

*Professors Brown, Epstein, and Johnson:  
three faculty members who react to new student  
interests in different ways, depending in part on their  
own childhood, their attitude toward authority,  
and their image of themselves as educators.*

## patterns of faculty response to growing student diversity

michael bloom  
norbert ralph  
mervin freedman

The faculty interviews we conducted in 1970-1972 as part of the Wright Institute study (described in the "Editor's Notes" and the first article) revealed that their institutions are more complex than they were a decade ago. Student needs are more diverse; institutional goals are less well defined; political pressures are more direct; and the role of faculty members is more amorphous. These interviews also indicated how greatly faculty members are influenced by the attitudes and behavior of their students. For example, when we asked them, "What advantages and satisfaction does your career offer you?" their answers centered on teaching and the human contact and interaction it offers. In response to the question, "What

is the most important source of information to you in evaluating your teaching?" the majority of professors stressed face-to-face interaction with students.

Clearly, students are "significant others" for faculty; they have a powerful effect on the professional identity, self-esteem, and general sense of competence of their teachers. They can reinforce faculty outlooks or force reexamination of them. Like that of other individuals, a professor's sense of identity—his view of himself in the world—remains constant as long as there is continuity between the way significant others act toward him and how he expects them to act, based on past experience. But current students are making demands on professors that often are not consonant with faculty members' past experience. As a result, many professors gave evidence in our interviews that their old identities are being thrown into question.

When we analyzed their comments, three clear patterns of response to these changed student opinions emerged: (1) some faculty reject the new values of student culture and rigidly reaffirm their habitual ways of thinking and behaving; (2) others embrace the new values of student culture and reject their old professional identity; and (3) still others use the new student values as a stimulus for reevaluating their outlook and self-conception. They neither totally accept nor totally reject new views, but rather incorporate those that seem to have value for them without rejecting their previous sense of themselves.

#### patterns of adjustment

These three patterns have a great deal in common with Perry's (1970) conceptualization of how individuals adjust to novel experience—by assimilation and accommodation. To Perry, assimilation is a matter of selective inattention and attention: the individual tends to recognize in a new situation only those aspects that accord with his assumptions about the nature of social reality, thereby preserving the integrity and stability of these assumptions. This mode corresponds closely to that used by the first group of faculty members, who react to growing student diversity by reaffirming their existing outlooks. Individuals who adjust to novel situations in this assimilative way can maintain a sense of security by preserving the continuity of their assumptions, but only at the cost of ignoring the novelty of divergent experiences.



In contrast, the person who deals with novel experience by accommodation modifies his assumptions about the nature of social reality to incorporate the novel experience and reconstructs his model of reality to include it. The second group of faculty accommodate the greater diversity of students in this way, by totally realigning their identity to accord with them. This accommodative mode enables the person to enter new situations, experience their stimulation and challenge, and gain a sense of mastery over them; but if this mode is used exclusively, the individual loses the security and continuity of his old identity.

The third faculty pattern represents an adaptive equilibrium between assimilative and accommodative adjustment. Faculty members strive to maintain a sense of security and continuity while gaining mastery and expanded choice by confronting new student values. Needless to say, they do not acquire a condition of static adjustment, but rather dynamic equilibrium.

Before considering case examples of these three patterns of faculty response, several caveats require emphasis.

The authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno and others, 1950) found that individuals have, in varying degrees, the disposition to assign positive values to groups with which they identify and negative ones to groups different from their own. Readers may experience an impulse to see the professors described in the following case histories as personifying positive or negative attributes. This is a natural tendency, but they should bear in mind that no one kind of faculty member is effective with all types of students.

Further, readers may view our types as static entities. In reality, they are functional behavior patterns; they exist in time and space and have evolved because they deal effectively with the environment. Each of the three patterns of faculty behavior described below can be seen as an adaptive response to the increasing diversification of students.

