DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 091 HE 001 418

AUTHOR Brown, Donald R.
TITLE The Patterning of Students in their Group Relationships.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis.
PUB DATE 66
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at a series of Seminars on the Social Psychology of the Future State Metropolitan Campus, the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, February 24, 1966

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.90
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes, Disadvantaged Youth, *Grouping Procedures, *Higher Education, Responsibility, *Students, Urban Environment, *Urban Universities, *Values
IDENTIFIERS *Michigan University Pilot Project

ABSTRACT

The dominant images that have characterized periods - "intellectualism" of the '30s, purposefulness of the '40s, "apathy" of the '50s, and "idealism" of the '60s - represent population rather than value changes. It may be generally assumed that students come to college believing, to various degrees, that college is a place (1) for intellectual development and growth of personality; (2) for acquisition of vocational training; or (3) to have fun. These views are generally incongruent with the values of the faculty, and students thus tend to seek support from peer groups. As a result of increased awareness, the freshman becomes quickly aware of the hypocrisy and cynicism found in many corners of our society. In college, he should ideally learn how to evaluate what he perceives in a way that permits change and development, but does not lead to alienation. If he does not learn this, he may adopt a set of values by imitation of his peer group. Urban universities will be challenged by more students from deprived backgrounds, student militancy, and the need for adult and community education. Universities can group students in such a way as to maximize educational benefits. (AF)

THE PATTERNING OF STUDENTS IN THEIR GROUP RELATIONSHIPS

Donald R. Brown
Center for Research on Learning and Teaching
University of Michigan

THE PATTERNING OF STUDENTS IN THEIR GROUP RELATIONSHIPS*

Donald R. Brown
Center for Research on Learning and Teaching
University of Michigan

It is with well advised humility that I venture to speak to you about the urban university of the future in general, and about groups, in particular. The reason for this humility is that I come to you unbiased and practically untarnished by relevant experience in urban universities and as one who puts more emphasis on individual development and determination than on group phenomena. In fact, the more I pondered the image of myself pontificating about groups in the locale of an urban university, the more my own experience as an undergraduate at a semi-urban, private university, as a graduate at a semi-urban, state university, and my 13 years as a faculty member in the cloistered atmosphere of a small Quaker women's college along with 10 years as a research consultant to the Mellon Foundation studies at Vassar, the more I felt drawn to the phrase "the social psychology" in the title of your 25th anniversary series. Having organized and participated in a symposium at the American Psychological Association meetings in San Francisco over a decade ago with the title of "The Social Psychology of Higher Education," which ultimately resulted in the publication of the volume edited by Nevitt Sanford called, The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of Higher Education, I feel at least comfortable in discussing some of the implications of this approach to the future of higher education, whether it be in the setting of a state urban-university or a quite different locale.

SOCIAL CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT OF A UNIVERSITY

All of this is not to say that the social cultural environment of the university does not play a very important role in the structuring of student life, but rather to point out that regardless of the power of the group in influencing and directing the behavior of the individual--whether in a university or any other area of life--in the final analysis, the group operates as a subculture which provides, for the individual, characteristic ranges of stimulation, goals and

*Presented at a Series of Seminars on the Social Psychology of the Future State Urban Campus, The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, February 24, 1966.

rewards. For these stimuli, goals and rewards to be effective, they must be perceived, internalized and appreciated by the individual. In the last analysis it is through the individual that all group effects are mediated.

