from Professor B was emphasized by other respondents. For example:

We don't need scholars only! We need good, deeply committed teachers, who will have a substantial impact on students with respect to Christian values.
(Priest, college, theology, age: 30's)

The whole thrust of a Catholic college should be toward having the good teacher-scholar-PLUS. Any reputable college offers Professor A's. We're in business to offer Professor B's.
(Sister, college, English, age: 30's)

These representative opinions point to substantial conflicts in viewpoint among faculty. The conflict, however, is not with a choice between scholarship and Christianity, but with whether the Christianity of a professor should be a factor in his appointment. Generally speaking, university and lay faculty say "no"; college and religious faculty say "yes."

In a sense, the question of faculty selection has now come full circle. As already noted, most faculty, including many religious, tend to reject Catholic "system norms" for the appointment and selection of faculty. The idea of a policy in this area does elicit a negative reaction. Nonetheless, for a significant group of faculty, the priests and sisters in particular, a community sharing Christian values is a sine qua non aspect of what a Catholic university or college really is.

Vignette on Academic Freedom

Catholic colleges are not found in a disproportionate degree among institutions censured by the American Association of University Professors for violations of academic freedom and tenure. For practical, if not theoretical, reasons, administrators in Catholic colleges are as likely as anyone else to observe the procedural guidelines established by the Association. Greeley, in fact, implies that the issue of academic freedom is more a matter of administrative competency:

> Some administrators still are tempted to fall back on the iron fist approach and to feel that academic

> freedom and due process are a threat to their authority and their control of the school. A few Catholic college administrators are frightened of academic freedom and do not understand it. Others live in mortal terror of the AAUP and would much sooner give in on a case that they could probably win rather than run the risk of unfavorable publicity or even of setting up an investigative committee which the administration would not be able to control.[1]

Still, leaving aside the question of administrative competence, a theoretical problem exists, at least, to the extent that there are administrators and faculty who believe a Catholic college cannot accommodate in principle, without circumscriptions, the philosophically-based ground rules of academic freedom. The empirical question is whether faculty perceive some ineluctable measure of dissonance between the commitment to "Catholic character" and the essentially secular character of ideological professionalism.

To probe this question among the respondent faculty, a vignette was phrased which placed the "Catholic character" of the college in a seeming opposition to scholarly freedom. An administrative regulation "prohibiting teaching contrary to the Catholic faith" was the contrived vehicle to present the apparent conflict of values.[2] The vignette is as follows:

> Dr. Smith, a non-tenured philosophy professor at Catholic college, has come under a great deal of criticism from parents and some faculty members who

---

[1]Greeley, The Changing Catholic College, p. 114.

[2]The wording in quotations was taken from a current faculty handbook of a Catholic college.

are convinced his teaching is undermining the religious values of the college. With turmoil building up over the issue, the president decides to appoint a hearing committee, citing the faculty handbook regulation which prohibits "teaching contrary to the Catholic faith."

The president's action in invoking this regulation has deeply divided the faculty into two positions:

One: Some contend the regulation is outmoded in principle. A college, even undergraduate, must be open to all academically respectable viewpoints. Even if an orthodox Catholic teaching essential to faith were involved, this should have no bearing on the academic freedom of an appointed professor to teach his scholarly convictions, if relevant, although there might be serious risk to the college's commitment on Catholic-Christian values and perspectives.

Two: Some contend the regulation, however imprecise, represents a valid and necessary principle. While open to all legitimate positions on academic issues, an undergraduate Catholic college cannot be so open that it tolerates any emphasis in teaching, although scholarly, that may be seriously detrimental to its Catholic-Christian character.

Assume that your opinion is needed on this issue; would you prefer Position One or Position Two?

The above vignette is clearly "loaded" and presents a most difficult situation without stating a specific issue.[1]

The vignette, however, served the primary purpose of eliciting written comments which reveal the attitudinal postures of the respondents to the question of "Catholic character" and the apparent threat that an unorthodox Dr. Smith might present.

---

[1]Despite the ambiguity, four respondents from the same university claimed the "exact" situation had occurred a few years ago at their institution.

In addition, respondents were also asked to check on the questionnaire which "position" they favored. Of the 524 respondents who did so, 324 (62 percent) favored Position One, while 200 respondents (38 percent) favored Position Two. Thus, a majority made the apparent choice of a Catholic college campus "open" to all viewpoints, even those which on the surface might appear harmful to the religious commitment of the college.

Before presenting a selection of written comments illustrating the various nuances of interpretation given to the vignette, two remarks from young professors are quoted which demonstrate the impossibility of assuming that all Catholic colleges are alike in their institutional attitudes towards academic freedom.

One young religious, a professor of history at the university-level, wrote:

> On this campus, the movement seems toward position one, but the great weapon is the fear, often expressed, that while position two might be okay, yet the AAUP will destroy us as they did St. John's in New York, if the case is presented to that body of teachers.

This expression of fearful hesitancy is in striking contrast with the attitude of another Catholic college, as expressed by a young agnostic professor of sociology:

> I ammore or less opposed to church-related colleges of any type. However, I have had no problems re: academic freedom at this college, despite the fact that what I teach frequently conflicts with Catholic dogma. I was assured when I was hired that there would be no problem.

Though colleges will differ in their climate of academic freedom, there are general themes or perspectives

which can be found among faculty towards the issue which transcend particular institutions. By means of selected quotations, the following survey illustrates perspectives shared by groups of faculty within and among the diverse institutions of this study.

Of those who favored Position One, a predominant attitude was to reject or deny the premise that any essential conflict exists between the dissemination of ideas resulting from genuine scholarship and Catholic-Christian values. The following quotations are typical replies:

> It is hard to imagine "any emphasis in teaching, although scholarly, that may be seriously detrimental to its Catholic-Christian character." If the teaching is truly "scholarly" there can be no "danger" to the student's beliefs. Position Two seems to suggest that indoctrination is really the aim of the Catholic college. I don't believe this. To be open to scholarly investigation of truth is not un-Christian and should not be considered un-Catholic either.
> (Laywoman, university, English, age: 40's)

> How can what is truly scholarly be detrimental to a college's Catholic-Christian character?
> (Sister, college, history, age: 30's)

> I think it is a pseudo-issue. Most "scholarly professional work" does not involve any convictions contrary to Catholic-Christian perspectives. Most disciplines profess to be "value-free"--no value judgments.
> (Priest, college, theology, age: 50's)

Other respondents made it clear that they perceived Dr. Smith to be a propagandist and, hence, unscholarly, himself. For example:

> I think I would favor neither position, since Dr. Smith seems to be a propagandist, which is a pedagogic stance inimicable to the free inquiry which to me should be the conceptual basis of <u>any</u> university.

> I would suggest that he be released because he has seemingly lost his scholarly objectivity; not because he is teaching values contrary to the college's Christian character. I would also support the firing of a Christian propagandist.
> (Laywoman, university, English, age: 30's)

> I favor Position Two if the man is attempting with positive effort to destroy the faith of undergraduates. If their faith is lost by mere contact with him, I'd probably favor Position One. Depends upon his mode of action.
> (Priest, university, English, age: 40's)

The strongest emphasis, however, was given by respondents who insisted that academic freedom cannot be trammeled in a collegiate institution. The following quotations are representative.

> You either buy academic freedom or you reject it. On a college campus, the anonymous "they" who are offended by controversy need some professional maturation.
> (Layman, college, physics, age: 20's)

> Any formulation of "divine truth" that must be protected by shackling the honest investigation of any truth is not worth its own continuation. All truth must be sought in its own arena and not in the arena of authoritarianism and dogmatism.
> (Priest, college, theology, age: 30's)

> The regulation is not only imprecise, it is completely incapable of being applied in any meaningful manner. The Catholic university's service to the Church cannot be that of a bulwark against intellectual attack. Its service must be that of the university--including free academic inquiry and teaching.
> (Layman, university, theology, age: 30's)

In general, those respondents who favored Position One of the vignette appeared to accept the view that "Catholic-Christian character" was too illusive a principle to be applied to a practical case. At the very least, these respondents showed less concern with protecting Catholic character and far more concern for preserving the

commitment of the college to the principles of academic freedom.

Not surprisingly, respondents who favored Position Two appeared to have firmer convictions that a Dr. Smith could pose a threat to the unique value commitments of a Catholic college. A frequently employed argument was that there are "limits" to academic freedom which a Dr. Smith has, at least, implicitly transgressed. The following comments are representative.

> To say that "academically respectable" is the only criterion is to elevate academic freedom to an absolute value which must eventually destroy all other values.
> (Layman, university, economics, age: 50's)

> Academic freedom does not give the professor the right to criticize those principles for which the college stands. He has the right to leave and go elsewhere--to a college where there is no danger of undermining religious values.
> (Layman, college, chemistry, age: 40's)

> I would object to a teacher's accepting a contract under a handbook regulation with a limitation on academic freedom and then ignoring the regulation.
> (Sister, college, English, age: 40's)

> If Dr. Smith wants absolute freedom of expression, he could enter another profession. Even non-Catholic colleges have certain guidelines for their faculty members.
> (Religious, university, history, age: 40's)

Finally, the most emphatic comments came from respondents for whom there was no apparent ambivalence about Catholic character and values for the college. For example:

> We've got to keep some bedrock of values. No shifting sand for basics. What the hell do we have <u>separate schools</u> for the Catholic if we don't believe and stand for something.
> (Layman, university, economics, age: 50's)

> The professor, Dr. Smith, should get a fair hearing. If he cannot intellectually respect the teachings of the Catholic faith, he should look for another job. What would we do if he were teaching communist principles?
> (Sister, college, English, age: 50's)

> An undergraduate Catholic college has no reason for existence if it permits teaching that is contrary to the Catholic faith. Why destroy yourself?
> (Layman, university, history, age: 60's)

> I am assuming that Smith was informed ahead of time that his freedom would be restricted in certain areas. If he was willing to compromise his freedom to obtain a job, he has no complaint.
> (Layman, university, biology, age: 40's)

It is evident that wide disagreements exist among the respondent faculty towards the situation posed by the vignette on academic freedom. The conclusion is unavoidable that these disagreements stem largely from the value presuppositions used to interpret the case. On one hand, the majority of respondents would apparently judge the extreme case of Dr. Smith by the same norms of academic competence used, presumably, by all academic institutions worthy of the name. Objection to Dr. Smith and his supposed undermining of religious values comes, principally, if his behavior is perceived as propagandizing in an odious or hostile manner. Otherwise, the operative assumption is that the "Catholic character" of the college, however defined, cannot be a limiting or constraining influence on what is taught in the institution.

On the other hand, a vigorous dissent to the above appears to be given by a smaller group of faculty. Dr. Smith is perceived as exercising his freedom to teach in the wrong institution. "Catholic character" is defined,

in some manner, as a purposeful striving for the institution. As a value-orientation, such character may, when threatened, exclude or circumscribe the expression of other values. In a word, Dr. Smith does not "fit" the Catholic college.

Underneath these divergent attitudes lie different conceptions of the meaning of "Catholic" as a qualifier of the noun, "college." For the former group, the religious connotation appears far more extrinsic in modifying "college" and less, if at all, an intrinsic qualification. The reverse appears to be true of the latter group of faculty. To add to the complexity, the posture of faculty favoring Position Two of the vignette seems heavily weighted with the overtones of religious freedom which, of course, the vignette, itself, encouraged.

To conclude this chapter on ideological attitudes, a summary will be given of the general findings with an interpretative analysis of the results.

General Summary

This chapter examined the attitudes of faculty in Catholic colleges towards the ideology of professionalism. This broadly-stated concept is considered to be the critical aspect of the problem of meaning for the Catholic college.

The first issue explored was to determine the relative stance taken by faculty with regard to the ideological underpinnings of academic freedom. It was

found that the respondent faculty approved in large measure the notion that the Catholic college can accept, without restrictions, the philosophy of academic freedom expressed by the American Association of University Professors. Particularly substantial support was given to statements emphasizing the rights of faculty--freedom to teach, freedom from putative administrative interference, and freedom from institutional coercion in matters of personal belief.