#### pattern one

*The Case.* The first pattern of faculty behavior is exemplified by Dr. Brown. She was an associate professor at the time of our interview, fifty years old, married with one child. She gives an immediate impression of having a great deal of commitment to and pride in her professional life. She states almost boastfully, "My

husband feels I work too hard, but I love what I'm doing." Throughout the interview she stresses individuality and an active life. She grew up on a small ranch, and as a child she played outdoors much of the time, often alone. When her father worked around the yard, she would follow him everywhere. She identified closely with her father and states that she took after him in personality. Not particularly intellectual himself, he thought that education was a way to get ahead. She describes him as independent, industrious, and strong—qualities she tries to cultivate in herself—but she thinks he was too lenient in his dealings with her, although she was usually eager to please him.

Dr. Brown paints a very different picture of her mother and their relationship, which she describes as one of avoidance. She feels that her mother was too weak to deal with her. "My mother was dependent and gentle. I was a wild animal, hostile; I couldn't relate to her. She tried to be strict with me, to teach me manners, but she just couldn't."

In school Dr. Brown tried to do the best and be the best, receiving much encouragement and praise for her accomplishments, especially from her father. She remembers herself as always being a good student—"an achiever," as she puts it—and high grades were very important rewards for her. She most enjoyed school when she had difficult tasks to perform and could demonstrate her abilities in completing them. She found her graduate years were most pleasant for this reason. "I was a slave in grad school, but I loved it," she says.

Dr. Brown believes that the primary function of a college education is to develop professional competence in those students capable of strenuous intellectual work—"to achieve a high level of cold, professional, analytic functioning." She maintains that "in college one should be pushed to the edge of his intellectual capacity," and thus students who lack the capacity for high-level intellectual functioning or who do not intend to enter a career in which this capacity is necessary should not attend college. They overcrowd institutions, diluting their value for those who do have ability and intellectual goals. Dr. Brown says that grades are "not perfect," but are "valuable." They help motivate some students. Superior students, she believes, need to know they are superior, and grades are one way of telling them. "They need to be rewarded," she says.



She describes her relationship with students as one of mutual respect: "equal, but separate." She expects her students to refer to her as Doctor Brown, and she calls them Mr., Miss, or Mrs. As she puts it, "I respect them too much to call them by their first names."

Dr. Brown sees students today as "the same as always." She feels that most student activism is caused by "a few rabble-rousers and self-seeking faculty members." She states that she has not changed her teaching style in any way because of student pressure. To "encourage intellectual involvement" in her classes she lectures, takes her students on field trips, and provides them with resource material.

Dr. Brown has good relations with most colleagues in her department. She values faculty members who are dedicated to their work, their teaching, and their subject matter. She most admires those who are highly competent, who set high standards for themselves and their students. She is not concerned with their political and social views and believes that the classroom "should not be blurred" by a professor's views on these matters. She considers that her own political views are generally more conservative than those of most faculty members, although she regards herself as very liberal on some issues, such as civil rights and civil liberties.

Dr. Brown sees herself as being rather impersonal, unemotional, respectful, and respectable. Her evaluation of her own academic abilities is that she is "intelligent," although not "gifted," and most importantly a "hard worker." Regarding ways of improving herself, she would like to be more self-disciplined and organized in the things she does.

*Student Views.* Our studies of student response to different faculty members indicate that the kind of faculty member which Dr. Brown typifies appeals to students who come to college for information and skills—the same objectives that motivated her attendance. They share her goals of education and consequently view her as a good professor. For other students she may offer little. For them the pressing demand is finding out who they are, what they have to offer the world, and what the world has to offer them. They have come to college to find, in Erikson's terms, their "psycho-social identity." These students want to know how a subject relates to the world and to themselves before they are willing to study it. Its relevance is important to them. But because Dr.

Brown's type of professor knows implicitly what students should learn, this apparent aloofness is often a sore point with certain students and can lead to rebellion or alienation among them, as the following example illustrates:

Interviewer: What do you find to be the major problem or difficulty in your education?

Student: Professors who are rigid and traditional.

Interviewer: What do you mean by traditional?

Student: They are interested in relating facts rather than philosophies.

Interviewer: Why is this a problem?

Student: It stifles new ideas . . . it doesn't provide for individual needs. They are too impersonal. They don't care about the student as a person.