ETON - 1860's

The reason for this disclaimer is to permit me, if you will, to direct your attention to an approach to the understanding of the groupings of students in institutions of higher education through a model which starts with a developmental theory of the individual in a complex social environment such as a university. I would argue that, if an individual is thwarted in this developmental sequence, he will often be forced to turn to readily available groups for his goals and rewards. This anchoring in a theory of individual development has many advantages when we are forced to operate, as we are, in a highly pluralistic educational society such as ours. Perhaps I can make this point more clearly by referring to descriptions of students and their approach to education in different historical eras. It is always helpful before one views with alarm the present situation to look back and try to understand the alarming situations of the past. Let me start by reference to a statement, called to my attention by Professor George Stern, written by one of the great Eton masters in the 1860's--a period when education of any sort, higher or otherwise, was reserved for a social-cultural elite. "You go to school at the age of 12 or 13; and for the next 4 or 5 years you are not engaged so much in acquiring knowledge as in making mental efforts under criticism. A certain amount of knowledge you can indeed with average faculties acquire so as to retain; nor need you regret the hours that you have spent on much that is forgotten, for the shadow of lost knowledge at least protects you from any illusions. But you go to a great school, not for knowledge as much as for arts and habits; for the habit of attention, for the art of expression, for the art of assuming at a moment's notice a new intellectual posture, for the art of entering quickly into another person's thoughts, for the habit of submitting to censure and refutation, for the art of indicating assent or dissent in graduated terms, for the habits of regarding minute points of accuracy, for the habit of working out what is possible in a given time, for taste, for discrimination, for mental courage and mental soberness. Above all, you go to a great school for self knowledge."*

---

*Quoted by Geoffrey Madan in "William Cory," The Cornhill Magazine, July to December 1938, p. 208, from an 1861 tract on "Eton Reform" by William Cory.

As one ponders on Cory's statement, one cannot help but be reminded of Philip Franck's warning that the metaphysics of yesterday is the common sense of today and the nonsense of tomorrow. That is to say, that while what Cory describes as the goals of a liberal arts education still hold today as they did in the 1860's in upper-class England, nonetheless the sociological derivations of our students in the urban university of the 1960's differs considerably, and 25 years from now will differ even more. For many years our students came from much the same social class as those that Cory was describing. But sometime shortly after World War I the proportion of Americans attending high school increased astronomically and this desire for education burst into the college scene about the time of World War II and has been increasing ever since so that today we find it necessary to think at least 25 years ahead in order to be prepared for the ever-increasing onslaught of students. This is bound to have far-reaching consequences on the nature of education and the needs that students bring to our institutions of higher learning. How has this manifested itself since World War II?

POST WORLD WAR II

Consider the bulging enrollments immediately following the war, when the veterans were flocking to our campuses. These were young men and women of above average college age who had been brought up during the great depression and then tempered in the fiery inferno of World War II. Their values and goals were clear. They knew who the great enemies were. First there were the problems of economic inequity and irresponsibility which could be defeated by the "new economics" and later there were the evils of totalitarianism and fascism over which they had waged a long and bitter physical struggle ending in total victory, or so it seemed. Now they retreated to the nurturing security of alma mater with the help of a benevolent G. I. bill to prepare themselves for the fruits of the better life for which they had made so many sacrifices. This of course is my generation. We knew what we were doing in college and our devotion to our studies and our pragmatic approach to the curriculum had profound effects on the university. Practically overnight the Hollywood rah-rah culture of the campuses was dealt its death blow and ultimately finished off by the rise of the meritocracy following the launching of Sputnik. Immediately following this group on the campus, there came the children of the new affluent society now coming to college in much larger numbers than ever before and consequently from much more diverse educational and cultural backgrounds. Our attention was called quite forcibly to their appearance and to the disparity from the good old days at

"City College," when no one but first class intellects populated the campuses with real commitment and social concern manifested on every side. Philip Jacob, in his study on value change in college students, summarizes the orientation of this new group as 1) an absorbing self-interestedness, directed essentially toward satisfying desires for material well being, privacy within one's own male-oriented family domain, and relief from boredom; 2) group dependence, which causes students to bring personal conduct and standards into line with the expectations of groups to whom they turn for a sense of belongingness; or look upon as vehicles to self advancement; 3) social and political indifference and irresponsibility; and 4) an instrumental approach to reason and morality which pulls both reason and moral code into the service of preset personal goals rather than acknowledges them as guides of verity and controlling rules of conduct.

MICHIGAN NOW

Jacob was of course describing what we all came to think of as the age of student apathy--in many ways a most comforting age during which to be a member of the establishment. Contrast this description with a quote from an article which appeared last Sunday in the Michigan Daily: "The American Student is Breaking Out of His Cocoon" is the lead:

"The eruption started in the late 50's when students (whose older brothers and sisters had thought the smooth move was to mind one's own business) were stirred by the Civil Rights movement and began to emerge from their study carrels and fraternity houses to make their dent on the world.