Much less support and sustantial disagreements among faculty subgroups were found on issues relating to the tentative nature of beliefs in the search for truth, student freedom to hear all speakers, and the freedom of a college from extra-academic authority.

Two conclusions are drawn from the above analysis:

1. Faculty in Catholic colleges perceive the concept of academic freedom essentially as the protection of faculty rights. The inference is strong that the personal freedom and security of the individual faculty member are regarded as the more persuasive and satisfying elements of academic freedom.

2. Faculty in Catholic colleges accept, only to a moderate degree and with deep reservations, those features of academic freedom pertaining to institutional autonomy, the quasi-religious aspects of academic freedom, and the extension of the concept to student freedom.

The apparent ambivalence towards the more transcendent areas of academic freedom appears to be a mixture of both political and religious conservatism. In particular, the component of religious faith seems to lend itself to a suspicion of the absolutism inherent in the concept of academic freedom.

The seond issue examined concerned the attitudes of faculty towards the central thesis of this study--that a value-oriented college ought to select faculty who are in accord with the distinctive goals of the college. The thesis was disagreed with by a slight majority of the respondents. However, the ramifications of the thesis in terms of individual faculty, such as the non-importance of personal attitudes towards Catholicism as a condition of employment, were given a fairly high degree of assent. From this analysis, a third conclusion is drawn.

> 3. Faculty in Catholic colleges do not accept the principle that the religious character of the college should be a pertinent factor in the selection, appointment, and retention of faculty.

From the analysis of written comments regarding academic freedom, it was found that a majority of respondents supported the position that a Catholic college should be open to controversial ideas and teaching, even if some risk to the Catholic-Christian character of the college was involved. However, this general assent was often mediated by the stricture that academic freedom could not be extended to the propagandist or the intentional destroyer of religious values. Without gainsaying the logic of the argument, it seems that such concern over the putative secular propagandist is a species of religious conservatism. A fourth conclusion is now drawn.

> 4. Faculty in Catholic colleges accept the basic premise of academic freedom insuring the freedom of the scholar to teach and to disseminate his ideas. This acceptance is

> qualified, however, by a willingness to limit the scope of scholarly freedom, if such freedom is perceived as a threat to the religious character of the college.

These conclusions are, of course, broad generalizations which need not apply to particular institutions or to specific faculty members. Nonetheless, these generalizations seem valid, not only for the respondent sample as a whole, but also for principal referent subgroups analyzed.[1]

Comparison of attitudes by the variables of the hypotheses showed wide differences in averaged opinions for four of the most critical variables. These were the university and college categories, the lay and religious faculty categories, the age category, and the combined lay-religious and age category. Less discriminatory of attitudes, and, apparently, far less meaningful, were the categories of academic rank, academic specialization, and the institutional source of the undergraduate and advanced degree for the respondents. The four principal variables are now briefly described in terms of the directions predicted by the hypotheses.

On the institutional categories, university faculty tended to be more liberal in their acceptance of the ideological premises of academic freedom than their college counterparts. In particular, the attitudes of doctoral-

---

[1] One exception, however, is with faculty who described their religious preference as "None." Their attitudes can be summarized by an almost complete acceptance of the ideology of professionalism and an almost complete rejection of possible constraints stemming from the religious character of the college.

level faculty were often in sharpest contrast with the attitudes expressed by faculty in colleges for women.

On the vocational status categories, lay faculty were more liberal in their views than religious faculty, sisters and priests together. Without exception of any statement presented to the respondents, lay and religious faculty were widely divergent in the extent of their averaged opinion.

On the age categories, younger faculty, generally under 40, were more liberal than older faculty. In particular, faculty over 60 years of age seemed almost diametrically opposed on many statements to the positions taken by younger faculty.

On the combined age and status categories, younger faculty, both religious and lay, were more liberal than older faculty, both religious and lay. However, on specific statements laden with religious overtones, religious faculty were less liberal than lay faculty in the same age bracket.

With this analysis and summary of the ideological issue completed, the next chapter considers faculty opinions on the professional climate of the Catholic college.

CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF THE PROFESSIONAL CLIMATE

Irrespective of a particular institutional character, it must be assumed that academic people generally place a primary importance on their own professional self-identity and, in turn, on the professional ambiance of their working environment. The academician in a Catholic college is not likely to perceive his professional role in ways distinct from that of other educators. Still, it is expected that demonstrable differences will exist among faculty in Catholic colleges in their assessments of the "professional climate" of their own institutions and that of Catholic higher education generally.

A survey is presented in this chapter of respondents' opinions of the Catholic college's climate of professional values with respect to students and faculty, and to other issues particularly pertinent to Catholic higher education. More important than the evaluations given to specific statements, however, will be the pattern of "favorability" with which the subgroups of respondents assess professional atmosphere.

A selection is made in the number of variables examined relative to the referent groups of the faculty

respondents. Only the primary variables of institutional differences (university and college faculty) and of the combined status and age categories (religious and lay faculty by age groupings) are examined. This selection is based principally on the evident importance of these variables to any conclusions about Catholic higher education.[1] The analysis proceeds according to the methods already used.

A series of statements were presented to respondents with the four-point scale of Agree to Disagree responses.[2] These statements related to the following themes and are the focus for the following presentation and analysis:

1. Students and the Catholic College
2. Faculty and the Catholic College
3. Religious Aspects of Catholic Higher Education
4. Professional Aspects of Catholic Higher Education

The respondents were asked to evaluate the climate of their own colleges for the statements referring to students and faculty. For statements on religious and

---

[1] In general, the secondary variables of educational socialization, academic rank, and disciplinary fields produced statistically non-significant results on the statements. The religious preference variable, however, produced strong differences between the Catholic faculty and the "None" group of respondents.

[2] Part I of the questionnaire consists of statements relating to students and faculty in the Catholic college. Part II includes statements relating to religious and professional aspects of Catholic higher education. See Appendix C, pp. 225-7.

professional aspects, respondents were asked to offer an evaluation of Catholic higher education.

Students and the Catholic College

Ideally, the climate of learning and of personal living that any college offers to its students is respectful of their individual dignity and worth. Students should be treated as mature and responsible adults. Students should find on campus a warm and friendly atmosphere. Students should be affected by the values of their teachers, and they should expect the college to promote values which transcend the narrower confines of the campus.

The above description of a campus environment favorable to learning and human growth is represented by six statements. The "favorable" response is indicated in parentheses following each statement:

1. Students do have their individuality respected and are treated as unique persons. (Agree)
2. If anything, not enough college authority is exercised over student behavior. (Disagree)
3. Most students are little affected by the values of their teachers. (Disagree)
4. Students are usually treated as adults in the application of college policies and regulations. (Agree)
5. Warm and personal relationships usually exist between faculty and students. (Agree)
6. The college actively promotes social commitment and involvement, beyond occupational interests, on the part of the campus community. (Agree)

The analyses to follow present results from the principal referent subgroups of respondents--the institutional categories of universities and colleges and the combined status and age categories. For the sake of easier reference, mean scores for the entire sample of respondents are included with the presentation given to the institutional categories. However, the probability or confidence level figures given in tables to report statistical significance refer only to the analysis of variance technique applied to the subgroup variables.

Table 30 shows the means scores of respondents according to the institutional levels of university and college faculty.[1, 2] Table 30 shows that a moderately high degree of approval is given to the value climate of their institutions by the respondents. About the same average response is given to each of the statements by the entire sample of respondents.

---

[1]The university sample comprises five institutions--three doctoral-level and two masters-level universities. The college sample comprises eleven liberal arts institutions--three coeducational, three for men, and five for women.

[2]Statements are coded in the direction of the majority response. A mean score of five or one would indicate the respondents gave an unqualified approval or disapproval to a statement, depending upon the direction of coding. Variations towards the extremes are interpreted in terms of the intensity of "Approval" or "Disapproval" to each statement. A mean score of three indicates that respondents, by the degree of their scaled responses, were evenly divided between the approvers and disapprovers. No neutral category was provided respondents.

TABLE 30

STUDENT ISSUES--RESPONDENTS BY INSTITUTIONS

	All Respond. (551)	Univ. (280)	Coll. (271)	Prob.
Respected as unique persons (A)	3.86	3.57	4.17	.001
Not enough authority over behavior (D)	3.81	3.78	3.86	ns
Little affected by teachers (D)	3.79	3.65	3.95	.01
Treated as adults in policies (A)	3.76	3.53	4.00	.001
Warm and personal relationships (A)	3.73	3.41	4.07	.001
Promotion of social commitment (A)	3.62	3.46	3.79	.01

The response to the statement regarding the exercise of college authority over student behavior is the only statement on which there is an apparent similar degree of response from both university and college faculty. Given the strong authoritarian overtone, it is perhaps surprising that a greater degree of disapproval was not provoked.[1]

College faculty clearly give their institutions a more favorable assessment respecting human and individual values than do university faculty. It seems, without elaborating, that these opinion differences are related to the more obvious qualitative and size differences between

[1]Some respondents noted that the statement did not distinguish between on-campus and off-campus behavior. This criticism appears to imply that if on-campus behavior had been specified, more respondents would have approved or agreed with the statement.

colleges and universities.

A more detailed examination of opinions is possible by the results shown in Table 31 which lists mean scores of the critical age and status variables.

A close look at the pattern of scores in Table 31 indicates that the older group of religious faculty are more favorable than others in expressing a positive student climate for the Catholic college. Likewise, the older lay respondents give appreciable assent to the statements concerning respect for students as persons and adults. But, in what appears a contrariwise posture, both groups of older faculty disapprove only slightly the authoritarian connotative statement on student behavior.

The younger and middle groups of religious and lay faculty are virtually similar in their views, giving only a moderately favorable assent to the student climate of their institutions, while strongly disapproving the statement on college authority over students.

These patterns suggest that although faculty in Catholic colleges are generally approving of the institutional climate regarding students, it is the older faculty, especially the religious, who are most apt to combine a favorable student atmosphere with the implications of strong authoritative direction of students by the college.

Faculty and the Catholic College

A second set of statements was concerned with the

TABLE 31

STUDENT ISSUES--RESPONDENTS BY AGE AND STATUS

	20-39		40-49		50-over		Prob.
	Rel. (55)	Lay (182)	Rel. (55)	Lay (73)	Rel. (96)	Lay (64)	
Respected as unique persons (A)	3.82	3.55	3.91	3.81	4.43	4.12	.001
Not enough authority over behavior (D)	4.19	4.32	3.82	3.65	3.20	3.33	.001
Little affected by teachers (D)	3.95	3.73	4.11	3.65	3.87	3.74	ns
Treated as adults in policies (A)	3.58	3.35	3.71	3.90	4.43	4.03	.001
Warm and personal relationships (A)	3.51	3.66	3.67	3.71	4.19	3.65	.01
Promotion of social commitment (A)	3.69	3.32	3.80	3.47	4.13	3.65	.001

relationships of faculty to the Catholic college, especially administrative-faculty ones. As a reference point, the following quotation from Donovan in his 1958 study establishes the historical perspective:

> The pressures toward increased participation of the faculty, religious and lay, in the formation of university policy has been a recent phenomenon in Catholic higher education. It is such a new pressure, and one for which the structure of religious life has so ill prepared administrators, that some overt tensions have developed. As a result of increased pressure from the lay and some religious members of the faculty--often in the form of an AAUP chapter--there have been more and more concessions to the voice of the faculty.[1]

In the years since Donovan's study, there is no question that a great deal of successful accommodation has been made to the "voice of the faculty." In particular, it is most doubtful whether lay faculty would accept today any subsidiary role in college policy formulation based upon their lay status. To a large degree, then, opinions of faculty regarding the faculty's professional climate are a measure of the process of secularization of the Catholic college functioning under accepted standards of faculty participation in the affairs of the college.

The following statements presented to respondents explore the above point of view:

1. Lay faculty are sometimes treated as if they had religious vows. (Disagree)

2. The authority structure of the Catholic college deprives faculty some of their rights as professionals. (Disagree)

---

[1]Donovan, op. cit., p. 43.

