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Descriptors

This booklet, in honor of Edmund Williamson, contains several articles. First T. R. McConnell discusses "The Impact of the Minnesota Student Personnel Program on Higher Education." He presents Williamson's theory on student personnel services (SPS) as being an integral part of the university. He also points out Williamson's philosophy on student participation and responsibility, as well as communication and university responsibility. Willis E. Dugan, in "The Impact of the Minnesota Viewpoint on Counseling Under the Leadership of Edmund G. Williamson," uses the Greek term arete in describing the development of the Minnesota SPS. Arete, while difficult to define, means an emphasis on man and his relation to the ideal of excellence. He goes on to describe three models for arete: (1) the Homeric, (2) the Sophistic, and (3) the Socratic. He uses these models to describe then the programs Williamson set up. He also discusses Williamson himself. The pamphlet concludes with an article by Edmund Williamson, "On Striving to Become a Liberally Educated Person." In this article, Williamson presents his philosophy of student responsibility and its relationship to violence and dissent. (KJ)
IN HONOR OF
DEAN AND MRS.
EDMUND G. WILLIAMSON
and
in recognition
of his retirement

APRIL 9 AND 10, 1969

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA
EDITORIAL COMMENT

"The note of appreciation that follows was presented on April 15, 1965, at the Annual Convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association held in Minneapolis, Minnesota. I then had the honor of introducing Dean E.G. Williamson to a general session of that convention for the presentation of his paper entitled The Emerging Professional Counselor.

"The years since 1965 have changed no part or element of my perception of Dean Williamson’s contribution to this University and to the field in which he has been an acknowledged leader. Consequently my earlier comments are printed here on April 10, 1969, on the occasion of a program commemorating his official retirement from the University of Minnesota.

"I am grateful to the arrangements committee for allowing me now to publish this appreciation. I hope Ed and Lorraine will find in it a small part of the affection and admiration that so many of us feel for them."

John G. Darley

Dean Williamson, Ladies and Gentlemen:

As the chairman has indicated, my task today goes beyond that of commentator on Dean Williamson’s excellent speech, although this would have been task enough in view of its provocative quality. The program committee for this convention wanted an appreciation, in greater depth, of Dean Williamson’s contribution, including his vision of the emerging professional counselor. This is an appropriate assignment: In 1962, at Chicago, the APGA presented Dean Williamson its Nancy C. Wimmer award for outstanding leadership; the APGA is now meeting in Minneapolis, the central scene of Dean Williamson’s career; its theme is the individual, the central concern of his career; the meeting is held at a time that approaches the flood stage of the profession to which he has given recognized and distinguished leadership on the national scene; among this audience are uncounted numbers whom he has influenced in many ways. It is thus fitting that, as his career begins to draw to a close, there be here a witness to his eminence. The program committee was in this respect wise.

Whether it was equally wise in its choice of a speaker may be another question. For many of our earlier years, Dean Williamson and I were often taken for brothers, so similar were we in the gauntness and intensity of our appearance. There were also, some of you may recall, certain similarities of interests and intellectual activities. But if the program committee has merely erred on the side of Minnesota’s usual intellectual nepotism, it may have been unwise. It has cleverly masked this possible error, however, in the time placed at
my disposal. I was planning a little biographical excursion that would obviously
have held you enthralled for at least forty-five minutes, until I was informed
quite recently that my comments should take no more than six or eight minutes.
Within this constraint, you will hear now fewer words and different words than
had been planned by Dean Williamson’s younger, but rapidly aging, brother in
certain devious psychological enterprises. I might add that he will be given no
time for rebuttal, since I am chairman of the department in which he holds
academic rank, and in these matters the chairman has the last word.

In higher education, as in many other domains, it is surpassingly easy to
make a legend out of a human being; the legend may come to have a life of its
own, with little isomorphism to reality. This is particularly true of those in
administrative work, when viewed through the typical faculty perceptual system.
I shall undertake the more difficult task of making a human being out of the
legend.

Legend has it that the administrator is efficient, tidy, never absent-minded,
and concerned with many minute details in the enterprise. Two instances will
suffice to make Dean Williamson a human being in this aspect. His office is
probably the most untidy, cluttered, and chaotic repository of odds and ends of
things and ideas on the campus. In the second place, I call to your attention that
he was best man at my wedding; he forgot his cufflinks; he managed to get a flat
tire trying to buy another set a short while before the ceremony; and became so
engrossed in talking about student personnel problems to the minister that we
were all slightly late for the wedding itself. Things like this can weaken a man’s
belief in the legend. Dean Williamson claims to be a realist, but he also points
out that he chooses what he will be realistic about. This imparts an
other-worldly character to legendary efficiency, I can assure you.

Legend says that a career in administrative work is an unproductive
enterprise, measured by usual academic yardsticks. I call to your attention a
publication list of almost four hundred citations in Dean Williamson’s case,
including major texts on counseling, technical journal articles, and monographs,
in addition to the usual aberrant miscellany that all of us are guilty of in
academic writing. This list includes the first significant design of follow-up
studies of the counseling process, sound articles on test construction, academic
prediction, and historic analyses of the field of personnel work. Having attended
to this matter of publication in a variety of ways myself, as author, editor, and
administrator, I see behind the legend a human being working fantastically hard
and with great productivity at the demanding task of technical writing,
imaginative writing, and creative presentation of new ideas in his field. Few of
my colleagues from any segment of the faculty can even approximate this record
of productivity, yet the legend persists.

The legend would have it that administrators seek only to build empires, seek
only to extend and aggrandize resources, with little concern for the empire’s role
or contribution. In passing, it was Bonaparte who commented that every foot
soldier may carry a marshall’s baton in his knapsack; I have noted that many of
my faculty colleagues carry a deanship, equally hopefully, in their briefcases and
are not maladroit at empire-building within their departments or special fields of
interest. It is true that Minnesota’s student personnel program is a vast enterprise. But let us rephrase the legend to conform to historic truth: about forty years ago, under the aegis of a great dean, John B. Johnston, and with the technical drive of a great applied psychologist, Donald G. Paterson, there began to emerge a new frontier concept of personnel services at Minnesota. Service to students and research went hand-in-hand; new needs were perceived in the several areas of student-institutional relationships and were met with newly-trained specialists. Gradually the empire grew; painfully the new techniques and procedures were tested, discarded, or modified as needed. Consider the oldest unit in the program — the Student Counseling Bureau. On March 23, 1965, the last recorded case number in a consecutive system reaching back to 1932 was 106,781. This is the number of students seeking counseling or referred for counseling over a span of approximately thirty-three years of continuous service and research on the counseling process, in higher education. I need not document the volume of technical publications flowing from this one phase of Minnesota’s program; it is known in some degree to almost all of you here. Comparable figures on service loads could be drawn from the other units in the total personnel program to attest to the work done. If this is the empire of legend, it may also be called in the sweep of history a singular state of dedicated service to countless generations of students. The man who has presided over these services, fought for them, and kept them to high standards is Dean Williamson. By a not too difficult shift in perception, the legend becomes a proud saga of technical and humane developments to meet emerging needs.

Legend somewhat sanctimoniously cleaves to the classroom as the central device for education’s miracles; an administrative and service organization is therefore out of the main stream of the enterprise since its student credit-hour load cannot be counted. Disregarding Dean Williamson’s own recognized classroom performance, continuing today in his advanced seminars, I suggest that teaching in the arena outside the formal classroom is the most demanding, the most difficult, and the most subtle task the educator faces. In this arena the faculty is protected by no set of prerequisites, no required lectures and syllabi, no fixed periods of class attendance, no periodic examinations, and fewer status symbols of rank and subject-matter. The shaping of behavior through the extra-curriculum, the educational interchange in the counseling process, the fostering of maturity and growth outside the classroom, approximating balance between individual freedom and societal constraints in student life and activities, giving meaningful training in leadership and its responsibilities — these are the goals of the educative process that are sought outside the confines of the lecture hall and laboratory. Put more simply, the process of making responsible and contributing adults out of often unruly, or apathetic, or self-centered, or impetuous, or naive adolescents is a form of teaching that few of us have the courage to undertake. Student leaders who swore at him, in later years returned to swear by him. The dialogue between youth and age in education is by no means confined to the classroom; the college years provide a period when this whole dialogue in many areas of behavior can take place, and the student personnel program is an active participant in it.
Legend sees few positive or creative aspects in the administrative process in higher education. Administrators cannot see the big, philosophic issues of our time. Last week, to the annual conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators in Washington, Dean Williamson presented preliminary results of his collaborative research project started in 1963 under the auspices of a commission on the student and social issues. The report was a study of policies and practices regarding student expression on controversial social issues; a shorter title – academic freedom for students. I shall not dwell on the design, the sample, or the findings of this study; I commend these to you when reports appear in the literature. But I shall quote briefly two excerpts from the rationale for the study and one excerpt from the preliminary findings:

"The role played by the university in out-of-class life of students historically has been one of maintaining discipline in terms of student dress and moral behavior... many student personnel administrators are currently at the center of a controversy about the rights of students to discuss and express their viewpoints, convictions, and desired solutions to local, national, and international issues of great significance."

But Dean Williamson goes on to point out, in discussing scholarly methods, that:

"Strange as it may seem in view of the scholar's intense allegiance to objective methods of research and ordered discussion of evidence ..., these potent methods of study have only rarely been applied to the problems of the academic community itself."

In reporting the preliminary findings, Dean Williamson's statement closes with these words:

"... the issue to be resolved is not the simplistic one of freedom or unfreedom, but one of searching thoughtfully, and with intensity and vigor, to formulate and delineate ... what is possible as an approximation of the desired forms of freedom relevant and basic to the achievement of the constantly reexamined mission of the institution ... For this is the universal mission of the university: to teach students how to use the academic method of thoughtful inquiry especially with regard to controversial and divisive issues and personalities."

I can think of no greater philosophic issue for our time than the one to which Dean Williamson addresses himself in this study; I know of few administrators in higher education with the technical competence, the wisdom, and the compassion to undertake the study. We have recently witnessed great institutions partially brought to their knees by failure to see the problem.

And now to the last of the legend. Hardening of the intellectual arteries and cynicism are the lot of the aging administrator; wisdom, renewed idealism, and perspective accrue to the aging faculty member. In rebuttal, I direct your attention to Dean Williamson's speech here today; he has defined the counselor's role as an agent of a society striving to reach its full potential; he has stated the manner in which the agency role should be discharged in a morally meaningful fashion and in a way to provide adult models for students; in such ways as to place age in the true service of youth in their continuing dialogue. I suggest that wisdom, idealism, and perspective are to be seen in this speech.
A.E. Housman, on the occasion of the Leslie Stephen Lecture at Cambridge in 1933, talked of *The Name and Nature of Poetry*. He said, at one point,

"I replied that I could no more define poetry than a terrier can define a rat, but that I thought we both recognized the object by the symptoms which it provokes in us."