They were a new generation bred in prosperity. These students did not know the depression, they did not remember the war. To seek material reward--the house in Scarsdale, the pretty wife, and the steady job--was not enough because it was so attainable. To be satisfied with a return to normalcy was not enough because normalcy was already the way of life.

They took their tactics from Ghandi, their idealism from philosophy class, their money from Daddy. They worked hand in hand with civil rights groups such as CORE, NAACP, SNCC, and SCLC.

The results of the movement were civil rights acts, the voting rights bill, and the emergence of the American student.

Realizing they had the power to influence events, students broadened their involvement so that it ranged from criticizing foreign policy to organizing the poor.

Thus, the idealism of the civil rights movement led to an alienation from the multi-university and the hope for an idyllic "community of scholars" as the wave of the future. The democratic nature of the movement led students to hope they could have a meaningful voice in governing their own affairs at their universities; and the success of the movement made students realize that they could implement their goals."*

VALUE AND POPULATION CHANGES

One is aware, naturally, that any attempt to describe all students at all institutions is a task fraught with folly. These descriptions that I have given as applicable to historical periods over the last 100 years refer not even to the modal situation but rather to the salient situation. They tend to represent the highly visible peaks of student behavior in the mass rather than individual students on the one hand or the majority of students on the other. These are the dominant images that characterized the periods, not necessarily the dominant behavior. Even if we take a frankly sociological view of the matter and attempt to understand these seeming changes in the value orientation of university students as reflections of the population from which they are recruited, from this view we know that college going has not only increased numerically but has increasingly attracted segments of our population with different "life expectancies" from those to which the more traditional liberal arts curriculum was originally attuned. We are dealing here with a population change rather than value change. For example, the increasing numbers of veterans attending college on the G. I. bill and its various revisions since World War II, working class children attending on government loans or state scholarship programs, the meritorious attending on National Merit Scholarships and similar competitive awards for students with outstanding high school attainment, Negro youth attending on the various new grants directed toward their recruitment, children of immigrants located by nationwide talent searches--all of these groups bring new value constellations to our colleges, and the realities of their postcollege lives will undoubtedly be different from those of the classical liberal arts college student who could postpone his vocational plans until graduate school and even sometimes forever. It's interesting to speculate on the

---

* The Michigan Daily, February 20, 1966

differences in the atmosphere of universities which follows from the obvious fact that not only have the sources of students changed, as the well established universities have increasingly culled off the cream of admissions and thereby gotten a much broader geographic representation in their student bodies and the large state universities have dipped much further down to sample the real sources of intellectual quality in their states, while at the same time, the recruitment of faculty has been very much influenced by these previous population shifts in college attendance. It is not idle speculation to propose that a large per cent of faculty just now entering into senior positions come from the G. I. bill crop which flooded graduate schools with the sorts of Ph. D. material that rarely aspired to such educational heights before. As I look back on my own college experience, I am struck by how much more similar in socio-economic background current faculties are to their students than my faculty, which tended to represent a kind of upper-class traditional scholarly gentlemen with considerable family wealth. All of this is bound to make for changes in the groupings of students in the urban university a quarter of a century from now.

THREE COLLEGE IMAGES - INTELLECTUAL, VOCATIONAL, AND SOCIAL

The above merely indicates to me the striking pluralism of American society and the consequent pluralism that we can expect in our urban universities in the future. Let us now try to analyze this diverse population and present some theoretical assumptions about the nature of development in students which would allow me to talk about the significance of the groupings of students that we might find on our urban campuses 25 years from today. For the sake of argument I will maintain that at the moment students come to us holding to varying degrees one of the following often mutually exclusive stereotypes of the purposes of higher education. The first relates to the development of the intellect and the growth of the personality. Here the emphasis is on the broadening of the intellectual horizons of the students along with the consequent maturing and stabilizing of the personality. The liberal arts curriculum as classically defined is accepted as the golden road to these goals and the product is hopefully "cultured." The stress in this type of education is on being. The image is best represented by the statement which I quoted from the Eton schoolmaster, Cory. The image today is still represented by some of the prestigeful colleges--particularly some of the smaller members of the seven women's colleges conference, which are prestigeful not so much because of their lofty educational aims but because these aims are generally supported by the upper classes, and in particular for women. It is the desire to

