R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 669 CG 000 100

COLLEGE STUDENT SUBCULTURES AND PERSONAL VALUES.

BY- APOSTAL, ROBERT A.

REPORT NUMBER R-22 PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.72 18P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COLLEGE STUDENTS, *PERSONAL VALUES, *RESEARCH PROJECTS, *STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, *SUBCULTURE, TABLES (DATA), CHI SQUARE, UNIVERSITY OF MAINE, CLARK TROW TYPOLOGY, STUDY OF VALUES, T TEST, CORRELATION

THIS STUDY WAS DESIGNED TO FIND OUT IF RELATIONSHIPS EXIST BETWEEN COLLEGE SUBCULTURES AND STUDENT VALUES. ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINE STUDENTS IN THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE WERE ADMINISTERED THE STUDY OF VALUES, WHICH MEASURES SIX VALUE ORIENTATIONS, AND THE CLARK-TROW TYPOLOGY WHICH DESCRIBES FOUR STUDENT SUBCULTURES. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS WERE CALCULATED ON EACH SCALE OF THE STUDY OF VALUES FOR THE GROUP AND FOR SEX, COLLEGE MAJOR, AND COLLEGE SUBGROUPS. T-TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE WERE COMPUTED BETWEEN VARIOUS TYPES OF MEAN SCORES. USING NUMBER RANKINGS, CHI SQUARES WERE COMPUTED FOR SUBCULTURES BY SEX, COLLEGE, AND ACADEMIC MAJOR COMPARISONS. A SIMPLE VALUES-BY-SUBCULTURE TABULATION FOR EACH OF THE SIX VALUE SCALES WAS PERFORMED. VALUES-BY-IDEAS AND VALUES-BY-COLLEGE ANALYSES REQUIRED THE COMPUTATION OF 12 CHI SQUARES. RESULTS ARE DISCUSSED RELATING TO THE STUDY OF VALUES, COLLEGE STUDENT SUBCULTURES, AND A TEST OF THE HYPOTHESIS THAT NO RELATIONSHIP EXISTS BETWEEN STUDENT VALUES AND SUBCULTURES. ON THE BASIS OF THIS TEST, THE HYPOTHESIS WAS REFUTED. REASONS EXPLAINING WHY SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS WERE FOUND BETWEEN VALUES AND SUBCULTURES ARE GIVEN. TABLES ARE INCLUDED. (PS)

College Student Subcultures and Personal Values

by

Robert A. Apostal
University of Maine
Orono

Testing and Counseling Service Report No. 22
Fall 1966

College Student Subcultures and Personal Values

by

Robert A. Apostal
University of Maine

The college environment is one of the newer objects of study in higher education. Recently, attempts have been made to identify college characteristics (Astin, 1962, 1963; Astin and Holland, 1961; Pace and Stern, 1958), describe college subcultures (Clark, 1962; Peterson, 1965; Trow, 1962), and discuss common problems of college administration (Dennis and Kauffman, 1966; Sanford, 1962). These investigations, now of critical importance in their own right, also compliment the research activity which is devoted to the study of college students.

The study reported in this paper was an attempt to determine whether any relationships exist between college environment characteristics and personal characteristics of those individuals operating within that environment. More specifically, this study was designed to find out if relationships exist between college subcultures and student values. The hypothesis tested was that no relationships exist.

Method

Subjects. Subjects for the study were members of the first professional course in the Teacher Education Program at the University of Maine. One hundred sixty-nine students, 74 men and 95 women, participated. Of these, 62 students were enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences, 102 were enrolled in the College of Education, and 5 were enrolled in other colleges. Sixty-three of the 169 students were majoring in one of the sciences, forty-four were majoring in social studies, amd sixty were majoring in the humanities. (The majors of two students could not be classified.) Most of the students were in their sophomore or junior year in college and progressing satisfactorily toward their bachelors' degrees.

Instruments. The inventory which was used to measure the students' values was the Study of Values (Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, 1960). The instrument used to identify environmental characteristics was the typology of college student subcultures described by Clark (1962) and Trow (1962) and prepared for research use by Peterson (1965).