This quotation, I suggest, may come to be our touchstone of excellence: we may not be able to define it, but we can recognize it and point to it as it is personified in a small group of outstanding individuals in each generation of a discipline.

So in an age when the academic marketplace seldom identifies an individual with the institution of his history, I am honored to have been chosen as the commentator for the presentation by Dean E.G. Williamson, of Minnesota.
The Impact of the Minnesota Student Personnel Program on Higher Education

by

T.R. McConnell

Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

From time to time I have taken college student personnel workers to task for what I have thought to be unfortunate attitudes or inadequate programs. There must be a masochistic strain among the members of their professional associations, for they have invited me back guessing that I would probably chide them again. This time, however, I come not to criticize but to praise; not to exhort but to honor. I come to express high esteem for a personal friend; a former colleague; a scholar of repute; an effective practicing professional; the dean at large of student personnel work; and a significant contributor to the orientation and development of American higher education. Few indeed are the persons who can play so many distinguished roles. Perhaps my professional regard for Ed Williamson may be summarized in the advice I gave recently to a university which wished to reorganize its student personnel services. I said simply, “Ask Dean Williamson of Minnesota what to do, and then faithfully carry out his recommendations.”

Fifteen years ago, speaking to the American College Personnel Association, I criticized the professionals for setting themselves apart from the faculty and from the students’ academic experience. I went so far as to say that I suspected them of wanting to establish a priesthood by using esoteric language and performing precious functions. By professing to be concerned primarily with the students’ nonintellectual and nonacademic affairs, professional counselors heightened the barrier between counseling and teaching, and between the classroom and the remainder of the students’ experience in the university. Partly as a consequence of this separatism, the faculty tended to consign student personnel work to the institution’s periphery, and student personnel workers to the nonacademic staff. Many, perhaps most, college and university presidents shared the faculty’s attitude. That such a point of view still persists is indicated by the fact that in a large institution I am now studying, the president only recently and reluctantly included the dean of students in his cabinet, which is composed of the major central administrative officers of the institution.

In fairness, of course, I should not have blamed professional student personnel workers alone for the gulf that so often separated them from the faculty. College teachers have never been prone to recognize specialties outside their own esoteric disciplines. If they have been generous enough to consider student personnel workers as professionals, they have almost never accorded them the status of scholars. Presidents have expected the dean of students to keep the lid on students’ rambunctiousness. The faculty has expected him to
keep the lid off—except when students were so presumptuous as to question the relevance of courses or criticize the quality of instruction. When the faculty has thought positively about student personnel services, it has defined their function as that of delivering the student to the classroom in the best possible condition for learning what the professors purveyed.

The Williamson thesis is that student personnel services are integral parts of the university, not something tacked on, not something incidental to the main course of a student's education, not something concerned only with social and emotional problems, not something identified with relief from the intellectuality of the classroom, the library, and the laboratory. On the contrary, Ed has emphasized again and again that education is a unified process of individual development, in which the student relates the curriculum to the extracurriculum, uses classroom learning as a means of understanding the larger society, and disciplines emotions with reason the while he infuses intellect with compassion. I find in his writings the thesis that education is basically but not exclusively intellectual—it is also profoundly concerned with personal motivation, human relationships, moral judgments, and social idealism. I find again and again the admonition that the student should not develop his personality at the expense of the rights and freedoms of others, and that he should not consider his individuality as something that exists apart from a set of social values and relationships. As a scholar, the Dean knows that education is abstract and theoretical, but as a psychologist he knows that it is also concrete, experiential, and experimental.

Long before the Berkeley students declared their education to be irrelevant, Ed pointed out “...that some kinds of learning, especially human relationships and values, take place in the direct experiences of human beings rather than in abstracted and artificial situations.” Writing about the role of the extracurriculum in general education, he declared that the life of the campus should “capture the ‘naturalness’ of voluntary and self-motivated activities and...use it to energize the learning of more than superficial social behavior and skills. But this we cannot do if classroom learning is segregated in emphasis from behavior and from the social reality faced by the student” (Williamson, 1952).

Nowhere, however, do I find any suggestion that the Dean embraced the “cult of immediacy”. On the contrary, he stressed the importance of intellectualizing students' social experience. Thus, he said, “...we must emphasize that the sometimes-impulsive but genuine enthusiasm of students which leads them to grasp problems and issues at hand needs the seasoning of historical perspective afforded by the systematic and exhaustive analysis so characteristic of the classroom” (Williamson, 1952).

He has declared again and again that the immediate problem should be submitted to criticism and analysis, to the discipline of evidence, to the judgment of science and scholarship. In their impatience with social injustice, today's students often demand that the faculty join them in a crusade, not in a trip to the library. Students now want to meet their professors not in their studies, but out in the city. But Dean Williamson might remind these students that a trip to the library might make their crusade far more effective. He might
point out that if students and their professors are to have much effect on the life of the city, they will have to be able to translate the knowledge of the physical, biological, and behavioral sciences into the means of improving health, education, racial understanding, justice, humane decency, and economic sufficiency.

The necessity of applying both intelligence and humane values to the solution of increasingly complex problems of association in the university has consistently guided Dean Williamson's work with individual students and student organizations. This attitude was exemplified in the long course of events which led to the elimination of discriminatory membership clauses in student organizations, particularly fraternities and sororities.

There is no time here to recount this history. It is appropriate, however, to summarize the procedures with which the issue of discriminatory membership was finally resolved. The University as a corporate body formulated its own policy against discrimination on the basis of race or religion. However, the institution took the position that it should not enforce its policy administratively "... until, or unless, students first had studied and formulated their own ideas and plans" (Williamson and Borreson, 1950).

Then ensued a long process of discussion, debate, and analysis involving students, faculty, and administration. These parties agreed that the resolution of conflict over discriminatory practices was basically an educational process. The Dean and his associates held that while discrimination was a serious problem, it was not the most important value at issue. "This greater value", said Williamson, "was the protection of the opportunity for students to learn valid methods of studying issues and conflicts and the advocated solutions of these conflicts. What was at stake was the very heart of American higher education as it operated in the field of social conflict, namely, the method of applying sophisticated and educated intelligence to emotionally involved conflicts among persons holding different and conflicting beliefs and values."

In an article covering the early stages of the controversy — it began in 1949 and was not fully resolved until the University Senate established a deadline of January 1, 1962 for the elimination of discriminatory clauses — Williamson and Borreson assessed the broader outcomes of the University-wide consideration of discrimination as follows:

"... We feel that many of our students have achieved deepened insight into possible alternative methods of dealing with social and value conflicts. We also feel that some students and some nonstudents have acquired a new concept of interclass-culture relationships and even new ways of living, without conflict, with students from differing backgrounds ... And these learnings are examples of products of the extracurriculum which we feel justifies its inclusion in the institution's total educational program."

By way of contrast, it would be instructive to study the way in which the State University of New York managed the problem of discrimination in students' social organizations. Without prior notice either to the presidents of the constituent institutions or to student organizations on the several campuses, and therefore without the process of discussion and concerted action, the Board of Trustees of the State University simply abolished all ties between the local
fraternities and sororities and their national chapters and summarily outlawed discriminatory membership. Students, faculty members, and administrative officers of the campuses first learned of the trustees' action through the newspapers. Those were simpler days. I can scarcely imagine what the student response would be today to such an arbitrary method of governance.

Long before the rest of us even thought very much about it, Williamson began to devise ways in which students could be led to recognize the inescapable connection between rights and responsibilities, and the dependence of freedom on self-restraint. These were the problems he discussed in the summer of 1965 at a Berkeley conference on "Order and Freedom on the Campus: The Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty and Students" (Williamson, 1965). Speaking soon after the so-called Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, Williamson declared that the great unsolved educational problem behind much of the picketing, trespassing, violence, and rioting that was just beginning to explode was that "... many students are committed to a concept or philosophy of the nature of rights as extreme permissiveness, as freedom to do as they please, as license to employ any means to gain whatever they desire."

He turned to the educative means of persuading students to recognize the fundamental necessity of accountability and to adopt responsible methods of attaining justifiable prerogatives. "The first means of teaching some students the concept and consequences of responsibility," he said, "is the simple one of continuous involvement of students in deliberation, delineation, and review of rights and responsibilities, thereby hoping to induce students to thoughtfully commit themselves to both rights and responsibilities."

He went on to say that "Such efforts to learn may also involve the appointment of students as full members of faculty and administrative committees, with the right and responsibility to participate in the delineation of institutional problems and in the formulation of policies, including the adoption of proprietary rules for residence halls."

This is what trustees, administrative officers, and faculty members should have freely done without being forced into it by student protests or revolts. Today, with the sorry record of campus disruptions before us, many institutions still have not taken students into the policy-making and decision-making councils.

As a matter of fact, Williamson had advocated student participation long before 1965. Colleges and universities which today are hesitantly trying to cope with the demands of their students for a voice in institutional decisions may be amazed — and they should be chagrined — to note that on May 11, 1951 the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota adopted the following resolution:

"Without implying that the ultimate authority for responsible decisions rests elsewhere than in the Board of Regents itself, by provisions of its basic charter, the Regents look with favor upon all efforts that are designed to improve the consultation, communications, and relationships between staff members and responsible student leaders" (Office of Dean of Students, 1965, p. 12).
This resolution was both the culmination of a long process of consultation among students, administrators, and faculty members and the legitimation of a continuing process of cooperative decision-making. Much of this collaboration was the product of Williamson’s leadership and sometimes not too gentle prodding. It was also the result of wise support by perceptive presidents and forward-looking faculty members.

The policy of participation went beyond informal consultation, for in the same year, 1951, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education asked the Senate to endorse the proposal that “the President explore with each of the standing committees of the Senate the desirability of adding student members or increasing the number of student members on each committee and in other ways establishing a greater degree of communication with student organizations (Office of Dean of Students 1965, p. 14).

It is appropriate to refer again to the educative process of considering the interrelated rights and responsibilities of members of the university community. Here, again, Williamson advocated the process of intellectual analysis and problem solving. At the Berkeley Conference of 1965, he spoke as follows:

“... I suspect that perhaps the most effective method of helping students to learn the mature paradox of rights within responsibilities, or freedom within restraint, will result from informal and continuous seminars about that philosophy of higher learning which involve the moral duty of each student to become his potentiality, especially to become a devotee of the academic virtue of thoughtfully reviewing all available relevant evidence and knowledge and of remaining open to reconsideration as new data become available. This is the collegiate style of living — to be a thoughtful individual, especially about the nature of academic freedom” (Williamson, 1965).

And then he said what all the rest of us should have decided long since:

“It is obviously not easy to organize such a thoughtful seminar in the midst of disruptive and frenzied conflict, and therefore continuous dialogue must be the order of the day.”