identify with these classes that accounts for the current elevation in the desirability of attending one of these institutions. Secondly, there is the much more widely held image of college as a place to acquire occupational training. As a society becomes both affluent and technologically advanced, the demand for highly trained personnel increases. The colleges rush in to fill the demands of the market, albeit sometimes with reluctance. The urban state university experiences great pressure to fulfill this type of demand arising from its constituents. This, at the same time, increases the demand for the college degree and cheapens it as a symbol of professionalization. The degree comes to cover a multitude of sins committed in the name of education. All sorts of occupational groups join in and demand college programs in their fields. The emphasis is on doing and on being able to do rather than on being. The third dominant image relates to the collegiate fun culture which is the one most often portrayed in the mass media image of college, particularly before the rise of the meritocracy. However, the idea of college as a never-ending series of increasingly romantic social events leading to blissful union to be punctuated by glorious homecomings is still a real image for adolescent girls in particular. Here the emphasis is on learning the sex role as popularly conceived. Perhaps this image never did exist in any large extent in the streetcar type of urban university.

The students, coming as they do from the larger society, bring with them one or another of these three views of higher education. Therefore they start their college experience with views that are to varying degrees incongruent with the generally held values of the faculty. The latter see themselves as seekers of knowledge in specialized areas and critics of the culture. Indeed, they demand special privileges of tenure and academic freedom in order to permit the unhampered pursuit of these goals. In recent years because of the nature of the market, they have indeed demanded almost total freedom even from teaching. At the same time they are asked to educate a semi-captive audience who hold values often widely discrepant from their own views and very often widely variant within any given classroom. Here are certainly the seeds of conflict.

STUDENT PEER CULTURE

The students are not without resources of their own for avoiding the issues of this conflict and the educational benefits which follow from its rational resolution. They create a "peer culture" which largely perpetuates the general societal values held outside the college and turn to this new subculture for their goals and their rewards. The

challenge for the urban state university, as for any university, is to become aware of the groupings or subcultures that exist amongst its students so that they can rationally plan to enlist the forces which are often very powerful inherent in these groups to influence the openness of their members and your students to new experiences. At this point we see the mediation between the individual view and the social groups approach.

As we have seen the society and, indeed, often the university are not completely clear about the goals of higher education. Therefore, it is not surprising that the students, unable to face the multiplicity of challenges to their self image, find themselves forced to seek clarity in group identifications which reinforce the old and familiar. In the case of male students, with their ever-increasing commitments to an occupational role, the ability to fuse the contrasting value orientations is often rather painless and usually with considerable social support in the service of occupational preparation. This situation is not so painless for women, and, indeed, with the increasing intolerance for idiosyncratic roles such as that of feminism, this situation is becoming even more confusing rather than less.

UNDERSTANDING LATE ADOLESCENCE

Having described the general value conflict of society in higher education, let me now turn to the entering freshman. If we think of the stage of late adolescent development that precedes young adulthood, we can assume that the entering college student is somewhere in this stage on his way to goals of higher integration and more precise differentiation of personality. The striking fact of this stage is the ascendancy of the cognitive and rational controlling mechanisms over the impulses which previously dominated the determinants of behavior. These controls are not yet mature; they tend to be rigid, overdetermined, and impulse seems capable of bursting through at any point. This is true to some extent of all of our students regardless of whether they are living in residence with the college in locus parentis or whether they are townies. Sanford, in The American College, has put it well when he describes the freshman as follows: "The freshman tends to be like a convert to adulthood, an enthusiastic supporter and imitator of adult ways who knows what it is to backslide--which he sometimes does. The achievement of flexible control, an arrangement in which there is genuine freedom of impulses because there is little danger of their getting out of hand lies ahead; nevertheless impulses are now inhibited or contained with sufficient effectiveness so that the young person can turn his attention to other matters. He is not ready to concentrate upon his relations with the external world--to