3. In matters concerning the interests of the college as a whole, faculty participation in decision-making is both sought and effectively encouraged by the administration. (Agree)

4. Faculty committees are really controlled by the administration. (Disagree)

5. Criticism by faculty members of college policies is likely to be regarded as "disloyalty" by key administrators. (Disagree)

6. Faculty are permitted to place emphasis on commitment to their disciplines above the interests of the college as a whole. (Agree)

Responses in the direction of coding (indicated in parentheses) are assumed to indicate the favorable professional treatment accorded faculty, religious and lay, in the respondent's college.

Table 32 presents the mean scores for these faculty issues as given by respondents within the institutional categories, and includes the mean responses for the sample as a whole.

Immediately evident from Table 32 is the strong disagreement with the suggestions of a quasi-religious treatment of lay faculty and an authority structure depriving faculty of their rights. All other statements received from respondents a slight to moderate average affirmation of a favorable professional climate. Perhaps most striking is the low degree of approval given by college faculty to the notion that faculty may emphasize disciplinary commitments above the interests of the college

as a whole.[1]

TABLE 32

FACULTY ISSUES--RESPONDENTS BY INSTITUTIONS

	All Respond. (551)	Univ. (280)	Coll. (271)	Prob.
Lay treated as if religious (D)	4.25	4.26	4.26	ns
Authority structure deprives rights (D)	3.92	3.87	3.99	ns
Participation of faculty sought (A)	3.67	3.30	4.06	.001
Administration controls committees (D)	3.61	3.49	3.73	ns
Criticism regarded as disloyalty (D)	3.39	3.33	3.46	ns
Emphasis on commitment to discipline (A)	3.30	3.56	3.04	.001

Where appreciable differences in averaged responses occur--participation in decision-making and disciplinary commitment--these appear to reflect the size and, perhaps, the more favorable atmosphere of the smaller colleges toward faculty involvement in college affairs.

Table 33 shows results by the important variables of age and status.

From Table 33, it can be seen that on only one

[1]It was evident that some respondents were uncomfortable with the phrasing of the statement, "above the interests of the college as a whole." But, it seems undeniable that disciplinary commitment can have practical aspects which conflict with the good of the institution as seen through the eyes of administrators.

TABLE 33

FACULTY ISSUES--RESPONDENTS BY AGE AND STATUS

	20-39		40-49		50-over		Prob.
	Rel. (55)	Lay (182)	Rel. (55)	Lay (73)	Rel. (96)	Lay (64)	
Lay treated as if religious (D)	4.15	4.08	4.46	4.18	4.66	4.08	.01
Authority structure deprives rights (D)	4.25	3.38	4.24	4.18	4.29	4.09	.001
Participation of faculty sought (A)	3.64	3.26	3.82	3.72	4.22	3.82	.001
Administration controls committees (D)	4.11	3.25	3.81	3.34	4.04	3.62	.001
Criticism regarded as disloyalty (D)	3.53	2.93	3.63	3.35	3.73	3.86	.001
Emphasis on commitment to discipline (A)	3.52	3.32	3.40	3.42	3.04	3.23	ns

statement, the quasi-religious treatment of lay faculty, are all groups in substantial disagreement, though the older groups of religious are much more so than lay faculty. The same pattern is true for the statement that the authority structure of the Catholic college deprives faculty of some rights with the seemingly significant exception, however, of the youngest group of lay faculty.[1]

A moderate degree of consensus exists on all other statements in the direction of agreeing that faculty do not have professional rights and influence negated in some substantial manner by the administrative character of the Catholic college.

This consensus is tempered by the notably lower estimate of the professional climate for faculty given by the younger lay faculty. Unlike the other groups, they virtually agree that criticism of college policies is regarded by administrators as "disloyalty." Moreover, the young lay faculty are appreciably less in agreement that faculty participation in decision-making is encouraged. In contrast, the younger religious faculty appear more alike the middle and older groups of respondents, religious and lay, than they do to their lay compeers by age.

Religious Aspects of Catholic Higher Education

A set of statements were directed to what can loosely be called the religious and moral dimension of

---

[1]Some younger lay respondents commented, to the effect, that it was the religious faculty, not lay, who were deprived of their professional rights in the Catholic college.

Catholic higher education. Two themes are stressed. First, the "secularization" of Catholic higher education is likely to proceed in the future with far less formal influence by the Roman Catholic Church in the sense of emphasizing the church relationship. Second, Catholic colleges are likely to maintain their distinctive character in terms of an emphasis on religious and moral values which are consonant with the general posture of Roman Catholicism.

Statements directed to the above themes are as follows:

1. The trend towards lay administration in Catholic higher education is likely to lead to an objectionable form of secularization with respect to Roman Catholic values and teachings. (Disagree)

2. In time, Catholic colleges will follow the path of many Protestant colleges and have only a nominal church relationship. (Agree)

3. What Catholic higher education may lack in endowment and financial resources is partially compensated by the advantages of an environment stressing human and religious values. (Agree)

4. The Catholic college represents a bulwark against the spread of permissive morality in our society. (Disagree)

5. It is the duty of a Catholic college to insist, by reasonable regulations, upon high moral standards for its students. (Agree)

Responses in the coded directions are assumed to indicate that respondents believe Catholic institutions will become less institutionally and theologically affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church, but still retaining, in essence, a characteristic concern for the religious and

moral development of students.

Table 34 presents the mean results by the institutional categories, including the mean responses for the entire sample.

TABLE 34

RELIGIOUS ASPECTS--RESPONDENTS BY INSTITUTIONS

	All Respond. (551)	Univ. (280)	Coll. (271)	Prob.
Secularization by lay administrators (D)	4.33	4.31	4.36	ns
In time a nominal church relationship (A)	3.62	3.71	3.53	ns
Compensation by human and religious values (A)	3.54	3.29	3.81	.001
Bulwark against permissive morality (D)	3.41	3.56	3.26	.05
Duty to insist on high moral standards (A)	3.16	3.06	3.26	ns

Respondents disagree strongly with the suggestion that lay administration can be equated with "objectionable secularization." However, they also seem to predict an eventual Protestant pattern of disassociation from formal church relationships, while rejecting moderately the view that Catholic colleges are a "bulwark against permissive morality."[1, 2] Least agreement is given, on the average,

[1]The phrase "Protestant pattern" refers simply to the historical fact that a number of American colleges and universities, now private and non-sectarian, were once closely associated with the churches of their founding fathers.

[2]The statement on permissive morality produced a

to the statement that the Catholic college has a duty to insist on high moral standards.

Few appreciable differences are found among responses of university and college faculty. However, university faculty are less likely than college faculty to approve statements implying religious and moral obligations for the Catholic college. To the extent that the majority of respondents agree with a religiously-oriented climate, it seems that Catholic higher education does attract faculty for whom professionalism becomes associated with religious and moral overtones.

Table 35 shows the results for the important subgroups of religious and lay faculty by age groupings.

Sharp differences among respondents are evident from Table 35. Younger faculty, religious and lay, disagree strongly on the suggestions of "objectionable secularization," on the Catholic college being a bulwark against "permissive morality," and on the duty to insist on high moral standards for students. Contrariwise, older faculty, of age 40 and over, tend to disagree much less.

In particular, the morally-weighted statements on permissive morality and high moral standards for students, find sharply opposing responses between the under-40 and over-50 groups of respondents, religious and lay.

On the prediction of a nominal church relationship

---

number of apparently opposed comments. One respondent wrote: "The Catholic college should be a bulwark, but isn't." Another commented, to the effect, that since he preferred "permissive morality," his agreement with the fact of the statement did not really reflect his personal views.

TABLE 35

RELIGIOUS ASPECTS--RESPONDENTS BY AGE AND STATUS

	20-39		40-49		50-over		Prob.
	Rel. (55)	Lay (182)	Rel. (55)	Lay (73)	Rel. (96)	Lay (64)	
Secularization by lay administrators (D)	4.55	4.48	4.38	4.53	3.86	4.17	.001
In time a nominal church relationship (A)	3.53	4.08	3.02	3.56	3.08	3.71	.001
Compensation by human and religious values (A)	3.75	3.02	3.96	3.27	4.21	3.82	.001
Bulwark against permissive morality (D)	3.83	4.01	3.14	3.58	2.38	2.95	.001
Duty to insist on high moral standards (A)	2.60	2.43	3.35	3.23	4.02	4.17	.001

for the Catholic college and the compensatory value of a human and religious atmosphere, the lay respondents differ appreciably from the religious, in all age groupings. Lay faculty agree more with the first statement and agree less with the second.

Overall, the pattern of responses to the religious aspects statements suggests that substantial disagreements exist among faculty in Catholic colleges with respect to the degree and kind of religious influences operative in these colleges.

Professional Aspects of Catholic Higher Education

A final set of statements probed faculty opinion on issues related to professional climate in terms of the stature of Catholic colleges among other institutions of higher learning. A consideration is also given to the climate respecting democratic and intellectual values. The statements are:

1. Democratic values, such as personal autonomy, are not inhibited by the religious affiliation of the Catholic college. (Agree)

2. Separating colleges from ownership by religious orders should strengthen the professional stature of many Catholic colleges. (Agree)

3. Catholic higher education is, in the main, less rewarding for professional advancement and prestige than state-supported higher education. (Agree)

4. Charges of anti-intellectualism and authoritarianism sometimes leveled at Catholic colleges are, for the most part, unjustified. (Agree)

5. Despite considerable progress, the average Catholic college with respect to academic

excellence is in the "backwater" of American higher education. (Disagree)

These statements, as answered in the coded directions, indicate that faculty in Catholic colleges do not consider their institutions to be lacking in basic intellectual and democratic values. But there is the suggestion that Catholic higher education has not reached the professional status which many faculty desire, in terms of the legal control by religious orders and in comparison with public institutions.

The above interpretation appears valid in considering the results shown in Table 36, which presents the mean scores by institutional categories and those of the entire respondent sample.

TABLE 36

PROFESSIONAL ASPECTS--RESPONDENTS BY INSTITUTIONS

	All Respond. (551)	Univ. (280)	Coll. (271)	Prob.
Democratic values not inhibited (A)	4.12	4.02	4.24	.05
Separate ownership from orders (A)	3.86	4.05	3.67	.01
Less rewarding professionally (A)	3.59	3.60	3.56	ns
Charges against colleges unjustified (A)	3.25	3.15	3.37	ns
Academically in backwater (D)	3.00	2.76	3.26	.001

Considering all respondents, the results given in Table 36 indicate that faculty strongly agree that religious

affiliation of Catholic colleges and democratic values are not incompatible. Only a slight agreement is found, however, with the statement concerning unjustified charges of anti-intellectualism and authoritarianism.[1]

On statements reflecting the professional stature of Catholic higher education, the respondents generally agree that colleges should be separated from ownership by religious orders and that Catholic colleges are less rewarding professionally than public institutions.

A clue to the thinking of the respondents is suggested by the sharp disagreement between university and college faculty with regard to the academic excellence of Catholic colleges. Though the university faculty appear to take a distinctly more negative stance on the substance of these statements than do college faculty, the university faculty agree that Catholic colleges are an academic "backwater." This may only indicate a species of university elitism with respect to the average Catholic college. But, on the whole, there remains the implication that a substantial number of faculty teaching in Catholic colleges and universities tends to disparage the professional quality of Catholic higher education in general.

Table 37 presents the mean scores of respondents on these statements by the combined age and status categories.

---

[1] A few respondents objected to the inclusion of both concepts in the statement, on the ground that they would have replied differently to one or the other. This may account for the slight agreement on the whole. However, the intent of the statement was to consider anti-intellectualism and authoritarianism as basically kindred concepts.

TABLE 37

PROFESSIONAL ASPECTS--RESPONDENTS BY AGE AND STATUS

	20-39		40-49		50-over		Prob.
	Rel. (55)	Lay (182)	Rel. (55)	Lay (73)	Rel. (96)	Lay (64)	
Democratic values not inhibited (A)	4.04	3.79	4.30	4.08	4.74	4.30	.001
Separate ownership from orders (A)	4.08	4.20	3.75	3.81	3.32	3.74	.001
Less rewarding professionally (A)	3.80	3.64	3.58	3.42	3.40	3.65	ns
Charges against colleges unjustified (A)	2.91	2.95	3.37	3.29	3.74	3.59	.001
Academically in backwater (D)	2.93	2.65	3.16	3.03	3.52	3.16	.001

It can first be noted from examination of Table 37 that all the subgroups of respondents gave a moderate assent to the proposition that Catholic colleges are less rewarding professionally than public ones. Otherwise, it appears that the age differentials among the respondents contribute the greatest degree of difference in opinions.