When student disruptions begin, it is usually too late to establish hurried communication. Confidence must be built through a long process of consultation, of frank expression of views, of determined efforts to define the issues and to resolve them rationally. There is nothing in the university community like instant credibility, instant confidence, or instant rationality. These bases of mutual trust, Williamson has reminded us, are the products of a tradition and history of community living.

For many years the continuing dialogue at Minnesota has begun in the fall with a conference of student leaders, faculty members, and administrative officers. This conference is characterized by vigorous discussion and debate. No holds are barred in expressing views, in criticising policies and programs, or in advocating University reform. In my day, at least, these conferences were never characterized by vituperation or recrimination, which have no place in an intellectual community. The sessions symbolized the open university, ready access to those in positions of authority and responsibility, acceptance of vigorous controversy, and the commitment to rationality in spite of occasional human emotional explosions.
The continuing dialogue and the recurrent seminars on which Williamson and his associates depend so heavily in intellectualizing and solving the problems of the University community are unlikely to save any institution from periodic eruptions of discontent, disagreement, protest, or even coercive behavior rather than rational problem-solving. In fact, Minnesota has not completely escaped from some of the forms of disruption that students, especially the extreme militants among them, have adopted in other institutions. But this University has not suffered the scars of violence that many other institutions will wear for a long time to come. It is dangerous to make predictions about student behavior these days, but I doubt very much that the University of Minnesota will suffer the violent disruptions that have fractured other university communities almost beyond repair.

Another way in which Williamson and his staff, with the support of the Senate Committees on Student Affairs and Educational Policy, have built student personnel services into the warp and woof of the University is by professionalizing these services without separating them from the fabric of the colleges and the faculties.

Perhaps the emphasis on a continuing relationship between professionals and nonprofessionals grew out of Williamson's early collaboration with Professor Donald G. Paterson and their joint effort to improve faculty advising. In the late 1920's the following program was formulated: Decentralized student personnel services would be organized under the direction of the dean of each college. A committee of faculty counselors would provide liaison among the remainder of the faculty, the dean's office, and a general University committee on student personnel. Even then, the need for special services was recognized. In the early thirties certain faculty members were appointed as specialized advisers for different kinds of student problems, such as speech disorders, emotional difficulties, social relationships, financial support, employment, and placement. These specialists, supplementing the general body of faculty advisers, were to serve the entire student body. A Faculty-Student Contact Desk was organized to collate information about individual students and to make it available to faculty advisers. By the mid-thirties, Williamson and some of his associates in the Department of Psychology had begun to stress the clinical phases of counseling and the importance of perfecting counseling procedures. By 1937 Williamson and Darley, stressing the need to study and assist the individual in a wide range of educational, social, and occupational adjustments, emphasized the need for the professionalization of guidance workers. These professionals, they said, would require thorough training in psychology, statistics, and clinical procedures (Williamson and Darley, 1937).

Even though they called for a high level of professional training, Williamson and Darley also pointed out that the prevention and solution of innumerable student adjustment problems could not be handled by professional workers alone, but required the closest possible cooperation between professionals, teachers, and administrators.

During the forties and fifties Williamson associated with him clinical psychologists, educational psychologists, social psychologists, and sociologists, as
major staff members in the counseling bureau, the student activities bureau, and other sections of a rapidly developing departmentalized program of student services. He added doctoral students in these disciplines who were preparing for a career in student personnel work. This staff was not in any sense a narrow technical one, but one educated in the disciplines which undergird the development of individual counseling and group work. The close tie which this kind of staff gave the Office of the Dean of Students to the basic academic side of the University was strengthened by joint appointments between several departments and schools and the Office of the Dean of Students.

Another phase of Williamson's policy strengthened the identification of student personnel work with the academic life of the University. He expected his associates to engage in research, and within the limits imposed by the administrative demands of the Dean's office, and his extensive extramural professional activities in this country and abroad, especially Germany and Japan, he set a research example for his colleagues. Those were rigorous days for members of the Dean's staff, and I might reveal that some of them now and then cried on my shoulder about what seemed to be excessive demands on the part of their leader. But I am sure they decided that it was all worthwhile, because their combined efforts produced at Minnesota the most university-oriented and most distinguished program of student personnel services among the major universities. This is no small achievement, and I am sure that Williamson would be the first to give generous credit to his professional and scholarly colleagues.

But let me emphasize again that throughout his period of professional development and research activity, the ties of the specialized services to faculty advising in the colleges were never slighted. I found that one of my functions as Dean of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts was to serve as a bridge between the central professional student personnel staff, the administrative staff of the College, faculty advisers, and faculty members. I remember that for a period of time I took some advisees in order to understand more fully ways of relating faculty advising to professional counseling, for example, how to decide when the student needed to be referred to specialized agencies for personal, social, educational, or vocational counseling. I attended some of the seminars for faculty advisers which were organized by the Counseling Bureau. I am afraid the professional staff often considered us poor pupils. I remember particularly a session in which Darley tried to explain to a faculty adviser the meaning of the standard error of measurement. He failed, and I think it was not because of any ineptness as a teacher.

Serving as the bridge between professional counselors and faculty advisers was not always easy. Faculty members from time to time came to me with what they were sure were stupid blunders on the part of the professionals. In defense of the professionals and of myself, I accumulated a set of woeful miscarriages of counseling by faculty members. Finally I abandoned the liaison role completely and appointed as Assistant Dean for students in the College a psychologist with special interest in student counseling, to organize the advising in the College and relate it effectively to the central professional services. Dean Roger Page still holds that position, and it is still the policy of the Dean of Students to mobilize for students' benefit all of the diagnostic, remedial, and supportive resources of the University.
To survey Williamson's major contributions to student personnel work and to higher education in a single paper is an obvious impossibility. I have little more than time to mention his revolutionary conception of the nature of discipline, the development of positive and educative disciplinary procedures, and the creation of judiciary agencies for the assessment of discipline and for the review and appeal of penalties. These contributions were truly revolutionary; they were far ahead of the practice of most other institutions. Let me merely sketch some of Williamson's main propositions:

"We have argued at length, repeatedly," he wrote, "that the harsh, repressive-punishment approach to control of student behavior must be replaced by a more humane effort to teach them the necessary adaptations of behavior which are imposed by their membership in organized society . . . We must seek some accommodation between these extreme points of view of individual autonomy and group regulation. Such a search offers us a means of abandoning discipline as harsh retribution and punishment, and then proceeding to search for ways of helping the individual learn how to have his individuality and, at the same time, become an effective member of the group" (Williamson, 1961, pp. 158-159). With this philosophy to guide it, disciplinary counseling became one of the specialized student personnel services of the University.

In 1955 the University Senate approved the charter of an all-University Judicial Council composed of four students and three faculty members. With such a record as this at hand, one can only be amazed that one of the major student demands in institution after institution today is for adequate representation on college and university disciplinary bodies. In institutions which established such participation before students had to fight for it, the model was more often than not, I suspect, Minnesota's policies and procedures.

Participation in making the rules under which students live is, of course, as essential as participating in the discipline which may follow their infraction. This, too, is a central tenet of Williamson's policy. "... within the community of scholars," he has written, "orderly consultation, review, and joint planning of changes in regulations, freedoms, rights, activities, and enterprises are slowly evolving to substitute for rioting, revolt, invective, and disruptive conflict" (Williamson, 1961, pp. 422-423). Perhaps events have proved that this was too hopeful. However, if institutions long ago had inaugurated this policy of participation, they might have escaped many of the disturbances that have recently torn them apart. The success of extreme student militants in some institutions is testimony to the fact that administrators and faculty members, by and large, have failed to mobilize the efforts of critical but constructive students in a continuing process of educational reform.

It was natural, and perhaps even inevitable, that Williamson's interest in students' correlative rights and responsibilities, together with his commitment to the open university and the free society, should have made him the champion of freedom of expression for students. He believed that within self-imposed limits, each student should have the right to hear, critically examine, and express views on the issues of his time, his university, and his society, no matter how controversial these issues might be in the public mind (Williamson and Cowan, 1966b).

Again, Minnesota's present policy on freedom of speech is the culmination of a long educative process in which Regents, administrative officers, faculty members, and students all learned constructive means for the management of controversy. This policy is summarized in a resolution of the Senate Committee
on Student Affairs of May 10, 1963, a date, to be noticed, that antecedes the famous Free Speech controversy at Berkeley. This resolution stated, in part:

"In order to more fully support the democratic processes, we encourage students to actively participate in and assume responsibility for freedom of speech. This implies the following:

"1. Students who participate in campus programs are expected to conduct themselves in a manner which will not interfere with freedom of speech.

"2. Students who participate in campus programs in which disorder occurs have a responsibility to act to restore an atmosphere conducive to free expression . . .

"The Senate Committee on Student Affairs disapproves the following actions as being detrimental to freedom of speech:

"1. Questioning inappropriate to the format of the meeting.

"2. Interruptions which prevent the continuation of the program . . .

"3. Picketing designed to restrict the freedom of expression . . ." (Office of the Dean of Students, 1965, p. 27)

Perhaps a personal reminiscence is not irrelevant here. My first appointment to a University committee at Berkeley was to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom. I sensed no problem of freedom of teaching and expression for faculty members. The famous oath controversy had been terminated, not without serious personal and institutional scars, but without an invasion of the faculty's intellectual freedom. However, after experiencing the right of free discussion at Minnesota and the unrestricted freedom of expression enjoyed by students at the University of Buffalo, I found the limitations on student expression at Berkeley to be unfortunate. There was a determined effort to keep the University politically aseptic. Candidates for political office were not permitted to speak on the campuses. As candidate for President of the United States, Adlai Stevenson was denied the platform on the far-fetched and spurious ground that the state constitution prohibited partisan interference in University affairs. Communists, of course, could not be heard.

I had come from an institution where my predecessor, Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, had declared, "... that students in the institution are free . . . to inquire into any subject that interests them, to organize discussion groups or study clubs for the consideration of any subject, and to invite to address them any speaker they may choose; that censorship of student publications shall be based on precisely the same grounds and shall extend no further than that exercised by the United States postal authorities" (Capen, 1953).

Soon after I became a member of the Berkeley Committee on Academic Freedom I suggested that, since there were no apparent problems of academic freedom for faculty members, we should concern ourselves with the obvious lack of academic freedom for students. The other members of the committee received this proposal coldly, and their looks said to me, "How silly can you get?" I was dropped from the committee at the end of that year. Not quite ten years later the Free Speech Movement erupted.