improve his understanding of that world and to find a place within it." This state of affairs offers both an opportunity and a danger to the development of a system of adult values. After all, one of the main functions of the university is to develop resources within the individual for that peculiarly human function--the ability to evaluate and act on the basis of one's evaluational decision. Turned as they are to the outside world, freshmen are sensitive to and capable of identifying with a whole new range of adult models and institutions on which can be based an often new and broader set of values. However, also as a consequence of increased awareness and greater cognitive sensitivity, the freshman becomes aware, often for the first time, of the corruption, hypocrisy, and cynicism to be found in many corners of a complex society such as ours. Also they are brought together in new groupings with new temptations for challenging and exciting activities and intellectual patterns. It could well be pointed out here that we have only recently seen some of the results of this awareness where it would appear that a significant minority of the students have suddenly taken the first image of higher education that I presented very seriously indeed only to discover that the institution or establishment as they refer to it was no longer as committed to this image as they had been led to believe. Indeed, a lot of the recent so-called conflict on the campuses centers about the students' discovery that the university is not devoted solely to their immediate and personal educational development. In many of them this seems like a betrayal but of course on more mature reflection they come to realize the multiplicity of the university as a mirror of the multiplicity of the society from whence they come. It remains then a challenge to higher education to guide the student through this crises toward the ability to evaluate and judge what is perceived in a way that permits change and development but does not lead to complete alienation from parents, community and society. What is desired is an internalized sense of values based on a strongly developed sense of dignity and pride in self. Upon arrival at college, even in the urban university, to some extent the immediate support of family and community are withdrawn or at least alienated, and as contact is made with new systems of value, the freshman seeks new sources of support. The easy choice is the readily available support of peers who minimize the threat by offering a subculture in which the student can more readily determine his own stake. If this total identification with the peer cultures which exist within and on the periphery of an institution persists for four years in an unaltered form, education will be a failure. It will fail because the student will either keep a value structure which developed before college and will remain untested against the broader horizons of the university or because, in his anxiety to avoid

rejection by the valued group, he will adopt a set of values by simple imitation. Values acquired in this manner, whether from faculty or through the influence of student culture, are not internalized but are merely borrowed for the occasion. For values to become internalized they must be reflected on and made the object of the individual's best efforts at judgment and decision making.

Closely related to the internalization of value is the development of self esteem, which also is at first very sensitive to the appraisal of peers and faculty. The development of self esteem will ultimately lead to a sense of identity and mastery but this goal may take all of college and longer to be reached. Therefore it is important for the institution to provide a readily open channel for its students to switch identities often during their college careers if both to avoid too narrow a range of choices and too early commitments which will hamstring the individual for life. For example, a young woman who flees into marriage in the sophomore year has chosen sides too soon to maximize her development.

THREE DIMENSIONS OF STUDENT GROWTH

What can the college do to foster growth during these years? In general there are three main dimensions along which students can be expected to grow which are very much influenced by the curriculum and the social groupings which exist at the institution. They are 1) freeing the impulse through the opportunity to learn and to manipulate the symbols of human experience in imagination through literature, philosophy and the arts while not directly committing oneself. Let us not underestimate the value of empathy through imagination in the overall educational process.

2) enlightenment of conscience to the point where the individual believes in what he ought to do because he has arrived at a moral code by reasoned judgment and knowledge. Contact with diversity, training in disciplined analysis of thought, and a tolerant but committed faculty are invaluable here along with, of course, sound liberal arts coverage of content.

3) differentiation and integration of the ego such that the student increases his scope while becoming more of a unity. That is, perceptions and thought become more and more differentiated and personal responses more and more discriminating and interrelated. Then a young woman, for example, could see herself as being both feminine and educated.