Younger faculty, whether religious or lay, agree less with all implications of a favorable professional climate than do the oldest group of respondents, religious or lay. It is also the younger faculty who agree, on the average, that Catholic colleges may be anti-intellectual and authoritarian and in an academic backwater of American higher education. On only one statement does there appear an appreciable difference in opinion between the younger religious and lay faculty. The latter are notably less inclined than the former to agree that democratic values are not inhibited by the college's religious affiliation.

The inference can be made that faculty do not acknowledge some ineluctable incompatibility between their institutions and the generally-accepted values of professionalism. But, it also appears clear that substantial disagreements exist regarding the extent to which Catholic higher education does embody a favorable professional climate.

Conclusions on Professional Climate

The foregoing analyses were directed at obtaining an impression of the attitudes held by faculty toward the

professional atmosphere of Catholic higher education. The term "professional" has been used in the broadest sense to describe a milieu which favors the autonomous growth and development of students, gives faculty a responsible voice in college affairs, and, overall, provides learning and working conditions of creditable prestige and stature.

The following set of conclusions begin with the most generalized impressions resulting from the survey, and continue with more specific observations based upon the opinion trends of particular respondent subgroups.

1. Faculty in Catholic colleges and universities generally describe their institutions in terms favorable to the educational and emotional development of students and to their own influence as professional educators.
2. Faculty generally give a negative appraisal of the professional quality of Catholic higher education in terms of prestige, status, and academic excellence.
3. Faculty place a moderate degree of importance on religious and moral values within the context of Catholic colleges. They reject an excessive moralistic tone and predict the eventual disassociation of Catholic colleges from church ownership.
4. University and college faculty generally appear similar in their assessments of the professional climate of Catholic higher education. Differences

appear to reflect institutional characteristics, rather than substantive differences in thinking about Catholic higher education.

5. Religious faculty are more favorable in their assessments of the professional climate of Catholic higher education than are lay faculty. Older religious faculty are generally more favorable than younger religious faculty.
6. Younger faculty, religious and lay, are generally less favorable, even negative in some aspects, to the professional climate of Catholic higher education than are older faculty. Younger lay faculty are generally the least favorable in comparison with all other groups by age and status.

The following chapter presents a summary analysis of the relationships between the respondents' opinions toward the professional climate of Catholic higher education and their attitudes toward the ideological orientations of professionalism. Two indices are described which attempt to depict value-profiles of faculty opinion with respect to the major research results.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY COMPARISONS OF PROFESSIONAL CLIMATE AND IDEOLOGY

A final analysis clarifies the relationships between the respondents' opinions toward the professional climate of Catholic higher education and their attitudes toward the ideological orientations of professionalism. In effect, the following discussions summarize much of the research results.

It was hypothesized that faculty who are more favorable than others to the existent professional climate of Catholic colleges are less favorable than others to the ideological views of professionalism. Conversely, faculty who are less favorable than others to the climate of Catholic colleges are more favorable than others to the professional ideological perspectives.

The hypothesis is directed at the relative position of faculty on two discrete sets of opinions, presumed to be qualitatively different. One, on climate, presupposes an objective factual assessment of the Catholic college. The other, on ideology, presupposes a value judgment on Catholic colleges.

The method employed for analysis began with discovering those statement items which appeared to be

most representative of the two sets of attitudes. After determining the statements, two indices were formed, one called the "Environment Index" and the other, the "Ideology Index."[1]

The items of the indices were established by subjecting all questionnaire statements to a "factor pot" after the responses of the individual respondents had been coded and keypunched on data processing cards. Factor analysis was employed to determine those items which loaded high in factor weights on the two relevant factors.[2] Arbitrarily, a weight of .50 or above was considered the cut-off point for including an item as "highly" representative of the attitude index in question.

The "Environment Index" comprised nine items which loaded highly on one factor and the "Ideology Index" consisted of twelve items which loaded the highest on the other factor.[3, 4] Table 38 and Table 39 list the

---

[1]The term "index" is used to describe an association of items which, by face content, appear to have a consistent theme.

[2]A standard varimax factor analysis method with orthogonal rotation of axes was used to rotate the data on two factors. Technical assistance and use of computer facilities was through the Statistical Laboratory of The University of Michigan and the School of Education, The University of Michigan.

[3]The two indices were found to correlate negatively. The product moment correlation was -0.386. Statistically, the indices appear distinct enough to corroborate the view that they are adequate measures of factual versus judgmental expressions of opinion. The negative correlation suggests the inverse relationship explored by the hypothesis.

[4]Alpha correlations were used to determine the internal reliability of the indices. The correlation for the "Environment Index" was 0.843 and the correlation for the "Ideology

TABLE 38

THE ENVIRONMENT INDEX

Item[a]	Factor Weight
The authority structure of a Catholic college deprives faculty some of their rights as professionals. (D)	.72
Criticism by faculty members of college policies is likely to be regarded as disloyalty by key administrators. (D)	.69
In matters concerning the interests of the college as a whole, faculty participation in decision-making is both sought and effectively encouraged by the administration. (A)	.69
Students do have their individuality respected and are treated as unique persons. (A)	.59
Faculty committees are really controlled by the administration. (D)	.57
Students are usually treated as adults in the application of college policies and regulations. (A)	.55
Lay faculty are sometimes treated as if they had religious vows. (D)	.54
Democratic values, such as personal autonomy, are not inhibited by the religious affiliation of the Catholic college. (A)	.51
Charges of anti-intellectualism and authoritarianism sometimes leveled at Catholic colleges are, for the most part, unjustified. (A)	.50

[a]"A" or "D" in parentheses indicates the response categories of Agree and Agree Somewhat and Disagree and Disagree Somewhat, respectively. The coding direction is presumed to represent the most favorable response to the professional climate of Catholic higher education.

TABLE 39

THE IDEOLOGY INDEX

Item[a]	Factor Weight
It is pointless to maintain rules for faculty to respect Catholic norms in teaching or conduct. (A)	.70
Students should be allowed to invite any person for public discussions on campus. (A)	.64
A Catholic college has a right to question the personal beliefs of faculty in unusual cases. (D)	.62
Faculty showing serious disrespect for the Catholic character of the college should not be reappointed. (D)	.61
There should be a definite policy on faculty selection to insure having faculty who share the values and objectives of a Catholic college. (D)	.60
It is the duty of a Catholic college to insist upon high moral standards for students. (D)	.59
Personal attitudes towards Catholicism are not important considerations for appointment. (A)	.58
Classroom discussions that raise controversy over religious beliefs should be watched carefully. (D)	.57
All beliefs are tentatively true or tentatively false and subject to inquiry for verification. (A)	.53
To be a critic of society a college must assert its freedom from all external authority. (A)	.51
If anything, not enough college authority is exercised over student behavior. (D)	.50
The Catholic college represents a bulwark against the spread of permissive morality. (D)	.50

[a]"A" or "D" in parentheses indicates the response categories of Agree and Agree Somewhat and Disagree and Disagree Somewhat, respectively. The coding direction is presumed to represent the response which would be given by the most liberal adherent of ideological professionalism. Some statements have been shortened or slightly altered to conserve space.

statements making up the indices, along with the factor weights for each item.

Analysis proceeded by determining the mean scores of respondent subgroups on each of the indices.[1] The analysis of variance technique was used to compare the group means for statistical significance.

Scores on the indices are interpreted in terms of "favorability." That is, on the response scale of one to five, the higher the value of the mean score, the more favorable the degree of opinion expressed to the theme of the index.

The following presentation of results begins with the institutional classifications of the respondents and ends with their academic fields.

Table 40 presents the scores of respondents by their institutional categories.

TABLE 40

INDICES--RESPONDENTS BY INSTITUTIONS

	Univ.		Colleges			
	Doct. (181)	Mast. (99)	Men (73)	Coed (90)	Women (108)	Prob.
Environment	3.65	3.54	3.82	3.79	4.09	.001
Ideology	3.70	3.43	3.56	3.31	3.29	.01

It is apparent from Table 40 that faculty of the

Index" was 0.876. See Appendix B for tables of intercorrelations.

[1]These are grand means or the means of the index means for the respondents within subgroups.

doctoral-level institutions seem most divergent from faculty of the colleges for women. The latter respondents appear to express the most favorable opinion toward the climate of the Catholic college while, in magnitude of the mean score, expressing the least favorable opinion toward the ideological viewpoints. Differences between other subgroups of respondents appear similar, on the whole, though perhaps the more negative appraisal of the "Environment" by faculty at the masters-level institutions may be suggestive of some genuine dissatisfactions by this group.

More substantial differences become apparent in Table 41 which shows results by the sex and religious or lay status of respondents.

TABLE 41

INDICES--RESPONDENTS BY STATUS

	Laymen (289)	Laywomen (48)	Sisters (94)	Priests (120)	Prob.
Environment	3.59	3.53	4.22	3.90	.001
Ideology	3.75	3.84	3.10	3.04	.001

On each index in Table 41, lay respondents, men and women, differ appreciably from religious respondents, sisters and priests. Only the "Environment Index," however, shows a substantial difference in degree of opinion between similar groups by status. Here, the sisters are notably more favorable than priests. (Probability is less than .01 between sisters and priests.)

It seems clear that the religious faculty are more likely than the lay faculty to be expressive of a more favorable view toward the existent professional climate of Catholic colleges, while the lay faculty are more likely than the religious faculty to agree with the ideological orientations of professionalism.

Table 42 shows the mean scores of respondents on the indices by age categories.

TABLE 42

INDICES--RESPONDENTS BY AGE GROUPS

	20-29 (65)	30-34 (101)	35-39 (79)	40-44 (70)	45-49 (56)	50-59 (107)	60-over (55)	Prob.
Environment	3.40	3.42	3.60	3.78	3.89	4.00	4.38	.001
Ideology	4.09	3.97	3.89	3.57	3.45	2.94	2.50	.001

Observation of Table 42 leaves small room for doubt that the age factor is most influential as a determinant of opinions. The direction of scores within the increasing age groupings indicates clearly the negative correlation of the two indices.

Two different patterns of demarcations by age can be noted. First, there appears on both indices a sharp difference between the under-40 and over-40 groups by age. The average responses of the under-40 faculty are roughly similar, while the average responses of the over-40 faculty show a progressive and substantial change, increasing with the "Environment Index" and decreasing with the "Ideology

Index." Put another way, the younger respondents are remarkably similar among each other on the respective measures, whereas the older respondents show substantial differences as the age groupings increase.

Second, it is the oldest respondents, of age 50 and over, who strongly agree with the favorable professional climate of Catholic colleges while they disagree with the ideological perspectives. All other respondents, on the average, expressed, at least, a moderate degree of approval on both indices.

Table 43 further clarifies the age factor by presenting the mean scores according to the combined age and status categories.

TABLE 43

INDICES--RESPONDENTS BY AGE AND STATUS

	20-39		40-49		50-over		Prob.
	Rel. (55)	Lay (182)	Rel. (55)	Lay (73)	Rel. (96)	Lay (64)	
Environment	3.78	3.38	3.92	3.76	4.26	3.95	.001
Ideology	3.69	4.07	3.35	3.65	2.59	3.07	.001

Examination of Table 43 shows that the age factor continues in the patterns already noted, whether religious or lay faculty are considered. However, within the respective age brackets, substantial differences seem apparent among the youngest group and the oldest group. For example, on both indices, the youngest religious

respondents and the oldest religious respondents differ appreciably in average scores from their lay counterparts by age. Among the middle group of age 40 to age 49, the opinion differences appear less substantial.

It is also evident that it is the older group of religious faculty who disagree most with the ideological issues, although they strongly favor the issues on the professional environment. In contrast, the youngest group of lay faculty strongly favor the ideological perspectives and give the least approval to those of the environment.