I should add that in the meantime Dr. Clark Kerr, first as Chancellor at Berkeley and then as President of the statewide University of California, opened the campuses to free discussion and to controversial speakers including avowed
Communists, a policy which was reviled by numerous California reactionaries and for which Kerr paid a high personal price. The Free Speech Movement, incidentally, was in part misnamed. Thanks mainly to Kerr, the students already had the right to hear ideas freely expressed, and to present their own ideas. What they demanded, and won, was the right of political advocacy, which the administration at Berkeley had attempted to deny them, again on the spurious ground that advocacy of political causes violated the constitutional prohibition of partisan political activity.

The Minnesota policy on free speech for students is directed to their out-of-class activities, and the nationwide survey of students' freedom of expression—the first such large-scale empirical investigation made in American higher education—by Williamson and Cowan was addressed to such matters as the rights to discuss controversial issues, to hear speakers on controversial questions, to engage in organized protest, and to participate in the civil rights movement. The study did not concern itself with students' academic freedom in the classroom (Williamson and Cowan, 1966a). Nevertheless, if students attain full intellectual freedom in their own extracurricular activities, they will not long tolerate efforts of their professors to circumscribe the right to question, criticize, and dissent in the classroom. We may as well conclude that faculty members who violate the intellectual freedom of the classroom will not go unscathed when students, as I am sure they ultimately will, turn against those who, consciously or unconsciously, attempt to induce intellectual conformity. And if a recent attempt to distinguish the rights and responsibilities of faculty members from the rights and responsibilities of students is any indication, the students have a cause.

Dr. Charles Frankel, Professor of Philosophy at Columbia University, recently declared the classroom out of bounds so far as students' assertion of Lernfreiheit is concerned. He asserted that no college or university has an obligation to present all ideas or all points of view in the name of academic freedom. He wrote:

"The ideas or opinions represented in the collegiate program of education must be simply the ideas and points of view presented by persons who, in the judgment of their colleagues, are competent practitioners of their disciplines. The right of any opinion to be heard, which is a right outside the campus, does not apply to the classroom. And this is not because the college does not practice free inquiry. It is because free scholarly inquiry is inquiry controlled and governed by scholars in accordance with their own standards" (Frankel, 1966). According to Frankel, the students' right to present their points of view, to bring in spokesmen for their ideas, or to examine alternatives to their teachers' views, will have to be exercised outside the classroom. This, according to Frankel, is the nature and extent of students' academic freedom.

To my mind this is an archaic and indefensible position. It is certainly contrary to the attitude expressed by one of Professor Frankel's former colleagues, Robert M. MacIver. In his classic treatment of academic freedom in our time, MacIver wrote that in any educational system "... the breath of life dies within it unless the student is freely permitted, indeed encouraged, to think
for himself, to question, to discuss, and to differ" (Maclver, 1955, p. 206). He went on to say that if the faculty member does not give the student freedom to express his ideas and dissents, or if the instructor requires the student to accept his conclusions without question, he will impose "... the same kind of academic orthodoxy on his student that he would repudiate if imposed on himself."

Maclver went even further, to my mind quite properly. He concluded that "an educator who does not reasonably present the pros and cons of a highly debatable issue, who does not first examine both with decent care, who treats unverified hypotheses as though they were invincible verities ... is betraying his discipline and rejecting the primary ground on which he is entitled to professional status or respect" (Maclver, 1955, p. 224).

Neither Maclver nor Williamson, I feel sure, would condone efforts by students to supplant their teachers' ideas with their own dogmas, or to suppress the ideas of either faculty or students who dissent from the students' own special orthodoxies. Again and again, extremists among the Berkeley activists have tried to keep dissenters from the microphone. Some of the militants at San Francisco State disrupted the classes of a professor who disagreed with their views and their tactics. This is not intellectual dissent. This is not an assertion of academic freedom; it is a violation of academic freedom. This is not an effort to keep the forum open; it is an attempt to close it.

No university can survive constant disruption of this sort. Such disruption negates, in fact, essentially prohibits, free and open discussion; the concerted search for intelligent and objective solutions to significant problems; the attainment of a true community of learning between students and faculty; the effective mobilization of student, faculty and administrative resources in advancing the fundamental purposes of the institution; and the alert and courageous protection of the freedom of the academy.

Apparently some of the extreme activists, in collusion with nonstudents, would be willing, even anxious, to destroy a university in order to remake it to their heart's desire. But what they would make of it is not clear. I would infer, however, that the institution they would try to build on the ashes would not be intellectually free; it would not be a forum where all voices could be heard, where all ideas could be examined, where all forms of dissent would be tolerated. It would be a place where orthodoxy and conformity would be imposed on faculty and students alike.

The methods of confrontation and violence are inimical to the purposes, yes, the very survival of the university. Williamson has pointed out that controversy, if productively managed, may stimulate growth (Williamson, 1965). Certainly a vigorous dialogue with no intellectual holds barred, no interests concealed, and no values ignored, is essential to the vitality and integrity of the university. If any one of the three chambers -- students, faculty, and administration -- refuses to engage forthrightly and honestly in this kind of dialogue, it will have failed to play its responsible role in advancing the free university and the free society. In the first paragraph of an open letter proposing a faculty-student commission to study university governance, the Committee on Policy of the Berkeley Academic Senate declared: "... distrust, recrimination, crisis and confrontation are
poisoning the atmosphere in which we live. We must find ways to govern ourselves rationally or we seriously jeopardize our central intellectual mission — the advancement and diffusion of knowledge."

Devising ways to govern ourselves rationally is the ideal to which Ed Williamson has devoted his entire career. Throughout his professional life he has not only pointed, but steadily walked, toward the goal of freedom and responsibility. All of us, students, faculty, administrators, and trustees, would be far better off if we had kept pace with him. Perhaps it is still not too late for us to quicken our steps, remembering his admonition that academic freedom must be continuously re-enacted and jointly maintained.
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To use one term to describe an individual or a program is really to oversimplify. Yet, I would like to suggest that the Greek concept, areté, can be helpful in understanding the development of the Minnesota Student Personnel Program under the leadership of Edmund G. Williamson (Ewing, 1966). The life of the man who has headed this program for twenty-eight years is intertwined with the evolution of a coordinated program of student personnel services, and the evolution of a theoretical position on counseling and guidance which has been labelled the Minnesota Viewpoint. The man, the theory, and the administrative and organizational model have all been influenced by this Greek concept of areté.

Areté defies easy translation. Meanings given to this word depend greatly on what the contemporary view of excellence happens to be, but with areté, the emphasis is always on man and his relation to the ideal of excellence. Castle (1961) observed that throughout their history, areté allowed the Greeks to emphasize a unique educational theme, “Education is the making of men, not the training of men to make things.”

I would like to describe three models for areté: the Homeric, the Sophistic, and the Socratic. Striking similarities with these can be found in the contributions of the Minnesota Student Personnel Program under the leadership of Williamson.

In the Homeric position on areté, you find an ideal of excellence in which there is a concern for personal honor. This was not egocentric, but involved the Greek appreciation for a good “fight.” The teacher of Homeric areté was concerned with setting an example for his students. Honor demanded that he prove the quality of his areté in an arena for all to see, in a ceaseless competition for first prize; it was not “better to have fought and lost than not to have fought at all.” The contemporary usefulness of these points was not lost in the Office of the Dean of Students at the University of Minnesota. In developing a staff of professional student workers, Dean Williamson made it clear that each had to prove his quality in the academic marketplace. That he, himself, provided an example of scholastic striving, is well known and documented.

The concept of areté also evolved as a new emphasis on man as a member of a social group. The Sophist was the Greek teacher of this political areté; the

1The author expresses his appreciation to Dr. Donald Biggs for his great contribution in the preparation of this paper.
Sophist was concerned with the practical and the utilitarian. Man needed to make his way with other members of society. The Minnesota concern for man as a social animal was evident in the numerous theoretical and empirical studies related to various aspects of social participation. More recently, Dean Williamson has eloquently stated the philosophical case that the student can develop his humanity not solely through autonomous individualism but as an interdependent member of society. Indeed, many at Minnesota have been fond of Herberg's dictum (1957) that "the human self emerges only in community and has no existence apart from it."

Later, areté, with Socrates, took on the flavor of his intellectual skepticism. The commitment was to challenging the orthodoxy of those who laid "final claim" to knowledge. The human areté also included a searching concern for a knowledge that was more than folklore and mythology. This was a kind of understanding of the necessity for scientific discovery. Those of us who have been acquainted with Minnesota Student Personnel work have no difficulty seeing this similarity. Many prized assumptions have been challenged. Questions, criticism, and evaluation have been integral parts of the Minnesota Viewpoint.

Today I would like to talk about the contributions to guidance and counseling which stem from a theoretical perspective, from an administrative organization, and from a unique spokesman. Although I divide my topic into three parts, I, somewhat differently from Caesar, do not hope to conquer. The task is formidable and the time is short. Thus my treatment will necessarily be superficial. At the onset, I point out that the Student Personnel Program at Minnesota and the Minnesota Model for Counseling have been a unique fusion of theoretical and practical. In many places the development of professional guidance has been hampered by a rather peculiar assumption that theory and practice are opposites. This has not been true at Minnesota.

Theory

The Minnesota Viewpoint on Counseling has called into question some of the accepted beliefs of the profession. Without creating an intellectual strawman, the team of Williamson and Darley in their book, *Student Personnel Work*, (1937) articulated a model for counseling which sought to take advantage of the advances in differential psychology, measurement, and industrial psychology. Although these colleagues and co-authors held out for scientific emphasis in personnel work, they wanted this field to have an empirical outlook tempered by a humane concern. Donald G. Paterson, in his Introduction to the Williamson and Darley book, proposed: "In short, the present book is a treatise on the individualization of mass education. It stands as a challenge to educational traditionalism!"

Guidance and student personnel workers should reread this book. Although many critics later claim that these two had called for a "heavy-handed" directivist approach, this was not the case. They warned counselors not to develop "Jehovah complexes". There was to be a maximum of leadership treatment and a minimum of executive treatment. Critics have also claimed that the Minnesota counselor was too much concerned with tests and did not
appreciate their limitations. Yet Williamson and Darley indicated an awareness of such problems as the inadequacy of grades as a criterion for tests and the artificiality of most distinctions between aptitude and achievement tests. Some of my colleagues may think these are recent discoveries. Williamson and Darley also suggested that social case work methods could be useful in student personnel work. This important aspect of counseling is still to be developed.

In the book, How to Counsel Students, (1939) Williamson scolded some of his professional colleagues. The Minnesota Viewpoint on Counseling was clearly to be a camp of practitioners rather than of erudite academicians. Williamson warned personnel workers of the time that they were too much preoccupied with semantic sophistry, and as a result one could not find information on what to do with students who sought counseling. Facts, he claimed, were necessary and paramount, to the avoidance of sophistry. This "call for facts" has been an enduring characteristic of the evolving Minnesota Viewpoint on Counseling. Williamson and colleagues have continually questioned seemingly "venerated" personnel assumptions and warned against the development of an "orthodoxy of obtuseness".