BRINGING STUDENT GROUPS INTO THE SERVICE OF STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

Now the problem that faces the urban university of today and one which will increase in the future is how can an increasingly diverse source of students drawn more and more widely from all areas of the population as the economic wherewithall for education becomes more available be brought together in the common pursuit of these intellectual and personal goals which I have just alluded to. It seems obvious to me that in order to accomplish this challenging goal, the university must bring student groups into the service of student development. In order to do this we must operate on several levels at once. For example, it has long been assumed by the better residential colleges that students largely educate one another even in the most rigorous academic disciplines. But, unfortunately with the rapid expansion and increasing specialization of knowledge coupled with the increasing cafeteria-like offerings of our universities, it is rare that two students come together outside of class who have a common academic experience to share. Thus the university should consider new ways of grouping students both in the curriculum and in the scheduling such that larger numbers will have some common shared intellectual experience which will serve as a foundation for intellectual and social interaction. Very often we now force our students in their noncurriculum groupings into nonintellective areas of concern by denying them easily integrated experiences which stem from the academic content of their institutional endeavor.

STUDENTS FROM DEPRIVED BACKGROUNDS

A further expectation for the future urban state university stems from the increasing proportion of students who will come from those segments of society which have been to some extent crippled by mistreatment and lack of opportunity in the past. It would be wrong to assume that these students already share the dominant values of the middle class which tend to be so well entrenched in all of us. Their aspirations have been thwarted too long for them to burst into full flower with just a little nourishment. This means that the university as it opens its doors--and the urban university really must--to these peoples must at the same time carefully evaluate the sort of socialization that these students must go through before they can really become a part of the academic race. If the university is not willing to face up to the requirements of this task they are surely allowing the race to be run against cripples. At the University of Michigan we have discovered a particularly poignant problem with those students from deprived backgrounds that have

been admitted under a special equal opportunity program in recent years. They have been so removed from the common experience of current college-going populations that they still have a quaint pre-meritocracy image of college life and therefore feel seriously deprived when life at the university turns out not to be as presented on television. It is difficult for them to see that their more fortunate classmates are living very much the same kind of work-oriented day to day life at the University. There are serious problems in the area of socialization to life at the University which must be solved before large numbers of our urban disadvantaged populations will be able to feel a part of academia. I am speaking here, of course, of those who clearly qualify on intellective and academic criteria. Indeed, the most frequent cause for failure on the part of these people appears to be social failure and lack of a sense of belonging with the peculiarly devastating effects of that kind of alienation rather than lack of ability.

NEW MILITANCY OF STUDENTS

A further characteristic of the state urban university of the future will be the increasing militancy of the students toward a role in running the university. This is an area which is fraught with confusion of purpose and aim both on the part of students and on the part of the faculties and administrations. One could with President Perkins of Cornell argue that the students after all are at the university to learn, not to run it. And if one did not want to be so blunt, one could point out that students stay only for a generation of four years whereas the faculty and administration seemingly stay on forever, or at any rate so it seems when we find ourselves having to resolve the same issues year after year only with different groups of protesting students who want a voice in running things their way and who weren't in on the last round of discussions. I am afraid that we are going to have to resolve ourselves to even more of this fatiguing but necessary educational function. I warn you, however, that the students of today have been all too well trained in the meaning of democracy from that first grade election on up. They are terribly sophisticated and sensitive to fraud. They will have no part of student governments, committees, advisory panels and all the other paraphernalia that has developed on our campuses over the years unless these have functions which are real. Pseudo-responsibilities will be spurned and the students will increasingly turn from these false involvements to other concerns which stem from the multiplicity of groupings which will spontaneously arise on any campus of this size. Many of these other activities will not be those that we would find conducive to the orderly conduct of the university's business.