The Study of Values is a well-known inventory of six value orientations: the theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious. The Clark-Trow Typology describes the following college student subcultures: the vocational, the academic, the collegiate, and the nonconformist. Peterson's edition attempts to avoid a labeling stereotype by referring to the subcultures as philosophies of higher education. Philosophy A is the vocational subculture which emphasizes education as career preparation. Philosophy B is the academic subculture which regards education as scholarly pursuit of knowledge and cultivation of the intellect. Philosophy C refers to the collegiate subculture and emphasizes the importance of extra-curricular activities in college. Philosophy D is the nonconformist subculture which emphasizes education as a search for personal meaning and individual fulfullment. Students who pick Philosophy D are often critical of many aspects of present-day society.

Procedure and Data Analysis. The Study of Values and the Typology were administered in one session. Means and standard deviations were calculated on each scale of the Study of Values for the total group and for sex, college, and college major

subgroups. In addition, t tests of significance were computed between mean scores for College of Arts and Sciences and College of Education students, men and women, and science, social studies, and humanities majors. The students were instructed to rank the four subcultures in the order that they reflected their own philosophy of education. Frequencies and percentages of the number 1, 2, 3, & 4 ranks for the subculture orientations were recorded. Using only the number 1 rankings, chi squares were computed for subcultures by sex, subcultures by college, and subcultures by academic major comparisons.

The study hypothesis of no relationships between values and subculture membership was also tested by computing chi squares. Contingency tables were set up by classifying students into high, average, and low ranges for each value (using the published norms to define these ranges for men and women), using only the number 1 rankings of the subcultures, and then performing a simple values-by-subculture tabulation for each of the six value scales.

Following the reports by Clark, (1962) and Trow, (1962), the chi square test was used to determine if any relationships exist between personal values and those subcultures which reflect an involvement with ideas (the academic and the nonconformist) and those which reflect an identification with the

college (the academic and the collegiate subcultures). For these analyses the students' scores on each value scale were classified into high, average, and low ranges as before and then compared with the appropriate combinations of subcultures. One of these combinations was the "ideas" vs. "non-ideas" subcultures (academic-nonconformist vs. vocational-collegiate); the other combination was the "college" vs. "non-college" subcultures (academic-collegiate vs. vocational-nonconformist). These values-by-"ideas" and values-by-"college" analyses required the computation of twelve chi squares.

Results

Study of Values

Table 1 presents the t scores for the sex, college, and college major variables for each scale of the Study of Values. These analyses may be summarized as follows:

1. There were statistically significant differences between men and women on each value scale except the religious scale. The men scored higher on the theoretical, economic, and political scales and the women scored higher on the aesthetic and social scales.

2. Education students scored significantly higher than Arts and Sciences students on the social value. No other college differences were statistically significant.

3. Statistically significant differences were found between the science majors and the social studies majors on the theoretical, aesthetic, social, and political scales. The mean value was higher for the science majors on the theoretical scale and higher for the social studies students on the other scales.

4. In the science-humanities comparisons, significant differences were found on the theoretical scale (science mean higher) and the aesthetic scale (humanities mean higher).

5. In the social studies-humanities comparisons, significant differences were found on the aesthetic and political scales The humanities mean was higher on the aesthetic scale and lower on the political scale.

Insert Table 1 about here

College Student Subcultures

The results of the subculture rankings indicate that 42 per cent of the group selected the collegiate subculture as best reflecting their philosophy of education, 38 per cent picked the vocational, 16 per cent chose the academic, and about

4 per cent picked the nonconformist subculture. There were no significant differences between observed and expected frequencies for the subcultures by sex, subcultures by college, and subcultures by academic major comparisons. In the above three comparisons as well as in the values-by-subcultures comparisons reported in the next section, the nonconformist frequencies were not included because of the small numbers responding to this subculture.

Test of the Hypothesis

Table 2 shows the frequencies and chi squares for the values-by-subculture tabulations. A significant chi square was found between no. 1 choice of subculture and the high, average, and low ranges on the economic value ($X^2 = 13.61$, $p < .01$ for 2 d.f.). Those students who picked the academic subculture tended beyond expectancy to score in the low range on the economic value whereas those who picked the collegiate or the vocational subculture tended to score in the average or in the high range. No other values-by-subculture chi square comparisons were significant.