A particularly interesting feature of the Minnesota Point of View on Counseling (1947) has been its concern for the scientific. In using the term, Minnesota Point of View, I am fully aware that there has never been a unified, one-person dominated point of view at Minnesota. But, as Williamson has pointed out (1947), this series of points of view are in some respects closer together than they are to other points of view, such as the nondirective. A most important part of all of these has been a common insistence on the necessity of testing all counseling hypotheses either experientially or experimentally. This was why, in 1944, the Counseling Bureau imported a psychologist trained with Rogers.

The plea for scientific guidance was stated in 1937 and again in 1950. This scientific focus led Minnesota counselors to call into question such oversimplifications as "guidance is the unfolding of inner growth", "guidance is the dissemination of information", and "guidance is a warm personal relationship". The counseling profession was goaded into abdicating such "gross" implicit guidance tenets. A contemporary review of the literature in guidance and student personnel work reveals much more sophisticated hypotheses. This change was in no small way influenced by a large number of professionals who have been associated with the University of Minnesota Student Personnel Program.

An outgrowth from this scientific commitment was research. All aspects of counseling and student personnel have been examined and called into question. Dean Williamson presented a model for others to emulate when, in a project presented as part of his doctoral thesis in the Psychology Department at the University of Minnesota, he questioned the effectiveness of faculty advising (1931). The findings were compelling! Advisees did not achieve significantly higher grades than those who were not advised. This data raised perplexing queries. Guidance and counseling professionals were challenged by Williamson's conclusion: "If counseling is helpful to students, it is not in respect to
scholarship that it proves beneficial. We shall have to look elsewhere for criteria of effectiveness or to other counseling methods than those involved in this study." Williamson, as Director of the University Testing Bureau, continued to ask empirical questions about counseling and provided some first tentative "hard" evidence that counseled clients earn higher grades and report being more happily adjusted in college (1941).

Several pioneer studies concerned with counseling process and counseling outcomes were completed. To attempt to critically analyze such an amorphous process as counseling was a formidable undertaking. Williamson and Bordin concluded, "The evaluation of counseling is not a casual process, easily carried out. Indeed, such a study represents a combination of careful and rigorous case reading, many days and weeks of interviewing, prolonged clerical and statistical labor, and above all, a period of patient waiting for the counseling cases to mature to the stage wherein adequate data are available for critical evaluation." This early counseling outcome study was an example of professional bravery, scholastic competence, and personal "doggedness". The problem of counseling process was also dealt with by Williamson and Bordin (1941). These authors broke new ground with their research describing the psychological processes involved in counseling interviews. Others at Minnesota (Campbell, 1966) (Berdie, 1960) have furthered this concern with counseling process and counseling outcome. According to Bordin (1949) these early Williamson and Bordin investigations of counseling effectiveness were probably the first in which matched groups of counseled and non-counseled students were compared.

Research in the University of Minnesota Student Personnel program has been varied. Student personnel services which at other institutions functioned according to "common sense" or as one wry wit commented, "that which tells us the world is flat", subjected their biases to "empirical" test at the University of Minnesota. Student activities are taken lightly at many colleges and universities. Indeed, they are often designed primarily to keep people busy with little interest in the educational value of such programs. Since 1943, the Student Activities program at Minnesota has tried to assist individuals to choose social experiences in line with their personal needs and the needs of the University community. Just as the Student Counseling Bureau at Minnesota found the routine dispensing of occupational information to be of negligible value, Student Activities counselors also rejected the routine dispensing of activity information as a useful method of assisting students in choosing relevant planned social experiences.

Research projects in the Office of the Dean of Students at the University of Minnesota were designed to provide useful information for the professional student personnel worker. A contribution was made to the profession when Williamson and Hoyt (1952) reported on the characteristics of student leaders. They concluded that their findings raised questions about the validity of two popular stereotypes. First, motivations of student political leaders can be described as "unstable" or "neurotic". Second, fraternity and sorority leaders tend to be just students and do not approximate the stature of the "heroic" type of ancient Greece. They posited a question for the profession, "How is social
participation related to personality?" This query has shown up in either an implicit or an explicit fashion in a number of research and theoretical papers completed by E. G. Williamson and his colleagues. In a study of participation in college activities, Williamson, Layton, and Snoke (1954) tested the hypothesis that amount and type of participation in student activities was significantly related to such demographic characteristics as education of parents, size of home community, family wealth, and degree of self support. This research did not fully explain the range of individual differences in social participation of college students. Indeed, they reported that "great diversity" rather than commonality was a characteristic of student life at the University of Minnesota. The same empirical attitude was evident in a study of disciplinary cases (1952). After an extensive analysis of student disciplinary cases at the University of Minnesota for the period 1941-1948, Williamson, Jorve, and Knudson concluded that students charged with misbehavior were not markedly atypical of students in general.

The commitment to the scientific attitude in student personnel work was institutionalized when Dean Williamson appointed Dr. Ben Willerman in 1949 to the Student Counseling Bureau to conduct a long range program of research on the social psychology of student life. Under Willerman's guidance, the problem of how social participation influences the personality of college students was explored from a number of perspectives. These included the evaluation of the effects of experimental and continuing student programs, studies of the inter-relation and status of student groups, and studies of the inter-personal and member group relations.

The professional counselor is deeply indebted to Rogers, Skinner, and Williamson for their fascinating and probing discussions of values. Williamson's position papers on counseling are an important contribution to the literature (1958, 1961, 1966). There have been a number of well-publicized misconceptions about the Minnesota Viewpoint on values. So-called Minnesota "directivists" have been accused of foisting their values upon hapless clients. Some of these critics were willing to endorse the simple dictum, "Counselors should be neutral about their values."

During the 1957 school year, Dean Williamson was immersed in the process of answering those advocates of a posture of neutrality for counselors. In his letter to Joseph Samler (March 29, 1957), the Editor of the American Personnel and Guidance Association Journal, he explained his conclusion about values and counseling: "We are in the business of influencing people. This gets us over in the area of preachers, ministers and rabbis, and I have to give cognizance to the fact that they have squatter's rights in that territory and that we scientifically-oriented counselors, as they call us, had better be sure that we are not merely kidding ourselves that we are scientifically neutral when actually they see us as advocating a new kind of metaphysics which has no super-naturalism in it." In developing his case against counselor neutrality, Williamson involved a number of individuals at the University of Minnesota, including myself and several of my colleagues, as well as persons from other colleges and universities. Many drafts of the manuscript, "Value Orientation in Counseling" were circulated to individuals like Herbert Feigl. Dean Williamson explained that he needed help in clarifying
his thinking (September 30, 1957). He went on to state, "I have been trying to think through this problem about what I refer to loosely as Value Orientation in Counseling. Something is wrong with my thinking and I am determined to straighten out my thinking whether or not I ever get the paper published. None of my colleagues think my point is either clear or important or relevant." This process of working through a viewpoint on values was a demanding and frustrating task. Williamson wrote Samler (September 26, 1957), "I think that it is only fair to alert you that I may withdraw my article on value counseling. I have reworked it a half dozen times and had many of my colleagues look at it and not a single person likes it, including me."

The Minnesota Viewpoint on values became increasingly sophisticated with the development of second and third position papers. In the paper, "Value Commitment and Counseling" (1961) Williamson held that counselors should expand their efforts and involve themselves in client's attempts to choose value commitments that give direction and force to their lives. Boldly he proposed that counselors should not hesitate to influence students to commit themselves to a value system in which an intellectual life is dominant. In a third position paper, "Value Options and the Counseling Relationship", (1966) he described his continuing private "seminar" on the topic: "What is the nature of the good life?" He concluded with a definition of values as standards by which we judge, perceive, and influence human behavior through the ordering of hierarchies of goodness. There was to be no single criterion for the good life but a diversity of options for rational choice.

Programs

The Minnesota Point of View has not just been words. In 1914, Dean Johnston became concerned with the problem of high student mortality, and this led him to conclude that technically and professionally qualified counsellors and psychometrists should be part of an overall student personnel program at the University of Minnesota. In 1921, Professor Donald G. Paterson assumed direction of the testing program for the Arts College, and on October 26, 1932, Edmund G. Williamson was appointed Director of the University Testing Bureau. These events are part of the origin of the first organized program of student personnel services. Under the leadership of E. G. Williamson, the University of Minnesota has developed a program of student personnel services which has made the emerging student personnel profession a useful colleague in the educational mission of the University. The Dean has said of himself that he is a practical administrator who loves to organize and manage. This characteristic has been a major factor in the contributions of the Minnesota program to the guidance and counseling profession.

The forging of new student personnel programs involves negotiation within the "realities" of human organizations. Dean Williamson helped others in the profession realize that the student personnel administrator's role could be both "practical" and "educational". He defined the Dean of Students as an educator who does his teaching on the run, often in the midst of tension and crisis, and with ever changing course titles and curriculum content (1957). Practical student
personnel situations could foster educational values. He pointed out three examples from the University of Minnesota student personnel program: a program to increase student participation in University policy making; a series of discussions with fraternity and sorority members which concerned the possibility and desirability of eliminating discriminatory clauses and practices; and the development of an open policy on speakers. With these examples, he challenged deans of students to inquire of themselves, "What educational good have I performed for students?" With his academic perspective and practical organizational skills, he provided a unique model for student personnel administrators across the country. In a letter to Dean John Hocutt (August 12, 1955), the Dean pointed out that the educational objectives of Deans of Students are different from those of professors, but the educational flavor of student personnel administration should be more obvious. The Office of the Dean of Students should be more than a service station in which students are repaired.

In 1941, E. G. Williamson became Dean of Student Affairs at the University of Minnesota. He was assigned administrative responsibilities for mens' activities, womens' activities, discipline, student loans and finances, housing, testing bureau, Freshman Week, speech clinic, and advisor of foreign students. What has happened since then is history. At that time, there were twenty professional staff, eleven clerical staff, four administrative and clinical fellows, which totals thirty-five employees. Presently 98 professional and administrative staff, 73 clerical staff, ten administrative and clinical fellows constitute 181 employees. The reasons for the phenomenal growth in student personnel services were predicted by a 1941 Committee on the reorganization of the Office of the Dean of Student Affairs. They stated that "in the last analysis, the successful administration of the Office will depend upon the skills and judgment of the individual in whom the new responsibilities are vested."