Some students unwillingly comply with the demands of these faculty members. Others avoid them. Still others who need to rebel against authority seek them out, finding a symbol of authority against which to exercise their feelings. Rebellion can take the form of classroom arguments over the relevance of the material or other disruptive outbursts. In some cases, confrontations between two viewpoints stimulate thought; in other cases, they restrict communication.

*The Pattern.* Faculty members characterized by this attitude commonly believe that what is most important in a college education is the acquisition of disciplinary knowledge and techniques for evaluating knowledge and that the student who gains such knowledge is well educated to function effectively in society. These professors consider themselves to be experts in a special field. They stress their responsibility for seeing that students get the knowledge and experience necessary for them to become expert as well. They feel that conventional grades are an appropriate measure of learning. Underlying this view of grades is a more general belief that there is a unitary set of goals within a discipline and absolute standards for evaluating them.

This first group of faculty members differs from those professors who believe that judgment is relative and therefore that one viewpoint may be "right" for them but not right for someone else. They are characterized by adherence to a fixed point of reference.



In our study we found that professors who share this view also tend to share similarities in background that may account at least partially for this position.

In Dr. Brown's past we see that she held her father in the greatest esteem. He had high expectations for her and praised her for performing well in her assigned tasks in school. The other important people in her formative years, her mother and her teachers, had similar expectations. She had no reason, therefore, to question their values. Furthermore, questioning these values would threaten the security she derived from her relationships with them. Even when she had become independent of her parents she found it difficult to question their values. To do so would perhaps entail rejecting many of the standards by which she evaluated herself. To say that conventional grades mean little can be very threatening for someone like Dr. Brown. She has based her sense of self-esteem on the assumption that the A grades she received for her work as a student means that she is a superior person—an authority.

It is easy to see why Dr. Brown claims that students today are no different from what they have always been—that is, that only a few “rabble-rousers” make students act differently. Students who are unconventional or difficult in one way or another are regarded as “sick” psychologically. Such a professor denies the validity of a student outlook that differs from his own. In Perry's terms, the professor assimilates these experiences within his present frame of reference—an effective way to eliminate situations that produce anxiety.

#### pattern two

*The Case.* Professor Epstein, just turned thirty when we interviewed her, teaches sociology in an interdisciplinary program. She was the only child of a Jewish family in a large Eastern city. In describing herself as a child she says: “I was a very good child, and virtually raised myself. I also was as stubborn as my old man. I was very alone.” These early themes of being a good child and being lonely were important. The picture that emerges is of a child who internalized parental standards of good conduct very early and very thoroughly, in order to win affection from her parents, but who expressed hostility and aggression through stubbornness, as her father did. She coped with her sense of isolation and her desire to

be a good child in ways that validated her family's ethnic identity—by intellectual activities. As she says, “I found myself in the situation of either going blind reading or being alone.” She notes that she loved school and read everything, and through these pursuits she gained security and self-esteem. But her school experiences were not untroubled or free of turmoil and ambivalent feelings. Stressful events such as tests and the first days of the school year were traumatic for her, causing her considerable distress.

The first three years of her graduate training at a large state university were uneventful, but in the final years a major event occurred: she became involved in the political unrest on her campus. Her participation in this struggle began a period of profound change in her life, both personal and intellectual. She remembers the camaraderie of the events, the joy of commonality of purpose and outlook, without mentioning substantive events and issues. She recalls gaining self-esteem and sense of purpose while associating with like-minded friends, and remembers feeling: “I must be doing something right. Look who my friends are. Incredible people!”

Intellectually she was greatly influenced by radical writers, especially those of a Marxist persuasion. She mentions the writings of Marcuse and Lenin as having a profound influence on her development. Radical action, radical peer-group affiliation, and radical intellectual orientation all became part of a new identity. Her whole value system was realigned in the way Erikson (1969) and Lifton (1961) have so well described. In a period of political and social controversy her total realignment served an adjustive purpose by giving her a way of ordering experience and action. It provided social support and an ideological system.

This restructuring of values can be understood in the context of her past experiences. It was a way of achieving community and companionship with peers, thereby overcoming years of loneliness. A somewhat unsocial and bookish girl before her conversion to radicalism, in the campus demonstrations an active, even flamboyant character emerged. She describes this period as the most important of her life. Needless to say, it had a profound impact on her teaching career.