Insert Table 2 about here

Table 3 presents frequencies and chi squares for the values-by- "ideas" and the values-by-"college" analyses. In the values-by-"ideas" vs. "non-ideas" subculture comparisons, a significant relationship was found on the economic value ($X^2 = 15.94$, $p < .001$ for 2 d.f.). Those students who picked the "ideas" subcultures (the academic and the nonconformist) tended beyond expectancy to score in the low range on the economic value whereas those who picked the "non-ideas" subcultures (the vocational and the collegiate) tended to score in the average or high range on the economic value. No other comparisons yielded significant chi square values.

Finally, in the values-by-"college" vs. "non-college" comparisons, the only significant chi square was found on the religious scale ($X^2 = 7.20$, $p < .05$ for 2 d.f.). Students who picked the "college" subcultures (the academic and the collegiate) tended beyond expectancy to score in the average range and not in the high range. Students who picked the "non-college" subcultures (the vocational and the nonconformist) tended to score in the high range and not in the average range on the religious scale. Incidently, in these "college" vs. "non-college" comparisons, two value scales, the aesthetic and the political,

approached significance (p values < .10; see Table 3).

Insert Table 3 about here

The hypothesis of this study was that no relationships exist between college subcultures and student values. On the basis of the above tests, the hypothesis was rejected.

Discussion

Several points help to explain why significant relationships were found between the values and the subcultures. To begin with, the economic scale measures a practical, commonsense orientation to life which motivates those who score high on this scale to seek what is useful from their environments. Apparently, the vocational and collegiate subcultures satisfy this need for usefulness for economically-oriented college students in the areas of career preparation and extra-curricular campus activities. The academic subculture, on the other hand, is not seen as utilitarian by those who elevate the economic scale and is not chosen by them.

The same general explanation applies to the significant chi square which was found between the economic value and the "ideas" vs. "non-ideas" subcultures. The subcultures which are involved with ideas are not chosen by those who score in the

high range on the economic scale because the ideas subcultures are not seen by them as being very practical.

In the values by "college" vs. "non-college" comparisons, a statistically significant chi square was obtained on the religious scale. Students who picked the subcultures which indicate an affiliation with the college (the academic and the collegiate) tended not to score in the high range. An explanation for this finding is that the religious scale measures very personal qualities such as need for personal meaning and quest for intra-personal unity. The "college" subcultures, on the other hand, are not very concerned with these personal qualities; therefore, characteristics of the collegiate and academic subcultures such as extra-curricular involvement and academic achievement are not attractive to the self-searching students who elevate the religious scale.

It is not surprising to find relationships between subcultures and personal values; it seems logical to reason that students with certain values would be attracted to the type of subculture most likely to provide an outlet for those values. What is surprising is that only a small number of significant relationships were found. It is suggested that one reason for this is that the description of the collegiate subculture con-

tains elements of both the vocational and academic subcultures and hence is not sufficiently differentiated from them. This situation might have caused students with different value orientations to pick the collegiate subculture because of its general appeal instead of selecting a subculture which would have provided an outlet for important but more specific values. Therefore, it is recommended that the collegiate subculture be re-described for future studies of college student subcultures.

References

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. Manual for the Study of Values, revised edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.

Astin, A. W. An empirical characterization of higher educational institutions. J. Educ. Psychol., 1963, 53, 224-235.

Astin, A. W. Further validation of the environmental assessment technique. J. Educ. Psychol., 1963, 54, 217-226.

Astin, A. W., & Holland, J. L. The environmental assessment technique: A way to measure college environments. J. Educ. Psychol., 196[illegible]2, 308-316.

Clark, R. B. Educating the expert society. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Dennis, L. E., & Kauffman, J. F. (Eds.). The college and the student. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

Pace, C. R., & Stern, G. G. An approach to the measurement of psychological characteristics of college environments. J. Educ. Psychol., 1958, 49, 269-277.

Peterson, R. E. On a typology of college students. Research Bulletin 65-9, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N. J., 1965.

Sanford, N. (Ed.). The American college. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962.