The development of a professional student personnel staff was an important concern of this new Dean of Student Affairs. He pleaded eloquently to them for the avoidance of the tendency to run down or to lessen their motivation, to ritualize and rigidify daily operations, by periodic and systematic attempts to refurbish, refresh, and upgrade their student personnel techniques. For the years 1941 through 1955, the following significant indices of staff professional development were reported. Seventeen books and monographs, 606 journal articles and 146 articles in monographs had been published by staff from the Office of the Dean of Students. In addition, there had been 101 honors, fellowships, and awards and 29 research grants. Through the years, many members of the student personnel staff at the University of Minnesota have left to become major professors at other institutions of higher learning. These noteworthy individuals have included such people as Theordore Sarbin, Harold Pepinsky, Donald Hoyt, Wilbur Layton, Edward Bordin, Charles Lewis, Paul Blo and, and others.

At the first Dean of Student's Staff Retreat held in September 1959, Dean Williamson stated his formula for staff development: "You can attract and hold a more competent staff if you require a higher level of competency. It's as
simple as that. You get cheap services out of cheap help." He told his staff that
the best way to win respect and support for student personnel was to function in
the perspective of the academic tradition — pursue excellence of scholarship.

Student personnel programs developed at the University of Minnesota
provided models for many other campuses. One of the reasons why other
student personnel workers paid attention was because of the Minnesota
willingness to engage in critical self evaluation. No program director was allowed
to rest on past laurels. Although staff members thought the Office of the Dean
of Students had a sufficiently comprehensive program of Orientation (1955),
they completed a careful re-examination of their program. They discovered that
in many instances students did not fully grasp the meaning of higher education
and set out to reorganize the freshman camp program to teach students to
broaden their educational objectives.

Many students were coming to the University with very singular goals which
did not seem to embrace the diversity of possible experiences that can be found
during the collegiate years. This conclusion stimulated student personnel staff
concerned with Orientation to experiment with the Freshman Camps. Six new
objectives for this program were identified by students, faculty, and staff who
served on camp advisory committees. One or two objectives were emphasized in
each camp and programs were arranged through which the chosen objectives
could be presented to the students. This new educational programming for
freshman camps was enthusiastically received by faculty, freshmen, and student
leaders.

The Special Dean's Retreat Program was developed in the Spring of 1956.
These have also been attempts to bring the intellectual aspects of University life
into the extra-curriculum. Sacke and Zander (1964) studied the differences
between those students who attended special Dean's Retreat Programs and those
who chose not to. They reported that students who attended did not have
significantly higher grades at the end of the first two years, but more of them
did complete their first two years of college.

The Disciplinary Counseling Office at the University of Minnesota represents
a unique fusion of theory and practicality for the professional counselor.
Although many in the profession thought counselors should have nothing to do
with discipline, student personnel workers at Minnesota reasoned otherwise
(1949). Misbehavior was defined as a normal part of behavior which was to be
changed through educational means. Consequently disciplinary counseling was
conceived of as a constructive educational technique designed to prevent
misconduct and provide an effective means of reeducating those students whose
behavior conflicted with that of other individuals, group mores, student life, or
society in general. Concurrently, Dean Williamson and his colleagues evolved
both a theoretical rationale and a practical administrative methodology for a
program of disciplinary counseling. In 1946, a separate administrative unit,
called the Disciplinary Counseling Office, was set up in the Office of the Dean of
Students. The staff included one full-time and one part-time counselor who were
to hear complaints of misconduct. In the first year of operation, the Disciplinary
Counseling Office handled 358 complaints.
The respect with which the student personnel and guidance counselors hold the Minnesota Program of Student Personnel was evident in 1962, when members of the American Personnel and Guidance Association presented the Nancy Wimmer Award to E. G. Williamson for organizing the first integrated program of student personnel services in the United States and for the continued outstanding service in the development and administration of this program. Indeed, this award was an indication that the Minnesota Student Personnel Program has provided a model for colleges and universities throughout the country and the world.

The Man

During the course of his career, Edmund G. Williamson made many trips to other campuses as counselor and lecturer. As a “traveling Dean”, he made what I consider to be the third major contribution to guidance and counseling. His trips helped “market” this new field to many individuals, institutions and professional organizations who previously had doubted that such educational needs existed. The first of these trips was in 1932, when Dr. and Mrs. Williamson completed a journey by bus to New Mexico. In 1937, there were two more trips as consultant and lecturer to the University of Missouri and to Harvard University.

The Minnesota Viewpoint on Counseling is most evident in a report “Counseling and Selecting Personnel with High Aptitude for Technical Training” by E. G. Williamson (1948). He described the visits of a technical mission of which he was a member, to postwar German universities and technical institutes. This group tried to assess the degree to which psychological diagnostic techniques were being employed for the selection and counseling of students. Questions were posed at each university. The conclusions were that little progress has been made in universities in paralleling the significant use in German industries of modern, scientifically constructed methods of identifying aptitude for professional and technical training. He went on to challenge the “Germanic” assumption that only those students, regardless of aptitude, who have studied the officially prescribed pre-requisite courses are qualified, as well as eligible, to undertake advanced technical studies. These observations were subjects for some “private” seminars (Williamson, 1947). There were some weaknesses in pre-war German guidance and counseling that were brought to the attention of American personnel and guidance workers. These were: 1) the failure to search aggressively for human talent; 2) the failure to provide extensive financial subsidy for talented individuals from lower economic classes; 3) the divorcement of counseling from education; 4) the neglect for non-intellectual aspects of education; 5) the neglect of training for citizenship. Guidance counselors should heed these warning signs. Their important role in humanizing the educational process could not be neglected. They should continue in their mission.

E. G. Williamson’s concern for student personnel has had a broader impact than the campus of the University of Minnesota. Indeed, he has led in the movement for the development of effective student personnel services in the junior colleges. He addressed himself to the problem of the junior college student personnel worker in a speech before the Louisville convention of the
American Association of Junior Colleges, entitled, “Needed Reforms in Junior College Guidance Programs”. The Dean sought to set junior college student personnel workers to do the necessary research which would allow them to more carefully diagnose the capabilities of their clients. B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education, has commented about the influence of E. G. Williamson on junior colleges: “Dean Williamson was the leader of a workshop on Junior College Personnel Services held at UCLA several years ago. He showed a real insight into problems of student personnel services in the junior college and gave outstanding leadership to the group.” He stated further, “Dean Williamson has been one of the truly ‘great influences’ on student personnel services in higher education — including the junior colleges.” (January 29, 1969)

Student personnel programs within Jesuit colleges and universities have also been greatly influenced by Edmund Williamson. The Dean, in July of 1965, spent three weeks as senior consultant to the Jesuit Student Personnel Workshop at Regis College in Denver, Colorado. This group of eighty representatives for twenty-eight Jesuit colleges developed a “blueprint” for a contemporary Jesuit student personnel program. The personal contribution of E. G. Williamson to Catholic education is described by Thomas A. Emmet, President of Higher Education Executives Associates (February 4, 1969): “Though not of our faith, he also in his quiet way has spoken to many a Catholic guidance group at local, state and national levels. There is many a Catholic women’s college that has felt his constructive ideas on their campus, and one can almost tell where he has been by the quality of their program.” Emmet went on to state, “I can say without fear of historical error, that Edmund G. Williamson did more than any other non-Catholic layman for development of student personnel work in Catholic colleges and universities.”

Xavier University in June 1968 supported this contention that Edmund Williamson had made noteworthy contributions to Jesuit education, when they awarded him the degree of Doctor of Laws honoris causa. The Board of Trustees of Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio, wished to testify to the contributions of this man to a field — “that has suddenly become the most challenging aspect of higher education everywhere in the world.”

How should I conclude this paper? Can I logically reach an end when talking about the influences of a theory, a program and a man? No. If my talk has seemed somewhat sentimental, this is because of my personal ties to this institution and to this particular time in the history of guidance and counseling. Some think that history is nothing but chance or the scattering of bits and pieces. In contrast, one of my implicit points this afternoon has concerned the thesis that the basis for achievements is not in chance but in choice. Myers has commented about the reason for Greek success. He stated that the Greeks had learned so well: “In an actual situation, men must act, not philosophize, and they can act, only on the basis of right opinions. Hence the educated man is he who has right opinions and the knack or at least the least harmful solution of particular concrete problems.” (1960)

In talking to you I have found some difficulty in separating out the theory, the administrative program, and the man. E. G. Williamson, in his first published
article (1926), stated a perplexing query, "What is the nature of sociality. He reasoned that sociality depended upon more than the immediate give and take of congregated animals. It could never be imposed by or assumed from “presence” or “absence”. Indeed, it must be authenticated by a socialized person himself. This has been the flavor of the second point I have tried to make this afternoon.
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On Striving To Become a Liberally Educated Person*
by
E.G. Williamson

Each year on many campuses and schools we observe the annual tribal ceremony celebrating the scholarly attainments of our students. I address myself to a relevant topic. For a number of years I have been engaged in a private search for a concept (theory) of education as human development, one adequate to augment the “normal adjustment” concept of the psychotherapist. This search has centered on identification of criteria of the “good life”, as the ancient Greeks phrased it. And this private search has taken me back to my own collegiate experiences of forty years ago when I was fortunate to be introduced to the concept of the “good life” and to Cardinal Newman’s idea of a University. Many other seminal influences have aided me to delineate, for me, some marks of the liberally educated person. It will become apparent as I develop my theme that my search has not yet ended and it undoubtedly never will, because it is a continual striving (the ancient Greek concept of teleology) to understand oneself and one’s universe, and in applying to one’s life the Socratic dictum that the “unexamined life is not worth living.”

But I have attained thus far in my search some provisional formulations which I present for your consideration.

First, let me say that I have not experienced difficulties in reconciling technical subject matter with the liberating arts. In the model of Leonardo da Vinci, one’s vocation is the exploitation of one’s full potentiality. Moreover, vocational proficiency is a necessity in our industrialized culture since we are a nation of workers and not a leisure class rigidly imposed upon an undifferentiated mass of peasants. Indeed, our technological culture faces us with an almost insatiable demand for trained and fully developed men and women and undoubtedly this societal need is part of the reason for the great increase in recent years in school and college enrollment. Moreover, if necessary changes in our culture and technology are to be “self-renewing” (Gardner) and not destructive of individuality, we must exploit and employ the topmost innovative potentiality of all of our citizens. And we are only now slowly beginning to see that these innovative capacities of students and adults alike must be applied to our unsolved divisive societal problems if we are ever to become a nation in which poverty, pollution, bigotry and ignorance are minimal.

This kind of societal reconstruction requires, in Jefferson’s terms, an active citizenry adequately informed concerning these and other great unsolved problems of urbanized culture. The great task of continuous change as improvement demands an educated citizenry prepared to participate in societal decision-making by voting, discussing, communicating with law makers, and by means of other efforts to innovate solutions to these great societal problems. To achieve such an informed citizenry we need to be reminded of the dictum that “in a republic, ignorance is a crime” (Max Lerner) and therefore a condition to

*Speech delivered on Cap and Gown Day, University of Minnesota, Tuesday, May 27, 1969.
be eliminated along with poverty, deprivation, bigotry and racism.