Like most faculty members, as our research and that of Gustad (1960) indicate, Miss Epstein did not make a conscious decision to go into teaching. Rather, she drifted into it, first as a part-time way to earn money, then as a full-time occupation. When



we asked her to describe her philosophy of education she replied: "Education is taking place in the streets; education means less and less what's going on in schools. The most important question is who you are and how do you want to get where you're going. The rest is foolishness or useless."

These remarks reflect her new ideological view of life and education. She completely rejects traditional forms of education. Her politically radical view of education is applied in other areas. She sees teaching as one way of organizing people for "the movement," and she would consider her courses and educational program a success if they "were a hotbed of political activity."

A feature of her new ideological perspective is a nondirective, even antiauthoritarian view of education. In answer to the question "How do you respond to the notion that students need structures and figures of authority in their lives?" she says: "Like a hole in the head. They don't need the type of authority that says you do this because I say so, or else. They need people to say this is the way I see things; this is the way I think things should be done. They need something they can identify with. The danger is that they will become wishy-washy." When asked how her philosophy of education expresses itself in the way she teaches, she answers, "I'm essentially nondirective. I ask kids what they want."

She describes with enthusiasm her methods for dealing with students. "They come to see me, the campus radical, and tell me they are upset, and I get them even more upset. I tell them the basic assumptions about American politics that we all know are wrong. They don't understand all the events on campuses that are happening around the nation. Some of them mean terribly well, and they think that teaching in the ghettos is the answer; but they have to change their whole vision of the future, when they find out that this won't work and why." This ideological assault on views of conventional students is complemented by a personal style that is abrasive at times, as she herself realizes. Self-critically, she says, "If I wasn't so intimidating maybe I could get to more kids. . . . I tried to keep quiet this year but I was a failure," revealing the difficulty she encounters in trying to reconcile noncoerciveness with ideological fixity.

*Student Views.* Student reactions to Miss Epstein are extreme. She herself notes, "I'm rated A or F by students; there's no in-between." Many students in search of elements of a new identity

are attracted to her because she seems to provide a philosophy of life that offers more than the traditional ideologies. These students feel they share common interests and concerns with her, and these feelings are reciprocated. But for a variety of reasons this initial enthusiasm declines markedly for some students. They seem to find her solutions too extreme—even occasionally frightening—and in various ways, ranging from apathy to antagonism, dissociate themselves from the impact of her teaching. They conclude that answers have to be found elsewhere. Searching for a post-conventional identity, they may wish to find a teacher who not only affirms the value of the journey but gives them some sense of a final destination. Her contact with more conventional students is slight. These students are enrolled in other schools or departments of the university and rarely select her classes. Wishing to implement conventional roles in conventional ways, they are not interested in her attempts to develop new definitions of life and education.

*The Pattern.* Faculty members such as Professor Epstein—the accommodators—deal with new and radical definitions of education and life by embracing these changes and substantially modifying their professional identities. They often characterize themselves as good children who internalized clearly defined parental standards of right and wrong rather early in life, but who did so ambivalently. They acquiesced to parental sanctions but with an inner sense of rage and rebellion. They were dutiful students whose success in school was admired by parents, and this dutiful orientation to education served to carry them through graduate school. During their early professional training they developed a conventional professional identity. But their identification with professional standards, like their feelings about parents, was not without ambivalence. They experienced tension between professional role definitions and their own sense of integrity. This ambivalence was not resolved, and they continued to endure a sense of alienation from the dominant outlook of their profession.

The rise of radical perspectives on education and society has aroused considerable personal conflict in these faculty members. Radical alternatives make possible a new commitment, one with more intrinsic meaning and one that appears to offer at least a partial solution to the tension between self and society. An individual who commits himself totally to radical ideology may thereby circumvent tension and ambivalence. A faculty member who adopts



these alternatives adjusts to the complexities of campus life by rigidly accommodating his frame of reference to radical perspectives. Any vestiges of traditional categories of thought and action are intolerable, and he becomes radical with a vengeance.