Trow, M. Student cultures and administrative action. In Sutherland, R. L., et al. (Eds). Personality factors on the college campus. Austin, Texas: The Hogg Foundation, 1962.

Table 1

t Scores for Sex, College, and College Major Variables on Each Scale of the Study of Values

Variable	t Scores					
	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
Sex	5.97***	3.73***	6.19***	4.98***	3.39***	1.89
College						
A & S and Educ.	1.55	0.57	1.87	2.38*	1.45	0.95
College Major						
Science-Social Studies	7.40**	1.95	2.04*	2.84**	2.41*	0.92
Science-Humanities	8.41***	2.72	6.66***	1.38	0.77	1.92
Social Studies-Humanities	0.95	0.58	3.87***	1.78	2.96**	0.78

*$p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 2

Observed and Expected Frequencies, and Chi Squares for the Values-By- Subculture Analysis

Values	Subculture Frequencies							X^2*
	Vocational		Academic		Collegiate		Nonconform	
	O	E	O	E	O	E	O	
Theoretical								2.16
high	14	16.49	10	6.96	18	18.55	3	
average	35	33.77	13	14.25	38	37.99	3	
low	15	13.74	4	5.80	16	15.46	0	
Economic								13.61**
high	16	14.92	4	6.29	18	16.79	1	
average	38	35.34	10	14.91	42	38.75	2	
low	10	13.74	13	5.80	12	15.46	3	
Aesthetic								5.08
high	12	13.74	7	5.80	16	15.46	3	
average	43	36.52	13	15.40	37	41.08	3	
low	9	13.74	7	5.80	19	15.46	0	
Social								@
high	16	17.28	7	7.29	21	19.44	2	
average	39	38.87	15	16.40	45	43.73	3	
low	9	7.85	5	3.31	6	8.83	1	
Political								6.67
high	20	18.06	8	7.62	18	20.32	1	
average	27	33.77	14	14.25	45	37.99	3	
low	17	12.17	5	5.13	9	13.69	2	
Religious								@
high	14	9.03	2	3.81	7	10.16	1	
average	28	34.55	17	14.58	43	38.87	2	
low	22	20.42	8	8.61	22	22.97	3	

* Nonconformist frequencies not included.

** $p < .01$.

@ X^2 not computed; expected frequency < 5.

Table 3

Observed and Expected Frequencies, and Chi Squares for the Values-By-Ideas and the Values-By-College Analyses

Values	Ideas Analysis					College Analysis				
	Ideas (Acad-Nonc.)		Non-Ideas (Voc-Coll.)		Ideas X^2	College (Acad-Coll.)		Non-College (Vol-Nonconf.)		College X^2
	O	E	O	E		O	E	O	E	
Theoretical					4.09					0.34
high	13	8.79	32	36.21		28	26.36	17	18.64	
average	16	17.38	73	71.62		51	52.14	38	36.86	
low	4	6.83	31	28.17		20	20.50	15	14.50	
Economic					15.94***					1.04
high	5	7.62	34	31.38		22	22.85	17	16.15	
average	12	17.96	80	74.04		52	53.89	40	38.11	
low	16	7.42	22	30.58		25	22.26	13	15.74	
Aesthetic					1.51					5.30*
high	10	7.42	28	30.58		23	22.26	15	15.74	
average	16	18.75	80	77.25		50	56.24	46	39.76	
low	7	6.83	28	28.17		26	20.50	9	14.50	
Social					@					0.44
high	9	8.98	37	37.02		28	26.95	18	19.05	
average	18	19.92	84	82.08		60	59.75	42	42.25	
low	6	4.10	15	16.90		11	12.30	10	8.70	
Political					0.06					5.94*
high	9	9.18	38	37.82		26	27.53	21	19.47	
average	17	17.38	72	71.62		59	52.14	30	36.86	
low	7	6.44	26	26.56		14	19.33	19	13.67	
Religious					@					7.20**
high	3	4.69	21	19.31		9	14.06	15	9.94	
average	19	17.57	71	72.43		60	52.72	30	37.28	
low	11	10.74	44	44.26		30	32.22	25	22.78	

* $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .001$.
@ X^2 not computed; expected frequency < 5.