This brings me to a third mark of a liberally educated person and that is the cultivation of a life style of the academic form of controversy of ideas without hating those who dissent and differ from us. This form of academic freedom requires the painful elimination of bigotry, arrogance, dogmatism and even rigid forms of orthodoxy. We must become convinced that the future lies open to thoughtfulness and to the accompanying innovation of solutions to the great problems faced by our society and not merely to the solution of our own personal problems! The cultivation of thoughtfulness as indeed the style of living characterizes the mission of our university. But vocational proficiency and societal reform must not crowd out the life of a cultivated taste in aesthetics of the great forms of artistic expression and experience. “Admiration of the really admirable, the disesteem of what is cheap and trashy and impermanent — our colleges ought to have lit up in us a lasting relish for the better kind of man, a loss of appetite for mediocrities and a disgust for cheapjacks —” (William James).

I reason that, even in a life of technological and economic expansion, we must never abandon the Renaissance style of living as the cult of delight of those forms of living which are aesthetically of a high order.

As liberally educated students, we must also commit ourselves to compassion for the less fortunate minority groups and the culturally deprived. And indeed we must, each of us, cultivate the habit of charitable giving as a personal value. That is, we must not only develop our own potentiality but we must also “do some social good” (John Dewey). Certainly William James would have applauded the response of this current generation as many have sought and found a moral substitute for war in the Peace Corps, Vista, and in many other social and reform endeavors.

But we must also cultivate, as the collegiate way of life, man’s capacity for curiosity and the use of his intellect to better his own life and thus to solve his problems — personal, societal and cosmic. We need to recall that “Universities are dedicated to the eternal worth of thought” (Lowell). Discipline and rigorous inquiry must thus be substituted for the sloganizing catch-phrases so characteristic of many of our forms of entertainment and of our political life and activities.

Still another mark of a liberally educated person is the openness of provisional hypotheses about philosophic queries which are subject to revision as new and relevant data become available and are thus not rigid and decadent in their orthodoxy. We need to give thought to Lynn White’s dictum that “truth is a shady spot where one eats lunch before trudging on”. This point of view is at variance with that of those who believe that truth is forever carved in stone, whether from Mt. Sinai or from other sources. For me, an educated person is characterized by his restless search for that understanding which overflowed the neat Aristotelian categories of the “known”. Indeed, I have come to distrust man’s fruitless efforts neatly to categorize knowledge in compartments with rigid separating walls, and I am thus reminded of John Stuart Mills’ dictum about the “deep slumber of decided opinion”.

In this twentieth century, and probably far into the next several centuries, our liberally educated students and graduates must seek to rise above localism,
tribalism, provincialism and cultural and political isolationism in search of a more sophisticated world view through which we are sympathetic with a variety of alternative cosmologies. And we need to devote our lifetime trying to evaluate which one, or ones, approximate adequacy in responding to man's search for understanding of his universe and himself.

The liberally educated person should also strive to attain and maintain a strong personal commitment to high ethical excellence, or as the Greeks said, a striving for *aretē*. Whatever may be characteristic of the non-college population, certainly the liberally educated person must be morally committed to a hierarchy of values both personal and societal.

One of these value commitments should be to assist in humanizing the impersonalization that is the by-product of our technological and urbanized culture. Indeed, we must come to realize that it is ultimately the individual who is the “carrier of value commitments” and we must not lose the individual in the midst of numbers in our universities. Education must thus dignify the worth of the individual through stimulating relationships with teachers of all persuasions.

Moreover, the liberally educated person must strive ceaselessly to attain an everchanging balance between external restraints imposed by membership in organized society, with its social norms and expectations, and the very dominant American ethos of the urge to become a self-contained individual, unique and autonomous. This search is a tremendously complex task for each of us, particularly for the college-aged student as he seeks to attain adult maturity and to win his freedom from the stifling imposition of the Establishment upon his struggle to attain individuality. This cluster of problems continues to be very real and in this particular decade it is one of the sources of the violent outburst of the adolescent against the Establishment. Mills stated the problem in this form: “How to make the fitting adjustment between individual independence and social control”, and he concluded a century ago that “nearly everything remains to be done on this subject”. Even though we suffer from violence and revolution on many campuses, and in many communities, nevertheless we must strive to utilize our intellectual capacities in our commitment to human values and in search for ways of making a fitting which permits the individual to be dignified as of personal worth in the midst of ever-larger numbers in both colleges and in the community at large.

Finally, I come to a statement about my conviction with regard to the role of the faculty and the administration alike in motivating and helping students to strive to attain these forms of the good life. And I find in the recent writings of Harry Gideonse what to me is a beautiful summary of this position. After visiting Russian universities he stated, “I shall never forget the flash in a Soviet rector's eyes when he told me of the civil servants' attitudes of his professors who treated their students as empty bottles to be filled and not as lamps to be lighted”. Thus I conclude that the liberally educated educator seeks to light the lamp of each student in his personal search for illumination of the ignorance surrounding him and thereby to attain a more adequate understanding of himself and his universe.

Naïve and old-fashioned I may well be, but I firmly believe that these goals of education are attainable even though we currently witness violence on many
campuses and schools substituted, by a few students, for rational inquiry as to new and desirable delineations of relationships between students and the institutions, and even though some institutions have become rigidly bureaucratic instruments used for the continued subordination of youth often in ways that are reminiscent of the oppressive colonial college of centuries past. But persistent efforts will, I believe, replace violence with enhancement of students through maturing into thoughtful persons capable of exploiting their potentialities for full humanity.

Responsible freedom of dissent must be protected, especially for speakers, political candidates and advocates of unpopular causes, but not by violence against those who differ in opinions and convictions. The open campus must be kept responsibly open by orderliness and we must not tolerate abuse, disruptions or political interference. Lawlessness and hoodlumism corrode academic freedom for both faculty and students. And therefore all of us must work ceaselessly to maintain freedom of thoughtful expression for all by our responsible and accountable use of that freedom by all.

But it is not debatable, for me, that innovative changes in responsible student participation in decision-making are long overdue in our schools and universities as well as in our surrounding society. And while we may profitably and relevantly interact about the nature of participation, yet it is clear, I believe, that the tactics employed in achieving desirable change should be both congruent with the nature of the educative enterprise and with the laws of the surrounding community. Indeed, we educators and students must not subscribe to destruction of the undergirding social order. More explicitly, clearly I do not subscribe to the nihilistic tactics as exemplified by the chant of "burn, baby, burn". Indeed, I believe that men of good will are nearly always capable of inducing desirable societal changes without violent revolution. But such is not always the order of the present day and I deplore lawlessness and destruction as self-defeating of the very changes to be desired.

I would be less than honest and realistic if I failed to recognize that the academic mission of cultivating the liberally educated person were not presently obstructed by nihilism, unrest, violence and disorder. Perhaps I am a sentimental optimist but nonetheless I confidently expect that lawlessness will, within the next decade, be replaced by thoughtfulness and intellectual comradeship among teachers, administrators and students and that responsible maturity will be the order of the day in most campuses and schools. I hope to live long enough to observe that transformation of the current academic scene.

It follows that I deplore racism and bigotry in any form and thus I share the white man's guilt because of the centuries of deprivation and degradation of black and yellow, Indian and Mexican. Indeed, we of the older generation must aid in the reconstruction of our society to the end that every person aspires to exploit his opportunity to become his full humanity.

In thus closing my academic career at my beloved and cherished alma mater, I wish to assert my unrepaid debts to students, presidents, alumni, Regents, faculties and staff colleagues who have aided to make that career a joyous one and I hope one productive of some "social good" for all.

Finis, Pax vobiscum.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

OF

EDMUND G. WILLIAMSON

1926-1968
Bibliography

E. G. WILLIAMSON
Dean of Students and Professor of Psychology, 1941-1969
University of Minnesota


“University of Minnesota Summer Session for Self Appraisal: An Experiment in Guidance On the College Level” (with D. G. Paterson), PROCEEDINGS OF PURDUE-WABASH CONFERENCE OF COLLEGE PERSONNEL OFFICERS, Bulletin No. 21, Engineering Extension Department, Purdue University, Vol. 14, 1930, pp. 47-48.

COUNSELING COLLEGE STUDENTS IN THE COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, LITERATURE, AND THE ARTS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA: A STUDY OF METHODS, TYPES OF STUDENT DIFFICULTIES, AND RESULTS. A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Minnesota in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, June, 1931. Parts published under separate title.


REPORT OF THE 1933 ACHIEVEMENT TESTING OF MINNESOTA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS, Association of Minnesota Colleges, University of Minnesota Testing Bureau, June 3, 1933 (Mimeographed).


A SYLLABUS FOR THE STUDY OF VOCATIONS (with Mary Murphy and Bette March), General College, University of Minnesota, 1934, 159 pp. (Mimeographed).


PREDICTION OF SUCCESS IN NURSING TRAINING (with Bette March), University of Minnesota Testing Bureau, July 30, 1935, 30 pp. (Mimeographed).


STUDENT PERSONNEL PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES USED BY FACULTY COUNSELORS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA (with Gwendolen G. Schneidler and D.G. Paterson), Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, 1935, ii and 105 pp. (Mimeographed).


“Pre-College Guidance,” PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRD ANNUAL ALL-STATE EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE, University of Nebraska Educational Monograph No. 9, October, 1936, pp. 81-90.


THE UNIVERSITY TESTING BUREAU MANUAL OF STAFF PROCEDURES, University of Minnesota, 1936, 50 pp. (Mimeographed).

THE VALUE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS IN THE SELECTION OF STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS OF NURSING (with R.D. Stover and C.B. Fiss), University Testing Bureau, University of Minnesota, December 21, 1936, 33 pp. (Mimeographed).


A STUDY IN THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COUNSELING, A summary of research with the assistance of the Minnesota W.P.A. Project No. 6094-4214, May 3, 1937 (Mimeographed).


MINNESOTA INVENTORY OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOR (FORM B), (with J.G. Darley), The Psychological Corporation, New York, 1937, 4 pp.
MINNESOTA INVENTORY OF SOCIAL PREFERENCES (FORM P)  

Review of “Occupational Ability Patterns” by Arthur F. Dodge.  

“Scholastic Motivation and the Choice of a Vocation,” SCHOOL AND  

STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK: AN OUTLINE OF CLINICAL PROCEDURES  
(with J.G. Darley, introduction by Donald G. Paterson),  

STUDENTS AND OCCUPATIONS, Henry Holt and Company, New York,  
1937, 437 pp.

“Testing for Nursing Aptitude” (with R.D. Stover and C.B. Fiss),  

“To Avoid Waste: A Function of College Personnel Work,” THE  
JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION, Vol. VIII, No. 2, February, 1937,  
pp. 64-70.