The question arises here on how strong are the influences of age and of vocational status in relation to each other. It seems unlikely, for example, that the two factors of age and status should combine in some way to produce a discrete class of individuals. This is to say that it seems more likely that age and status are, by themselves, independent variables having their own selective impact on attitudes. Specifically, it appears reasonable to expect that age differentials will discriminate faculty opinions regardless of religious or lay status, simply because those who have spent a longer period of years in service to Catholic colleges have more reason to associate their personal self-esteem with the institution they serve. Younger faculty, whether religious or lay, are potentially more mobile and would seem to have less reason to associate their professional self-identity with a particular institution or class of institutions.

On the other hand, religious and lay status can be expected to have a selective impact on opinions apart from age. By their vocational choice, religious faculty have a greater stake in Catholic colleges, often owned by their religious orders, than lay faculty. It can also be expected that religious faculty, as a result of their personal commitment, will display a larger degree of concern for the meaning of their institutions as "Catholic" with respect to the ideological character of professionalism.

In sum, the results of Table 43, (page 187) suggest that the younger the respondents, the more favorable they are to the ideological thinking of professionalism and the less favorable they are in their assessments of the professional climate of Catholic higher education. But, if the respondents are also religious, they will be less favorable than lay faculty of comparable age to ideological thinking and, likewise, more favorable in their assessments of the professional climate.[1] Another analysis of the indices concerned the religious preference distinctions

---

[1]These observations appear to be supported by the results of a two-way analysis of variance applied to the indices using age and status as factors. No significant interactions were found with age and status on either index.

For the "Environment Index" the differences in the age levels were significant at the .001 level; the differences in status were significant at the .01 level. For the "Ideology Index" both factors of age and status were significant at the .001 level.

These statistical results suggest that age and status have very strong, independent, main effects.

of the respondents. These results are given in Table 44.

TABLE 44

INDICES--RESPONDENTS BY RELIGIOUS PREFERENCES

	Catholics (411)	Protestants (54)	None (34)	Prob.
Environment	3.89	3.46	3.25	.001
Ideology	3.30	3.83	4.35	.001

It can be observed in Table 44 that the Catholics are substantially different in the degree of their averaged opinion compared to the Protestants and the "None" group on both indices. Protestants, however, appear somewhat similar to the "None" group in their opinions on the "Environment Index," though an appreciable difference occurs between the two groups on the "Ideology Index."

To the extent that the faculty who did not express a religious preference might be considered comparable with faculty in secular institutions, it is interesting to note their extremely strong agreement on the ideological issues. Although such a comparison cannot be made, it seems that within Catholic colleges, at least, there is an apparently wide difference between the presumably agnostic faculty members and those of religious persuasion.

Table 45 reports the scores of respondents according to the Catholic or non-Catholic institutional source of their undergraduate and highest degrees.

TABLE 45

INDICES--RESPONDENTS BY DEGREE SOURCES

	Undergraduate Cath. (366)	Non-C. (184)	Prob.	High. Degree Cath. (227)	Non-C. (305)	Prob.
Environment	3.86	3.57	.001	3.93	3.63	.001
Ideology	3.30	3.88	.001	3.18	3.74	.001

Regardless of degree source at the undergraduate or graduate level, the opinions of the respondents as shown in Table 45 appear distinguished to an appreciable degree by the Catholic or non-Catholic type of institutions. Again, what perhaps can be called a "Catholic" versus "secular" pattern seems evident. Graduates of Catholic institutions are more favorable to the professional climate of Catholic colleges than those who are not. Similarly, graduates of non-Catholic institutions are more approving of the ideological issues than graduates of Catholic institutions.

This is, as noted already, a methodologically imprecise analysis since the admixtures of religious and lay respondents vary considerably with the institutional divisions. However, the results do point to the inference that educational socialization within Catholic higher education produces graduates more favorable to the climate of these institutions and less favorable to the ideological thinking of professionalism.

A further distinction in respondents compares them

by their academic fields. Table 46 shows results on the indices by the broad discipline categories and includes, for comparison purposes, the mean scores of respondents teaching in the area of theology or religion.

TABLE 46

INDICES--RESPONDENTS BY ACADEMIC FIELDS

	Human. (202)	Soc. Sc. (121)	Nat. Sc. (133)	Prob.	Theol. (79)
Environment	3.73	3.75	3.85	ns	3.66
Ideology	3.52	3.66	3.33	ns	3.53

It is evident from the results shown in Table 46 that the broad disciplinary categories of respondents appear similar in opinion. Likewise, the opinions of the theology respondents are substantially similar to their colleagues.

The lack of differences to an appreciable extent suggests that specific academic orientations may not be linked to the value issues represented by the indices. In other words, disciplinary identifications, on the whole, are not related to some discernible mind-set toward Catholic higher education and ideological professionalism.[1]

[1]This is to say, of course, that the results reported here do not suggest the relationship. It can, however, be pointed out that the lay and religious proportions among the academic fields do not appear out-of-line with what seems reasonable from a knowledge of Catholic colleges. The lay proportions are as follows: Humanitites--62 percent; Social sciences--76 percent; Natural sciences--70 percent; and Theology--23 percent.

A final analysis is presented with Table 47 which shows the results on the indices according to the respondents' academic ranks.

TABLE 47

INDICES--RESPONDENTS BY ACADEMIC RANKS

	Inst. (115)	Asst. P. (183)	Assoc. P. (120)	Prof. (123)	Prob.
Environment	3.49	3.60	3.81	4.16	.001
Ideology	3.85	3.69	3.37	3.01	.001

Since academic ranking reflects roughly the seniority status of faculty, it is not surprising to observe in Table 47 a pattern of scores similar to those reported for age. Specifically, the instructors and the assistant professors appear quite similar in their opinions on the indices, while the associate and full professors are closer together in their opinions. As with differences in age, the academic ranks show a progressive increase or decrease in averaged opinion on the respective indices according to the increased levels of rank.

It seems apparent, however, that the full professors take substantially the strongest stances, giving a sweeping endorsement to the professional climate of Catholic colleges and virtually rejecting the propositions of the professional ideology.

Conclusion

The analyses of the Environment and Ideology indices have shown an apparent inverse relationship between the degree of favorableness expressed toward the professional climate of Catholic higher education and the acceptance of ideological professionalism. This result suggests a conflict of values regarding the aims and purposes of the Catholic college.

If the substantive differences between and within faculty subgroups are merely indicators of the type of social changes to be expected of dynamic, adaptive institutions, the conclusion can be drawn that the end result will be the strengthening of Catholic colleges as Catholic colleges. However, to the extent that the disagreements concern the reasons for the existence of Catholic colleges, then it seems no less is at stake than the very survival of these colleges as Catholic colleges.

Given the fact of the widely divergent attitudes and perceptions on the part of faculty reported in this study, it appears a more likely conclusion to doubt whether Catholic higher education can arrive at a successful accommodation with "professionalism" and still be distinctively "Catholic."

A final chapter reviews the major research findings and summarizes the study in terms of the hypotheses and principal conclusions. Suggestions for further research are given. Some practical and theoretical implications for Catholic higher education are briefly discussed.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This final chapter has two objectives. One is to summarize results in terms of the hypotheses and the conclusions drawn from them. The second objective is to present the findings, including suggestions for further research, in terms of the implications for Catholic colleges and universities.

Overview of the Study

The research problem was to explore the attitudes of faculty in selected Catholic colleges and universities towards the ideological norms and values of professionalism in light of the identity crisis for Catholic higher education. The consideration for the necessity of the research is the social importance of the "crisis of meaning" for Catholic higher education centered about its need to make an ideological accommodation to the prevalent norms of American academia. The terms of the crisis are dictated by the assumption that this accommodation cannot be successfully made without raising the serious question of whether the "typical" Catholic college can also retain its Catholicity in any meaningful sense.

Broad perspectives of the study concerned faculty

attitudes towards: (1) the question of "identity," (2) ideological professionalism, and (3) the professional climate of Catholic higher education. A specific thrust was directed at uncovering an hypothesized inverse relationship between faculty attitudes towards ideological professionalism and the existent professional atmosphere of Catholic higher education.

Underlying the study was the central thesis that a college with a philosophical orientation ought to have faculty who share or acknowledge the common purpose implicit in the goals and values of the institution.

The selected sample consisted of sixteen midwest Catholic colleges and universities. These institutions were chosen to represent a cross-section of educational quality as well as of the institutional types found among lay-oriented colleges in Catholic higher education. The faculty sample comprised 551 respondents to a questionnaire who were selected (initially) according to a range of disciplinary identifications.

The research instrument was a questionnaire directed at obtaining responses to a series of forced-choice statements and at encouraging written commentaries towards vignettes representing basic issues in Catholic higher education.

Confirmation of Hypotheses

Subgroups of the respondent sample by institutional, academic, social, and religious variables formed the

referent groups of the hypotheses. Each hypothesis used the term "liberal" or "more professionally liberal" to suggest the predicted more favorable acceptance of ideological professionalism and, inversely, a less favorable opinion towards the professional climate of Catholic higher education.

The hypotheses are now repeated with brief statements directed at their confirmation as a result of this study.[1]

A primary hypothesis was concerned with describing a pattern of attitudes held by faculty which specified the principal relationships of the research issues.

The Primary Hypothesis

> Faculty who are more liberal in their acceptance of the professional ideology are less favorable to the professional environment of the Catholic college. Conversely, faculty who are less liberal in their acceptance of the professional ideology are more favorable to the professional environment of the Catholic college.

The hypothesis was strongly confirmed. To the degree that acceptance of the professional ideology was generally found among the respondents, there was also a less favorable assessment given to the professional environment of Catholic higher education. Predominantly, the respondents were more likely than not to accept the normative considerations of professionalism and to stress the professional identity as primary for their colleges.

---

[1]For the sake of clarity and to facilitate interpretation, the hypotheses are stated as declarative assertions, rather than using the statistical mode of the "null hypothesis."

It cannot be said, however, that the professional ideological perspectives received unqualified assent. To a significant degree, the acceptance of ideological professionalism was mediated by the concern shown by important subgroups towards the religious dimensions of Catholic higher education.

Secondary hypotheses were formulated to distinguish subgroups of faculty in the degree of their assent to the research issues.

Hypothesis One

Faculty in Catholic universities are more professionally liberal than faculty in Catholic colleges.

The hypothesis was confirmed. On all issues, the classifications of "university" and "college" distinguished the respondents. Faculty in the doctoral-level institutions and faculty in the women's colleges represented the extremes. In between, and not persuasively different from each other, were the faculty of the masters-level universities, the men's colleges, and the coeducational colleges.

Hypothesis Two

Faculty of the lower professional ranks are more professionally liberal than faculty of the higher professional ranks.

The hypothesis was confirmed. Instructors and assistant professors were generally "more professionally liberal" than associate and full professors.

Hypothesis Three

Faculty of the humanities and the social sciences are more professionally liberal than faculty of the natural sciences.

The hypothesis was not confirmed. The results did indicate a possible rank-order in the direction of the hypothesis of the social sciences, the humanities, and the natural sciences. Differences, however, were so slight as to be really inconclusive. These results suggest that the normative principles of professionalism may transcend particular disciplines.

Hypothesis Four

Lay faculty are more professionally liberal than clergy and religious faculty.

The hypothesis was strongly confirmed. As a group, and without control for age differences, the lay respondents differed substantially in the direction of the hypothesis from the religious faculty as a group.

Hypothesis Five

Younger faculty, whether lay or religious, are more professionally liberal than older faculty, whether lay or religious.

The hypothesis was strongly confirmed. Age differences produced an almost linear progression on a continuum of "more" to "less" professionally liberal.

Substantial differences existed with respect to vocational status of the faculty even within comparable age groups. No evidence was found to suggest that the factors of age and status have a joint effect in influencing opinions on the research issues. Both factors appeared to have powerful and independent effects.

Hypothesis Six

Male faculty, religious or lay, are more professionally liberal than female faculty, religious or lay.

The hypothesis was not confirmed. Laymen and laywomen were substantially the same in their opinions; likewise, priests and sisters did not differ across the broad range of statements on the issues.