Of course, only a small minority of students will themselves want to participate actively in the affairs of the university but they will be in a position to mobilize their less involved and active peers if they are treated in a manner not becoming intelligent adults. The happy note here is the amazing responsibility and maturity which the recent generations of students have shown when given real responsibility and power. When taken into the inner sanctum and frankly apprised of the many elements involved in each day to day problem facing the university, they generally react in a most conservative manner befitting those who realize that they are as yet poorly equipped to deal with these complexities. I recall the remark by President Elliott of Harvard when in 1885 he was apprised of the rules for student government which had just been formulated by the Board of Trustees of Bryn Mawr College. He said, "Bryn Mawr College for young ladies will be out of business in a year. You cannot treat young ladies with that much freedom and responsibility." That particular student government is flourishing because it is real and everybody who participates in it knows that it is real. For those of us who moan about the lack of student interest in the multitude of committees and organizations that already exist, I suggest that you take a hard look at the real purpose of these institutions possessing gruesome immortality and ask if they have not long since outlived their purpose and have failed to take on secondary functions which justify their continued existence. Student committees, like faculty committees, can grow old and tired.

CHALLENGE OF ADULT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION

One final challenge which will face your university even more in the future than now and one which I am sure you are very much aware of is that of adult education and involvement. As an urban university more and more of your alumni will be from the immediate metropolitan area and will be increasingly involved in the affairs of the university. This can be a great source of support and strength, but it can also be a terrible drag and concern if the university is unable to count on its alumni when other pressures are drawn up against it. The urban university must be especially sensitive to the needs of its community at many, many levels and you will increasingly find yourselves involved in such diverse areas as urban renewal and continuing education for women. Both of these are serious social problems dealing with minorities in their treatment if not in their numbers. These urban challenges will often fall upon the shoulders of your student body who after all return at the end of each working day to every corner of the city and will

represent the university by their attitude and behavior. Will they derive a sense of concern and a sense of competence to deal with these questions from their experiences on your campus? Will the main thrust behind many of the student groups that exist and will exist at the University of Minnesota be oriented toward social amelioration and political activism where more than just impulsive acting out is involved but rather deep concern and directed action?

GROUPING STUDENTS FOR EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

These are only a few of the challenges that will face the great urban university of the future. I have avoided many that more properly fall in the realm of political and financial resources to meet the increasing enrollments and demands of ever growing technologies. There has not been time to suggest specific areas in which the university can prepare to meet these challenges directly. Let me merely suggest that a thorough understanding of the developmental processes underlying the growth of both the intellect and personality in each individual student will allow you to offer at your university the kind of curriculum best designed to foster these growth patterns within the context of the facilities that you will have at your disposal here at Minnesota. Just by way of example, you have it in your power to manipulate the formation of groupings amongst your student bodies in such a way as to enlist this powerful source of pressure in the direction that all of us as humanistically inclined educators support. You can do this by grouping students together in, say, freshman courses in such a way as to maximize their contact, both in and out of class and thereby overcome some of the barriers that young people have toward social interaction before they have developed a sufficient sense of confidence to overcome their shyness. The occasional sparks lit in the classroom will flare up again outside of class if these students have the opportunity to come into contact with each other. It is easy to make these arrangements in small residential colleges; it is a challenge to the ingenuity of schedule makers and administrators to arrange things at the University of Minnesota in this manner, but we are doing it at Michigan in our Pilot Project which now includes over 600 freshmen and hope to accomplish this and more in our Residential experimental college for 1200 students which we hope to open in September 1967. I can't go into details about the underlying rationale and the plans for this venture now but hope that during the discussion period someone will ask me to expand on this at great length. I would be very happy to do so. Let me merely point out that one of the fruits of understanding the basic developmental sequence pursued by most students will provide a base for the development within the university of a

multiplicity of educational environments such that the student by wise guidance and a bit of shopping around can find those sets of educational conditions and environments which best suit his potential and intellectual aspirations. Under those circumstances we can hope to maximize the development of each student through the concerted effort of the faculty and his group memberships.

I conclude by reminding you that college education must perforce proceed according to assumptions concerning what beginning students have in common. Where dissatisfaction with this state of affairs has been great, the tendency has been to go to the other extreme and accent the individuality of each student. A better view is that whereas each student is in some respects like all other students and in some respects like no other student, it may well turn out that in the matter of deciding upon educational objectives, possibilities, and instrumentalities, it will be best to consider the ways in which he is like some other students while creating diverse and pluralistic educational environments within and across institutions.