1938  
“Achievement of Students in Subfreshman Composition” (with Curtis E.  
Avery), THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, Vol. 24,  
April, 1938, pp. 257-267.

“A Further Analysis of the Young-Estabrooks Studiousness Scale,”  

“An Apprentice Method for Training Counselors” (with M.M. Sukov),  
OCCUPATIONS, Vol. 16, No. 9, June, 1938.

THE FIFTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN  
COLLEGE PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION, 1938, pp. 73-77.

A SYLLABUS FOR THE STUDY OF VOCATIONS (Revised) (with  
Ruth Westlund), University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1938, 411 pp.

A SYLLABUS FOR THE STUDY OF VOCATIONS, PART I: CHOICE  
OF AN OCCUPATION (Revised) (with M.E. Hahn and Ruth Westlund),  
University of Minnesota, 1938, 91 pp. (Mimeographed).


“College Grades and N.Y.A. Scholarships,” SCHOOL AND SOCIETY,  

“Guidance and Business Education,” BUSINESS EDUCATION WORLD,  

“Personality Traits and Attitudes of Jewish and Non-Jewish Students”  
(with May Sukov) JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY, Vol. XXII,  
No. 5, October, 1938, pp. 487-492.


Review of "Inventory of Activities and Interests" by Henry C. Link and others, No. 921, in Oscar K. Buros, Editor, THE 1938 MENTAL MEASUREMENTS YEARBOOK, New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1938, pp. 57-58.


"What Has Guidance to Contribute to Education?", Texas Junior College Association, April 28, 1938.


1939


SYLLABUS FOR THE STUDY OF VOCATIONS. PART I: CHOICE OF AN OCCUPATION (Revised), University of Minnesota Mimeograph Department, Minneapolis, 1939, 145 pp.


1940


“Evaluating Counseling by Means of a Control Group Experiment” (with E.S. Bordin), SCHOOL AND SOCIETY, Vol. 52, No. 1349, November 2, 1940, pp. 434-440.


STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA (with T.R. Sarbin), Burgess Publishing Company, Minneapolis, 1940, 118 pp. (Mimeographed).

1941


APTITUDES AND OCCUPATIONS: A STUDY GUIDE (movie script) (with M.E. Hahn), Coronet Productions, Inc., Chicago, 1941, 22 pp. (Mimeographed)


I WANT TO BE A SECRETARY (with M.E. Hahn) (movie script), Coronet Productions, Inc., Chicago, 1941, 21 pp.

APTITUDES AND OCCUPATIONS: AN INTRODUCTION TO VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE (movie script) (with M.E. Hahn), Coronet Productions, Chicago, 1941.


"Objective Evaluation of Student Personnel Services at the University of Minnesota" (with E.S. Bordin), PROCEEDINGS OF THE INSTITUTE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS OF HIGHER INSTITUTIONS, Vol. 12, 1941, pp. 271-290.

"Plan for Administrative Organization of Student Personnel Services at the University of Minnesota" (with T.R. Sarbin), PROCEEDINGS OF THE INSTITUTE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS OF HIGHER INSTITUTIONS, Vol. 12, 1941, pp. 51-64. See Also: Chapter IV in STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, University of Chicago Press, 1941, pp. 51-63.


Review of "Vocational Guidance in New Zealand" by H.C. McQueen, JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, Vol. 34, No. 9, May, 1941, pp. 706-708.

1942


"Prediction of Success in the College of Science, Literature and the Arts" (with Edward S. Bordin), UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA STUDIES IN PREDICTING SCHOLASTIC SUCCESS, Part I, 1942, pp. 1-32.


“Counseling Students in Colleges,” PROCEEDINGS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF LAND GRANT COLLEGES, Chicago, October 24-26, 1944, pp. 89-96.

“Counseling Students in the Postwar College,” JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY, Vol. 18, 1944, pp. 87-95.


Introduction, COUNSELING STUDENTS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, University of Minnesota Press, September, 1944.


“Student Activities – An Integral Part of Student Personnel Work,” EDUCATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL MEASUREMENT, Vol. 4, No. 1, Spring, 1944, pp. 3-12.


“Student Personnel Work,” POSTWAR COUNSELING ON THE COLLEGE CAMPUS, Pasadena, California, Western Personnel Service, 1944, pp. 3-6.

48

1945


Foreword in “Student Personnel Work in the Postwar College,” AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION STUDIES, Series 6, Vol. 9, No. 6, April, 1945, pp. iii-iv.


Review of “Twenty Careers of Tomorrow” by Darrell Huff and Frances Huff, JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATION BY RADIO, Vol. 5, October, 1945, p. 34.

“Shall I Go Back to School?” (with J.D. Foley, H. Morse and A. Brayfield), G.I. Round Table Series, Washington, D.C., American Historical Service Board and War Department, 1945, 50 pp.


1946


"The Place of Sororities at the University of Minnesota," THE FRATERNITY MONTH, May, 1948, pp. 21-23.


1949  


Foreword in “Predicting Success in Professional Schools,” AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION STUDIES, 1949, pp. v-vi.

Foreword and Editor, TRENDS IN STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1949, pp. v-vi.


1951 


"Learning Habits of Charitable Giving Through the Extracurriculum" (with B.J. Borreson and Robert Irvine), EDUCATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL MEASUREMENT, Vol. II, No. 1, Spring, 1951, pp. 103-120.


STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA (with M.L. Snoke and Dorothy F. Snyder), University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1951, 154 pp. (Mimeographed).


1952 


“The Improvement of Counseling and Teaching,” PROCEEDINGS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND ALLIED INSTITUTIONS, College Station, Texas, October 9-14, 1952, pp. 71-80.


“Measured Personality Characteristics of Student Leaders” (with Donald Hoyt), EDUCATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL MEASUREMENT, Vol. 12, Spring, 1952, pp. 65-78.


1953


Preface in STUDENT COUNSELING IN JAPAN by Wesley P. Lloyd, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1953, pp. vii-viii.


“The Role of Mental Hygiene in Our Schools,” THE POTS DAM GUIDANCE CONFERENCE, State University Teachers College, Potsdam, N.Y., August 19-21, 1953, pp. 2-10.


“Counseling from the Perspective of a Dean of Students,” NEW PERSPECTIVES IN COUNSELING, V.H. Hewer, Editor, University of Minnesota Press, 1955, pp. 20-32.


Counseling Lectures and Records of Consultation Meetings, Sendai, Japan, Dean of Students Office, Tohoku University, 1956, 15 pp. (Printed in Japanese).


“Student Personnel Services in Florida Colleges and Universities”,
HIGHER EDUCATION AND FLORIDA’S FUTURE, Vol. 5, Professional
and Specialized Programs, Tallahassee, Florida, The Council for the

“Students Live Off Campus”, THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD, Vol. 37,

1957 Comment on “The Psychotherapy Research Program at the Pennsylvania
State University” by Dr. Snyder, JOURNAL OF COUNSELING

“The Dean of Students as Educator”, THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD,

“Editorial Comment”, JOURNAL OF COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY,

“Learning Versus Fun in College”, JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION,

Preface in POLICY MANUAL FOR STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS
(Japanese translation), Institute for Democratic Education, Tokyo,

“Professional Preparation of Student Personnel Workers”, SCHOOL AND

“Report of Special NIC Committee on Autonomy”, A Panel Discussion,
YEARBOOK OF THE NATIONAL INTERFRATERNITY CON-
FERENCE, November, 1957, pp. 61-63.

“Transposing Techniques and Points of View”, JOURNAL OF COUN-

“Values of Fraternities to Colleges and Universities”, A Panel Discussion.
YEARBOOK OF THE NATIONAL INTERFRATERNITY CON-

1958 Preface in “The Administration of Student Personnel Programs in
American Colleges and Universities”, THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON

Review of “General Education: Explorations in Evaluation” by Paul M.
Dressel and Lewis B. Mayhew, THE PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE

STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES,
Eastern Japanese Student Personnel Services Institute, Tokyo, Japan,
1958 (Japanese translation by Tetsuro Kon).

“Students’ Residence: Shelter or Education?” THE PERSONNEL AND
“Value Orientation in Counseling” PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE JOURNAL, April, 1958, pp. 521-528. (Reprinted in READINGS IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY, Hiroshi Ito, Editor, Yokohama University, Knagawa City.


“Education Counselors Told To Keep Humility”, MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE, October 11, 1959, p. 7.


“Philosophy and Objectives of an Off-Campus Housing Program”, SECOND ANNUAL BIG TEN OFF-CAMPUS HOUSING CONFERENCE, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, April 17, 1959, pp. 2-7.


"Social Change on the Campus", FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS, April 7-9, 1960, pp. 163-180.


“Institutional Policy in Relation to Student Rights in Controversial Situations” (Panel discussion with Carl M. Grip, Jr., Timothy Jenkins and Ruth O. McCarn, moderated by Royce S. Pitkin), University of Chicago, CURRENT ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION, 1961.


1963 “Balancing Student Privileges with Student Responsibilities”, STUDENT PERSONNEL METHODS BULLETIN, Western Personnel Institute, Pasadena, California, January 31, 1963 (Mimeographed).


APTITUDES AND OCCUPATIONS (2nd Edition), Coronet Instructional Films, August, 1964 (Teacher’s guide and film).


"Demise and Rebirth of Vocational Counseling", NATIONAL VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE QUARTERLY, Autumn, 1964.


"Discipline - Another Dimension of Counseling", PERSPECTIVES IN PERSONNEL: PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRD ANNUAL STUDENT PERSONNEL CONFERENCE, Stillwater, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, June 18-19, 1964, pp. 18-36.


“Sharing Responsibilities in the Counseling Relationship”, ODS Staff Papers, No. 8, February, 1964, 6 pp.

“Some Unsolved Problems in Guidance”, ELEVENTH ANNUAL GUIDANCE CONFERENCE, Whitewater, Wisconsin, Wisconsin State University, October 8, 1964 (Mimeographed).


“The Berkeley Phenomenon: Reports, Observations, and Some Basic Papers”, ODS Staff Papers, No. 16, April, 1965 (also Supplement NO. 1), 49 pp.


“The Role of the President in the Desirable Enactment of Academic Freedom for Students” (with John L. Cowan), THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD, Fall, 1965.

“Some Alternative Roles of Students in the College”, ODS Staff Papers, No. 17, October, 1965, 5 pp.


“Activities and Functions of Student Government”, KENT STATE UNIVERSITY RETREAT, Punderson State Park, December 2-3, 1966 (brochure). (See also: ODS Staff Papers, No. 28, March, 1968, 10 pp.).


   "Is Student Power Dead?", TECHNOLOG, University of Minnesota Press, Vol. 48, No. 7, April, 1968, pp. 30, 32.

67