Hypothesis Seven

> Faculty professionalized in non-Catholic undergraduate and graduate schools are more professionally liberal than faculty professionalized in Catholic schools.

The hypothesis was confirmed. As a somewhat rough measure of educational socialization, faculty were distinguished in their attitudes on the issues according to the institutional sources of their degrees.

Hypothesis Eight

> Faculty who are Protestant or "None" in religious preference are more professionally liberal than faculty who are Catholic.

The hypothesis was strongly confirmed. The "None" group of respondents were consistently the "most professionally liberal" of all referent groups considered. The Protestants consistently took positions between the "None" group and the Catholics.

Conclusions on Hypotheses

The research issues probed in terms of the hypotheses are matters of value. They are not, properly speaking, subject to quantification. However, to the extent that substantial agreements and disagreements have been shown to exist among the opinions of faculty in Catholic colleges, it can be assumed that these are indicative of the qualitative similarities and differences in actual beliefs

held by faculty.

In an essay-style, a series of conclusions are now discussed with respect to the critical differences found among faculty subgroups.

The Older Faculty: A sharp cleavage in attitudes was apparent between older and younger faculty with the mid-40's appearing to be the dividing line. As the cross-section of respondents increased in age, the older faculty were notably more conservative towards the ideological perspectives and more favorable towards the professional climate of Catholic higher education.

Whether religious or lay, the older faculty appeared to incorporate the kind of internalized commitment to Catholic higher education which stresses the importance of religious and moral development for students, the inculcation of loyalty to the Catholic church, and, underneath all, the expression of deep personal faith in the supernatural ordering of reality.

As a class, the older religious faculty, both sisters and priests, particularly of age 50 and above, represented two extremes in the opinions expressed by subgroups. They were the only ones to reject emphatically the ideological perspectives pertaining to professionalism and they were the most favorable of all subgroups in their assessment of the professional climate of Catholic higher education.

The older lay faculty were only slightly more

favorable to the ideological statements than were the older religious, but they were appreciably more likely than their counterparts to respond critically, in the sense of being less praiseworthy, to the climate of Catholic colleges with respect to faculty and students.

The Younger Faculty: Among the younger faculty, of the mid-40's and under, a fairly homogeneous set of opinions was evident. Whether religious or lay, younger faculty were substantially more accepting of the ideological perspectives and less favorable to the climate of Catholic higher education than were the older faculty, religious and lay.

Younger faculty stressed the broader viewpoint of the scholarly Christian community as opposed to the implications of an instrumental relationship between the Catholic church and the Catholic college. They rejected suggestions of a moralistically-toned education and were strongly emphatic in denying that religious norms are suitable or proper for considerations of faculty selection and appointment.

Differences in the degree of opinion between the younger religious and younger lay faculty were notable, however, and similar to the patterns observed distinguishing the older religious and lay faculty. The younger lay faculty were appreciably more professionally ideologically-oriented and substantially less favorable to the climate of Catholic colleges than the younger religious.

On the whole, the younger religious and lay faculty appeared more alike than not to each other when compared with the older faculty groups. In particular, these younger faculty gave the impression of being critical and more demanding of what Catholic colleges should become and should do as educative institutions.[1]

Nonetheless, it is the younger lay faculty, more than the religious, who appeared decisively oriented towards the professional ideology without mediation from consideration of religious concerns. If the designation of "new breed" can legitimately be applied to the faculty who evaluate themselves and their institutions in substantially secular terms, the younger lay faculty in Catholic colleges earn the label.

The Non-Catholics: Though a small percentage of the respondents, the non-Catholics generally expressed attitudes in marked contrast with the Catholics. The "None" group in religious preference gave a virtually unqualified assent to the ideological propositions and they were, of all groups, the least favorable to the professional climate of Catholic higher education.

The Protestants were always in between the Catholics and the "None" group in their stances on the issues, often appreciably different from both other referent groups, but,

---

[1]This should not necessarily be interpreted in favor of professionalism, however. There was some evidence in the written comments of the younger respondents that they regard professionalism, as commonly considered, to be rigid, narrow, and inimical to "real" education.

to a very slight degree, closer to the Catholics.

Most likely, the non-Catholics are a force moving the Catholic college towards a greater degree of accommodation with secular norms and standards. Their numbers and influence probably will increase, as these individuals are persuaded that the selection and appointment of faculty do not depend upon expressed or hidden "Catholic" norms.

The Institutions: Faculty teaching at the university level are more ideologically-oriented and less favorable to the professional climate of Catholic higher education than are faculty teaching at the college level. However, within the subclasses of institutions, differences among similarly classified universities and colleges appear slight.[1]

At the apparent extremes in the sets of attitudes were the faculty in the doctoral-level institutions and the faculty in the colleges for women. These institutions appear to be most unalike in their degree of professional ideological assent and in their attitudes towards Catholic colleges. Though the terms may be arguable, the doctoral-

---

[1]This is to say that faculty of specific institutions gave responses which, on examination, did not appear appreciably distinctive from responses of faculty in similar institutions. While it was not the purpose of this study to examine particular institutions, a check on the data did reveal a rough correlation between the assumed quality and prestige of institutions and the degree of acceptance of the ideological perspectives. In general, the greater the assumed quality, the greater the acceptance of ideology and the less favorable attitudes towards Catholic higher education were found.

level universities are representative of the most "secular" stance and the colleges for women are representative of the most "Catholic" stance among the classes of institutions.

Faculty in other types of institutions--masters-level universities, men's colleges, and coeducational colleges--were, on the whole, closer to each other in overall attitudes, generally showing a moderate acceptance of the ideological orientations and a moderately favorable stance towards the professional climate of Catholic higher education.

These institutional differences may only represent the varying definitions of the meaning of a Catholic college as formulated, explicitly and implicitly, by the goals and practices of particular colleges. However, from what has been shown in this study concerning the respective attitudes of lay and religious faculty, it seems fair to conclude that the proportional mix of lay and religious faculty has more bearing on an institution's operational meaning of its Catholicity than the institutional categories themselves.

Other classifications of faculty, to the extent these produced interpretable results, were either of little importance or linked in some substantial way to the group variables discussed above.

Conclusions on the Research Issues

The results of the study have clearly shown that faculty in Catholic colleges are not of one mind concerning the aims and purposes of Catholic higher education,

particularly as these differences are interpreted from the viewpoint of accommodation to the secular norms of American higher education in general. There are, however, some generalized impressions which appear to reflect the dominant thrust of the thinking of the faculty on the issues, and which, at least in terms of the majority of the respondents, seem to represent the current state of affairs among the faculty and institutions studied.

These concluding global impressions are presented according to the themes of identity, ideology, and the professional climate regarding Catholic higher education. The Identity Issue: Most faculty appear to generalize the meaning of Catholicity in connection with their colleges to the universalistic and superordinate goal of a scholarly community based upon an acknowledgment of the Christian faith and the worth of Christian values within the academic context. By far, faculty tend to reject an instrumental relationship between the Catholic church and the Catholic college which would link the aims and purposes of the church with those of the college.

What faculty stress for their college is a professional and educational primacy which, in effect, subordinates religious and moral aims to a secondary, though not unimportant, goal. For example, the preferred faculty member is a good teacher and scholarly competent, and if he should also be a dedicated Christian, the latter is a highly desirable, but a secondary consideration. In

effect, the faculty prefer the competent Christian teacher.

The consideration given to the centrality of theology in the Catholic college is the clearest indication of the thinking of faculty concerning the meaning of the Catholic college. They emphasize the importance of a scholarly competent faculty for theology on a par with other academic disciplines, and they opt for a program nearly all elective in terms of requirements, less narrowly "Catholic" in approach, but still a program that gives academic recognition and importance to the study of religious truths and experiences. In sum, the role of theology is acknowledged as central to the meaning of the Catholic college as the academic formulation of the premise that religion, itself, constitutes a vital part of the human experience.

Overall, the faculty appear to externalize a Christian dimension for the Catholic college in the sense of limiting the inculcation of religious and moral values to an extra-academic role, dependent upon the human interactions of believers in a non-coercive and religiously non-prescriptive atmosphere.

The Ideological Issue: Most faculty give a moderate degree of support to issues relating to the conceptual bases of academic freedom. In particular, faculty appear critically cautious of stances reflecting a strong stress on individual rights and freedoms, especially if the formulations are

construed as "absolutes" or in unwarranted conflict with institutional prerogatives.

However, faculty clearly accept the normative principles of professionalism with respect to the substance of academic freedom regarding an open climate in which freedom for scholarly teaching and discussion is assured, though, at times, the specifics could be considered a risk to the Catholic dimension of the college.

Most important, faculty generally reject limitations on their teaching, conduct, and personal attitudes and beliefs, aimed at insuring a faculty body favorable to, and hence promotive of, specifically religious aims for the Catholic college.

This rejection of Catholic "system norms" may only imply that faculty are suspicious of any policies subject to administrative control which attempt to apply extra-academic standards to the crucial areas protected by the concept of academic freedom. But, it also appears likely that many faculty simply regard any appeal to religiously-based norms as prima facie evidence of professional incompetence and academic inferiority.

In terms of a presumed accommodation to the ideological norms of professionalism by faculty in Catholic colleges, it is clear, over-all, that the faculty are saying that their institutions should maintain the same professional standards as maintained by all other respectable institutions of higher learning. They also

appear to be saying that an effective Catholicity, however defined, does not require a set of specified principles and practices which would, functionally at least, distinguish the Catholic campus from others.

The Professional Climate: The majority of faculty report their working environments to be professionally satisfying and conducive to the educational and emotional growth of students. Faculty do not perceive Catholic colleges to be second-class, undemocratic institutions where faculty have no real voice in college affairs.

However, the existence of negative attitudes towards Catholic higher education is also in evidence with respect to the academic quality and excellence of Catholic colleges. Though faculty generally believe their institutions are professionally rewarding, they apparently see Catholic colleges as not having attained a desirable degree of professional stature and prestige.

Recommendations for Further Research

Findings reported in this study have referred to broad classes of faculty teaching in Catholic colleges and universities. Obviously, these groups are not all that homogeneous in their characteristics and opinions. Thus, the findings and the conclusions drawn from them are generalizations that paint a picture of Catholic higher education which is very broad in scope and easily oversimplified. The limitations of the study, especially with respect to the sampling method, size of the respondent

population, and the possible response bias of the faculty composition, are additional factors which dictate the necessity of caution in interpreting the findings.

A need then exists for corroborating the more salient research results. This need, in turn, suggests further areas of study. A brief mention of some is now given.

Institutional differences, particularly between doctoral-level universities and colleges for women, were emphasized as being persuasively divergent in stances pertaining to ideological professionalism and to the Catholicity of the colleges. There is need to explore the specific institutions and their faculties on the issues. For example, how different and in what ways are a Catholic university striving for professional eminence and nation-wide recognition compared with a smaller institution striving to achieve a unique educational experience for a limited clientele? Even more pertinent perhaps, is the need for specific research directed at determining what does make some Catholic colleges apparently "distinctive" in their integration of the Christian dimension with their educational programs.

Age and religious or lay status were found to be powerful and independent factors in determining faculty attitudes. This is an important finding, since it suggests that the faculty mix of a Catholic college may well be most decisive in whatever claim the college makes towards

its professionalism and Catholicity. For example, questions of mergers between Catholic colleges and of defining an institution as "independent" rather than "Catholic," are perhaps more contingent upon age and status proportions of faculty than upon financial and other factors. This is simply to say that beneath more visible issues, such as financial survival, the values and attitudes of the people who staff the college will determine in the long run the survival of a college as "Catholic," however defined. Research can clarify this crucial point.

Stress was placed in this study on the wide divergence in attitudes between the non-Catholics, especially the apparent agnostics, and Catholic faculty. If, for example, the attitudes of faculty and administrators towards Catholicism, or even Christian values, is not pertinent in the selection and appointment of faculty, it seems reasonable to assume an institution's Catholicity, functional at least, will be affected. Further research is needed to explore the influence on institutional values of non-Catholic and Catholic faculty members who apparently relegate to non-importance any religious dimension for the Catholic college.