The evolution of this new self-definition of Dr. Epstein and faculty members like her results from self-questioning and face-to-face interaction with students in the classroom. Since the personality development of these faculty members is close to that of students, the same types of conflict concern them both: dissatisfaction with traditional models of education as well as with conventional identities. They are searching for a new commitment in a new frame of reference. When confronted with students offering radical alternatives, these faculty members, who have viewed education in traditional terms for most of their professional life, find that these new definitions provide a framework for thought and action and a partial solution for their own developmental problems. Instead of restricting interaction with students to avoid the threat of redefinition, as professors in Pattern One tend to do, faculty members such as Dr. Epstein find mutual affirmation of emergent identities in their relations with students. Their reference group is no longer their profession and colleagues but students in search of post-conventional identities.

### pattern three

*The Case.* Dr. Johnson has been teaching for fifteen years, usually in traditional educational settings. During the past few years, however, he has been a faculty member of an innovative undergraduate college devoid of standard curriculum and grades. Faculty members exhibiting this third pattern of response are by no means all located in "alternative" educational institutions. Some are engaged in traditional educational activities in conventional settings. But Dr. Johnson came to this college in search of new ways to do things. He is not convinced that its program will work out to his satisfaction, but sees it as a challenge that could bring the educational process closer to his ideals.

Johnson was a serious child—too serious, he says. He thinks that he grew up too fast, being ambitious from an early age, although he got along fairly well with his peers.

The usual role models in his household were reversed, John-

son states. His mother tended to be dominant and his father submissive. As a result he lacked respect for his father, although they were close and his father was always warm and supportive, no matter what he did. Dr. Johnson recalls his father as intellectual and industrious and his mother, on the other hand, as driving, shrewd, and more socially conforming than his father. He respected her for these qualities, and today he believes he is overtly most like his mother in energy and drive—although in less obvious ways, he has much of his father's character.

Dr. Johnson was always encouraged by his parents to do well in school. They considered it to be his best avenue for upward social mobility, and he accepted this belief without question. His consistently high achievement was taken for granted. Now he thinks that he would have been better off had he rebelled. He believes he got good grades because he knew how to "play the game well," not because of intrinsic interest in his studies. In college the professor who had most educational impact on him was a male speech teacher who drew out his individuality and encouraged him to develop a distinctive style of speech that is effective in communication.

With respect to professional commitment, Johnson states, "I wanted to become a teacher out of a desire to work with people who are growing and for whom academic work would be a projection of their own interests and concerns." He is most interested in students who come to college to find a relationship between their "inner direction and the academic and artistic world." He feels that enhancing the ability to be economically productive is, of course, valuable, but he believes colleges presently provide ample opportunity for professionalization. He had earned a Ph.D. in sociology and worked for many years as a faculty member before he gave much critical thought to the value of colleges and universities for himself and the world at large. He joined the faculty of the innovative college because of the "failure of conventional educational institutions to deal with the growing need of students to evaluate things before accepting them."

In recent years he has increasingly questioned the way he was treated in school—that is, as an "urn to be filled with the rich juices of knowledge." He found this process comfortable both as a student and as a teacher, but now he finds it unsatisfying. In his first years as a faculty member he met many students who, in his opinion, were in college primarily to obtain a "union card" for a better



job and not for the intrinsic value of study. He taught in a traditional manner—presenting materials and giving grades—and although he felt that something was missing, at the time he did not have the social and intellectual context or the personal understanding to change.

Many students in Johnson's present school come to pursue personal development, either exclusively or in addition to vocational goals. With these students, he sees his role as being less defined than it used to be. He has held classes that presented theoretical matter intertwined with personal experiences. He has taught outside his academic discipline on various occasions. One group of students put on a television play, another took up his long-standing interest in jazz after learning that he had worked his way through college playing the saxophone.