Finally, further study is needed in terms of the larger picture of Roman Catholicism on the attitudes of faculty. Not only Vatican Catholicism, but also the national and local levels of American Catholicism should

be considered. Recent issues of priestly celibacy, controversy concerning former priests teaching in or administering departments of theology, and the rise of a Radical Left among activist clergy and laymen are some important new developments. At the very least, continuing study is needed to note the impact of the broader currents of change and resistance to change on Catholic higher education.

Concluding Remarks

The presentation of this research has made clear that, to a large extent, substantial ideological conflict exists in Catholic higher education. It appears true that such differences cannot be relegated to the category of "mere" opinion. Rather, the disagreements are substantive, and since they strike at the heart of what a Catholic college is, their ultimate resolution is likely to produce major qualitative changes in the character and style of Catholic higher education.

In pragmatic terms, the question must be pursued on whether a Catholic form of higher education does produce graduates who incorporate a "Catholic vision of man" which distinguishes them from graduates of institutions making no such claims. Equally important is the need for each Catholic college to specify in unambiguous statements and procedures the college's relationship to the Catholic church, the form and degree of adherence to the theological and moral positions of Catholicity, and the extent to

which any strictures on faculty and students may exist because the college has a serious Christian (and specifically Catholic) commitment.

For administrators (and trustees) of Catholic colleges, there appears the evident need to be aware of the actual beliefs on the part of both the college's internal and external communities concerning aims and purposes. What administrators certainly cannot do is assume the existence of some persuasive congruence between the purported purposes and actual convictions held by faculty and others.

For faculty, there are obvious career implications contingent on an institution's definition of its purposes. Most faculty in this study rejected Catholic "system norms," even as they gave a moderate assent to the ideological norms of professionalism. This may be interpreted as the desire of faculty for a new educational model with its roots in Catholic culture and Christian tradition. It may mean, however, that faculty are in a transition which will ultimately lead to a complete acceptance of "professionalism" and a complete secularization of Catholic higher education. But, at the very least, faculty considering careers in Catholic higher education must be assured that their appointments and promotions are not subject to "invisible" Catholic guidelines as interpreted by key administrators. If such guidelines do exist, then the professional integrity of a Catholic

college demands the forthright and open description of the boundaries relating to the religious commitment.

Given the disagreements shown in this study, it seems doubtful that any overall Catholic position could ever be applied to Catholic higher education. More likely, each college and university will consider its own character and formulate its own "definition" of Catholicity, if it chooses to do so at all.

Some Catholic colleges may indeed develop a new model for Catholic higher education that resolves the identity question within the highest standards of professionalism. Without question, this is the direction some institutions are determined to take. However, it seems unlikely that this goal can be achieved without positive policies of faculty recruitment and appointment perceived by many faculty as antithetical to the prevailing norms of professionalism.

Some Catholic colleges are likely to retrench in the sense of Berger's cognitive minority, establishing a institutionally-specific "Catholic" raison d'être that is essentially conservative and almost fundamentalist. These institutions are quite likely to reject, and emphatically say so, the current specifications of professionalism.

For most Catholic colleges, however, the internal and external pressures are such that their future direction seems to inevitably lead towards the non-sectarian

independent college model. The impact of avowedly religious concerns will steadily decrease. What remains of Catholic, and even Christian, commitment will be limited to an adjunct area--a curricular offering, a chapel service, a president's exhortation at commencement--that is inconsequential to what the college really stands for. In sum, these colleges may retain the qualifier of "Catholic" for whatever benefits this may bring, but in practice they will be virtually undistinguishable from other colleges having no discernible religious character.

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION AND SAMPLING RESULTS

Preliminaries to Study

This research on faculty attitudes in Catholic higher education was stimulated by the author's personal interest and concern for the problems besetting Catholic colleges during a time of rapid social change. Additional support for the study was given by the faculty of the Center for the Study of Higher Education, the University of Michigan, by their encouragement of studies related to the problem of institutional adaptation to the needs of the broader society.

A pilot study was made of two Illinois Catholic colleges during the spring of 1969. At this time, a questionnaire was developed and tested with the cooperation of administrators and faculty of the two colleges. Extensive interviews with the colleges' personnel helped clarify the research objectives and refine the research instrument.

During the summer months, a decision was made to limit the study to institutions of the North Central accreditation region, primarily for reasons of cost, but also to facilitate personal communications with the selected colleges and universities. Sixteen institutions

were selected based upon size and type, lay student orientation, accreditation, and a range of presumed academic quality.

Letters were sent to the presidents of the colleges and to the department chairmen in the universities explaining the nature of the study and requesting names of faculty in the selected disciplinary areas. One president did not respond; another college of equivalent type was substituted.

Institutions were promised anonymity. Since the study intended a broad survey of faculty opinion, no comparisons are made between particular institutions. The faculty lists, however, provided the basis for a personal mailing of the questionnaire to potential respondents and a means of comparing the total potential population of faculty with the respondent population. A code system was used, strictly for the purpose of checking response rates and to enable the mailing of a follow-up card to those who had not returned the questionnaire by a reasonable time.

The universe population comprised 1,016 full-time faculty, including 18 faculty who were primarily in administrative capacities. The questionnaires were mailed during the last week of September and the first week of October, 1969. A cover letter requested the cooperation of the individual faculty member.

A follow-up card was mailed during the second week of November to those subjects who had not responded

by this time. Questionnaires received after this time were regarded as coming from "late responders."

The cut-off date for using questionnaires was the first week of December, 1969. After coding and key-punching of responses, the data processing and statistical analyses were begun, including the content analyses of the many written comments and position statements received.

Questionnaire Returns

Returned questionnaires were examined for "usability." Of those received in time and suitable for data processing, 551 constituted the sample information provided by the respondents. This is a return rate of 54.2 percent.

Although most respondents expressed favorable comments towards the purposes of the study, there were two negative types of responses. First, some faculty members did not feel qualified to respond because they were new to their positions or did not, for reasons not given, feel competent to address themselves to the issues presented by the questionnaire. Second, some faculty members were of the opinion that the statements in the questionnaire represented an anti-Catholic bias. They apparently felt the study was "loaded" against Catholic higher education. Some, who took this stance, however, did respond and complete the questionnaire, although they made critical remarks about the "impartiality" and competence of the research.

It is, of course, impossible to determine how

these negative response factors may have contributed to response bias and their effect on the percentage rate of returns.

"Early" versus "Late" Responders

Those who returned questionnaires before the mid-point (October) comprised 421 faculty or 78 percent of the total sample. Later returns (November) comprised 130 respondents or 22 percent of the total. The mean scores on each item of the questionnaire were calculated for each of these groups. Statistical comparisons were performed by the analysis of variance method.

With the exception of two statements, no significant differences were found between the "early" and "late" responders reaching the .05 level of confidence.

Since the differences between these groups of respondents were statistically insignificant, this appears to suggest that those who did not respond at all may not be appreciably different as a group from those who did respond. This, of course, cannot be known for certain.

Response Percentages by Institutions

Of the total sample of 551 respondents, 280 represented university faculty and 271 were college faculty. Thus, the respective institutional populations were almost perfectly balanced. Table 48 shows the return percentages of usable questionnaires for the particular institutions. (Institutions are numbered to preserve anonymity.)

TABLE 48

QUESTIONNAIRE--RESPONSE PERCENTAGES BY INSTITUTIONS

Institution	Mailed	Returned	Percentage[a]
Doctoral-level			
1.	122	44	36
2.	112	81	72
3.	141	56	39
Masters-level			
4.	129	70	54
5.	75	29	38
Coed college			
6.	55	32	58
7.	46	29	63
8.	44	29	66
Men's college			
9.	48	28	58
10.	50	27	54
11.	24	18	75
Women's college			
12.	41	27	66
13.	35	22	63
14.	36	25	69
15.	26	15	57
16.	32	19	60
Total	1,016	551	54

[a]Percentages are rounded.

Response Percentages by Disciplines

Individual faculty were selected according to seven discipline areas. Six disciplines represented a range from the sciences to the humanities. The seventh discipline was theology. As necessary, some substitutions were made, such as chemistry for physics and political science for economics, depending on the curricular

composition of a particular college. Table 49 gives the return percentages of usable questionnaires by disciplines.

TABLE 49

QUESTIONNAIRE--RESPONSE PERCENTAGES BY DISCIPLINES

Discipline	Mailed	Returned	Percentage[a]
Physics	114	74	64
Biology	105	60	57
Economics	105	51	48
Sociology	124	68	55
History	161	87	54
English	234	114	49
Theology	157	79	50
Other[b]	18	18	100

[a]Percentages are rounded.

[b]The "Other" classification represents respondents who gave their primary duties as administrative, such as presidents and deans of students.

Summary Comment

The research sample of individual respondents appears reasonably representative of the selected cross-section of mid-west Catholic colleges and universities. At the very least, the sample is a substantial proportion of the faculty members comprising the disciplines common to the undergraduate divisions of the universities and the liberal arts colleges. It seems, therefore, that their opinions on the research issues can be regarded as an important and reliable indicator of faculty thought within American Catholic higher education.

TABLE 50

ENVIRONMENT INDEX--ITEM INTERCORRELATIONS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1		.52	.39	.40	.49	.43	.50	.47	.37
2			.50	.42	.51	.40	.34	.34	.28
3				.49	.41	.45	.27	.29	.28
4					.30	.54	.31	.43	.33
5						.30	.31	.27	.27
6							.27	.39	.34
7								.31	.24
8									.40
9									

TABLE 51

IDEOLOGY INDEX--ITEM INTERCORRELATIONS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1		.46	.49	.58	.50	.51	.46	.46	.38	.35	.34	.48
2			.45	.37	.36	.43	.32	.39	.39	.44	.38	.34
3				.46	.45	.47	.42	.41	.27	.36	.33	.40
4					.46	.48	.42	.39	.29	.35	.29	.43
5						.45	.41	.39	.30	.28	.35	.41
6							.30	.42	.28	.30	.37	.50
7								.31	.32	.30	.19	.33
8									.28	.30	.40	.42
9										.29	.28	.32
10											.29	.25
11												.24
12												

APPENDIX C

CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION
Inventory of Opinions and Attitudes

This questionnaire is designed to obtain professional opinions with respect to Catholic higher education. For the most part, the questionnaire statements concern issues which are currently of interest to the future direction of Catholic higher education. Other items pertain to the environment of the Catholic college or university and offer a means of studying some of the qualitative changes that have occurred over the years.

The questionnaire takes about 30 minutes to complete. Please read each statement carefully and indicate your opinion by circling or checking the appropriate symbol.

A - you agree with the statement.
AS - you agree somewhat or partially with the statement.
DS - you disagree somewhat or partially with the statement.
D - you disagree with the statement.

You are encouraged to comment on any item to clarify your point of view, especially if you should consider an item to be particularly provocative.

The term "college" should always be understood to refer to undergraduate education, whether that of an independent liberal arts college or the undergraduate liberal arts division of a university.

The University of Michigan
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

____ Unit Code

Directions: Indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement by circling or checking the appropriate symbol.

PART I — Please respond to the following statements on the basis of your present college environment.	Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree
1. Students are usually treated as adults in the application of college policies and regulations.	A	AS	DS	D
2. Most students are little affected by the values of their teachers.	A	AS	DS	D
3. Faculty are permitted to place emphasis on commitment to their disciplines above the interests of the college as a whole.	A	AS	DS	D
4. Lay faculty are sometimes treated as if they had religious vows.	A	AS	DS	D
5. The college actively promotes social commitment and involvement, beyond occupational interests, on the part of the campus community.	A	AS	DS	D
6. The authority structure of a Catholic college deprives faculty some of their rights as professionals.	A	AS	DS	D
7. If anything, not enough college authority is exercised over student behavior.	A	AS	DS	D
8. Warm and personal relationships usually exist between faculty and students.	A	AS	DS	D
9. Students rightfully resent college rules that attempt to control their off-campus behavior.	A	AS	DS	D
10. Faculty committees are really controlled by the administration.	A	AS	DS	D
11. Students do have their individuality respected and are treated as unique persons.	A	AS	DS	D
12. In matters concerning the interests of the college as a whole, faculty participation in decision-making is both sought and effectively encouraged by the administration.	A	AS	DS	D
13. Criticism by faculty members of college policies is likely to be regarded as "disloyalty" by key administrators.	A	AS	DS	D

PART II — The following statements request your qualitative opinions concerning Catholic higher education.				
1. The Catholic college represents a bulwark against the spread of permissive morality in our society.	A	AS	DS	D
2. Democratic values, such as personal autonomy, are not inhibited by the religious affiliation of the Catholic college.	A	AS	DS	D

	Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree
3. Students should be allowed to invite and to hear any person of their own choosing for public discussions on campus.	A	AS	DS	D
4. There should be a definite policy on faculty selection to insure having faculty who share the distinctive values and objectives of a Catholic college.	A	AS	DS	D
5. The relative lack of student rebellions on Catholic campuses reflects the success of Catholic value-orientations.	A	AS	DS	D
6. To be true to its purpose, A Catholic college has a right to question the personal beliefs of a faculty member if unusual circumstances warrant such action.	A	AS	DS	D
7. Separating colleges from ownership by religious orders should strengthen the professional stature of many Catholic colleges.	A	AS	DS	D
8. Catholic higher education is, in the main, less rewarding for professional advancement and prestige than state-supported higher education.	A	AS	DS	D
9. It is the duty of a Catholic college to insist, by reasonable regulations, upon high moral standards for its students.	A	AS	DS	D
10. A modern Catholic college can accept, without restrictions, the philosophy of academic freedom espoused by the AAUP.	A	AS	DS	D
11. In time, Catholic colleges will follow the path of many Protestant colleges and have only a nominal church relationship.	A	AS	DS	D
12. To be a "critic of society" a college must assert its freedom from all external authority, be it clerical or lay.	A	AS	DS	D
13. Charges of anti-intellectualism and authoritarianism sometimes leveled at Catholic colleges are, for the most part, unjustified.	A	AS	DS	D
14. For the scholar in any discipline, all beliefs are tentatively true or tentatively false and subject to continuous inquiry for verification.	A	AS	DS	D
15. There is a great need today for master-planning on a national level for Catholic higher education.	A	AS	DS	D
16. What Catholic higher education may lack in endowment and financial resources is partially compensated by the advantages of an environment stressing human and religious values.	A	AS	DS	D
17. The personal attitude of a faculty member towards Catholicism is not an important consideration for appointment, even if he should teach a "sensitive" discipline.	A	AS	DS	D
18. The very best Catholic colleges academically are often the least "Catholic" religiously.	A	AS	DS	D

	Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree
19. Faculty who show serious and continuous disrespect for the Catholic character of the college should not be reappointed.	A	AS	DS	D
20. Despite considerable progress, the average Catholic college with respect to academic excellence, is in the "backwater" of American higher education.	A	AS	DS	D
21. Campus disorders emphasize the need for colleges to control their own internal affairs without government intervention.	A	AS	DS	D
22. It is pointless for a Catholic college to maintain rules that insist faculty respect Catholic norms for teaching and/or conduct.	A	AS	DS	D
23. The trend towards lay administration in Catholic higher education is likely to lead to an objectionable form of secularization with respect to Roman Catholic values and teachings.	A	AS	DS	D
24. Classroom discussions that raise disturbing controversy over religious beliefs should, at the very least, be watched carefully by the administration.	A	AS	DS	D

PART III Please respond to the following statements according to your opinion of what ought to be emphasized in Catholic higher education.

1. The Catholic college should be a community of Christian scholars, who in their thorough commitments to professionalism and the service of man, witness Jesus Christ in society.	A	AS	DS	D
2. Catholic colleges should be valuable and necessary to the extent they serve society and not because they have or should have a functionally meaningful religious identity.	A	AS	DS	D
3. The Catholic college should assist the Roman Catholic church in its teaching mission by combining strong professional goals with permeative religious and moral values.	A	AS	DS	D
4. What basically matters in a Catholic college are intellectual values and these should have little or no bearing on whether a college is "Catholic."	A	AS	DS	D
5. Though Roman Catholic agencies happen to operate colleges, these colleges should be regarded primarily as educational institutions serving the general public and providing educational "choice."	A	AS	DS	D

Please comment:

PART IV The following vignettes illustrate possible conflict situations based on differing principles. Please respond on the principle (not practical considerations) you believe preferable.

I. FACULTY SELECTION

Department X of Catholic college has two candidates to consider for an available position and must choose between the two.

Professor A is a good teacher and would clearly be more than an adequate asset to the department because of his proven and continuing scholarship. He is, however, quite indifferent to the Christian character of the college, although he respects the college for its academic values.

Professor B, younger but also a good teacher, has yet to prove himself as a scholar. Still, he has the reputation of being deeply committed to the concept of a scholarly Christian community and is likely to have a substantial impact on students with respect to Christian values.

Assume that you are involved in an informal faculty debate regarding the two candidates and the preferred choice to be made on principle, would you,

1. definitely prefer professor A. ____
2. probably prefer professor A. ____
3. probably prefer professor B. ____
4. definitely prefer professor B. ____

Please comment:

II. FACULTY RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

Dr. Smith, a non-tenured philosophy professor at Catholic college, has come under a great deal of criticism from parents and some faculty members who are convinced his teaching is undermining the religious values of the college. With turmoil building up over the issue, the president decides to appoint a hearing committee, citing the faculty handbook regulation which prohibits "teaching contrary to the Catholic faith."

The president's action in invoking this regulation has deeply divided the faculty into two positions:

One: Some contend the regulation is outmoded in principle. A college, even undergraduate, must be open to all academically respectable viewpoints. Even if an orthodox Catholic teaching essential to faith were involved, this should have no bearing on the academic freedom of an appointed professor to teach his scholarly convictions, if relevant, although there might be serious risk to the college's commitment on Catholic-Christian values and perspectives.

(over)

Two: Some contend the regulation, however imprecise, represents a valid and necessary principle. While open to all legitimate positions on academic issues, an undergraduate Catholic college cannot be so open that it tolerates any emphasis in teaching, although scholarly, that may be seriously detrimental to its Catholic-Christian character.

Assume that your opinion is needed on this issue, would you,

1. definitely favor position one. ____
2. probably favor position one. ____
3. probably favor position two. ____
4. definitely favor position two. ____

Please comment:

III. COMPULSORY THEOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

A policy committee for Catholic college is debating a possible change in compulsory requirements for theology.

Group A argues to retain the requirements, subject to some revisions. Since students have chosen to attend this college, they should expect to be exposed to the total range of values important for true human development. As long as the courses are taught liberally, theology should be a necessary part of the liberal arts core for all students, non-Catholic and Catholic. For a college committed to the exploration of ultimate values, waiving requirements raises a more serious question on goals than the fact of requirements.

Group B argues for the abolition of requirements. Though students have chosen the college, they tend to be conditioned to equate theology with the catechism and, worse, with Catholicity, itself, an attitude strengthened by waiving requirements for non-Catholics. When the young today show such seriousness about personal freedom and value-commitments, the intellectual approach to theological truth needs broad encouragement and college goals are better served by not requiring theology courses.

Assume your opinion is needed, would you,

1. definitely favor group A's position. ____
2. probably favor group A's position. ____
3. probably favor group B's position. ____
4. definitely favor group B's position. ____

(next page)

Please comment:

PART V Please complete the following personal background inquiry. This data is, of course, completely confidential, except for use in statistical summarizations by the researchers.

1. Your principal position: faculty ___ administration ___

2. Your age _____ Marital status: single ___ married ___ other _____

3. Layman ___ Laywoman ___ Sister ___ Priest ___ Brother ___

4. Instructor ___ Assistant prof. ___ Associate prof. ___ Professor ___

5. Highest earned degree: bachelor ___ master ___ doctorate ___ other _____

   Earned at: _____
   (name of institution)

6. Are you currently working for a degree? Yes ___ No ___

   If yes, the university is: _____
   (name)

7. Did you receive your undergraduate degree from a Catholic college? Yes ___ No ___

8. What is your teaching field? _____

9. How many years have you been on the faculty/administration of a Catholic college or university?

   _____

10. How many years have you been on the faculty/administration of a non-Catholic college or university?

    _____

11. Please state your religious preference. _____

THANK YOU FOR THE TIME AND ATTENTION YOU HAVE GIVEN THIS STUDY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Astin, Alexander W. Who Goes Where to College? Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1965.

Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Berger, Peter L. A Rumor of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969.

Burtchaell, James T, C.S.C. "The Restless Christian College." College Newsletter, The National Catholic Educational Association, XXXI (December, 1968), 11-12.

Clark, Burton. "Faculty Organization and Authority." The Study of Academic Administration. Edited by Terry Lunsford. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.

Cooper, Joseph B. and McGaugh, James L. Integrating Principles of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1963.

The Documents of Vatican II. Edited (general) by Walter M. Abbott, S.J. and translated (general) by the Very Rev. Msgr. Joseph Gallagher. New York: America Press, 1966.

Donovan, John. The Academic Man in the Catholic College. New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1964.

Fellman David. "Academic Freedom and the American Political Ethos." American Freedom and the Catholic University. Edited by Edward Manier and John W. Houck. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, Inc., 1967.

Ford, Charles E. and Roy, Edgar L., Jr. The Renewal of Catholic Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 1968.

Gleason, Philip. "American Catholic Higher Education: A Historical Perspective." The Shape of Catholic Higher Education. Edited by Robert Hassenger. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward a

Science of Latent Social Roles--I." Administrative Science Quarterly, II (December, 1957), 281-306.

Greeley, Andrew M. The Changing Catholic College. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

_____. From Backwater to Mainstream: A Profile of Catholic Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Hassenger, Robert. "Conflict in the Catholic Colleges." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXXCII (March, 1969), 95-108.

_____, ed. The Shape of Catholic Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

The Idea of the Catholic University. A statement by twenty-six Catholic educators meeting at Land O'Lakes, Wisconsin, July 23, 1967.

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

Klapper, Hope L. "The Young College Faculty Member--A New Breed?" Sociology of Education, XLII (Winter, 1969), 38-49.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Wagner, Thielens, Jr. The Academic Mind. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, Inc., 1963.

Lenski, Gerhard. The Religious Factor. Anchor Books. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1963.

MacIver, Robert M. Academic Freedom in Our Time. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

Manier, Edward and Houck, John W., eds. Academic Freedom and the Catholic University. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, Inc., 1967.

McGrath, John J. Catholic Institutions in the United States: Canonical and Civil Law Status. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1968.

McNamara, Robert M., S.J. "Higher Education and American Catholicism: A Review Article." Sociological Analysis, XXV (Winter, 1964), 238-47.

Metzger, Walter P. Academic Freedom in the Age of the University. A Columbia paperback. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

Parsons, Talcott and Platt, Gerald M. The American Academic Profession: A Pilot Study. NSF Grant GS513, March, 1968.

Pattillo, Manning M., Jr. and MacKenzie, Donald M. Church-Sponsored Higher Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

Peters, Diane S. "Speech, Attitudes, and University Faculty." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, the University of Michigan, 1969.

Ratterman, Patrick H., S.J.. The Emerging Catholic University. New York: Fordham University Press, 1968.

Schumann, Howard and Laumann, Edward O. "Do Most Professors Support the War?" Trans-action, IV (November, 1967), 32-5.

Sullivan, William J., S.J. "Theology for Undergraduates." America, CXXI (November, 1969), 463-66.

Thurstone, Louis L. "Attitudes Can Be Measured." Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. Edited by Martin Fishbein. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

Trent, James W. with Golds, Jenette. Catholics in College: Religious Commitment and the Intellectual Life. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Trimberger, Ellen Kay. "Why a Rebellion at Columbia was Inevitable." Trans-action, V (September, 1968), 28-38.

Veysey, Laurence. "The American Professor: A Study in Long-Term Deviance." Paper prepared for the American Historical Association, December, 1969. (Mimeographed.)

Zelan, Joseph. "Religious Apostasy, Higher Education, and Occupational Choice." Sociology of Education, XLI (Fall, 1968), 370-79.