Johnson now sees himself primarily as an "educator," a facilitator of the growth of his students' potential, rather than a member of a professional discipline. His move away from the traditional role of professor resulted from years of reevaluation of past activities and values but was partly stimulated by his placing himself in situations that were different from any he had previously experienced—for example, encounter groups and experimental classes. These experiences were often very uncomfortable for him, but the insights he gained made them worthwhile. As a result, Johnson has concluded that the really important aspect of the educational process is the teacher's ability to be "open" with students. He believes he should show them both why he is interested in things and how he goes about mastering them. Johnson finds that being open is not always easy. He states that he, like everyone else, has some areas of insecurity. In engaging in free exchanges on both subject matter and personal values, he finds that these insecurities may become painfully exposed, but not without benefit, since this exposure has sparked his own personal development as well as that of his students.

Since he views the value of various educational experiences as somewhat relativistic and personal, Dr. Johnson considers grades to have little meaning. He believes, however, that students desire and need evaluation and criticism. He holds that a teacher must first gain a student's respect by allowing the student to see that his opinions have value, and only then proceed to challenge his ideas. In an intellectual encounter based on respect the weakness of an

argument becomes evident, and the student is motivated to improve his understanding of a topic. In Johnson's opinion, the evaluation implicit in challenging discussion has more meaning than grades because students are reevaluating and criticizing the ideas with which they are most concerned. He thinks students are basically curious and therefore eager to test their ideas, and he has found that if they are given a chance to do so, they will hound a professor for criticism.

Johnson believes that many more students today, in comparison with those he taught fifteen years ago, are going to college to gain some awareness of themselves and their world. He finds that current students have greater self-direction, and he feels stimulated by them. He believes that his teaching style has much to offer them and that they, in turn, have much to offer him. He thinks student activism on campus results from frustration with colleges that do not look on students as individuals.

*Student Views.* Students' reactions to this type of professor, like their response to our two previous groups of faculty, are diverse. For students who come to college to gain information and skills, the interest of these professors in relating intellectual endeavor to personal life may seem to be a waste of time or even a threat. These students may view the relativism expressed by these teachers as evidence of incompetence. Often they prefer to see intellectual material presented in less ambiguous ways. As a result, students who see college primarily as preparation for a job are likely to avoid this third group of professors, if they can.

Radical students, as well, are likely to criticize these faculty members. They are searching for definitive grounds on which to base their condemnation of society. The relativistic and complex views of these professors seem weak to them. Also, they may consider the disposition of these teachers to see things in terms of personal responsibility as antagonistic to their desire to regard things as entirely socially determined.

For students who view college as a chance for further personal development, this type of professor is often held in high esteem, as the following passage indicates:

Interviewer: Can you describe the best teacher you've had here?

Student: He knows his area; he knows how to learn



from the student; how to draw the student out. He's warm and inviting. He's curious. He's concerned for the student.

These students themselves often are reevaluating their past. They see that some professors can understand their questioning and their problems. If they allow themselves to become familiar with such a faculty member (which is usually easier than with teachers who are more defensive), they may recognize that he has gained some satisfaction from his way of thinking and looking at the world. He does not demand acceptance of his outlook; rather he offers it to them for their inspection. They may find that he has dealt with the same problems they are facing and that he has discovered some satisfactory resolutions.

*The Pattern.* Faculty members such as Dr. Johnson, in accord with their belief that personality development—the integration of personal needs and intellectual endeavor—is the major educational task among many students today, see education as the joint responsibility of student and teacher. These professors believe that students have some awareness of their own educational needs and that, with the aid of their teachers, they can develop procedures for satisfying them. They hold that these educational procedures can be developmental for the teacher as well.

Faculty members who exemplify this pattern of behavior do not abandon discussion of facts and theory, but integrate such discussions with accompanying feelings. Dr. Johnson, for instance, explicates and discusses sociological theory. He believes, however, that such presentation is of little value unless he tells something about how sociological theory has influenced his world view and his identity within it. Such professors see themselves offering for the scrutiny of others the theories and views that have been useful, exciting, and productive for them. They tend to see student rebellion as an opportunity for testing ideas and values. They are usually open to students' views, but they are not necessarily persuaded by them. They appear to be able to cope with challenge to their own ideas, because their self-esteem seems to be based, at least in part, on confidence in their ability to adjust to novel situations rather than on their expertise alone.

These professors have high expectations for themselves. Since their past goals have been altered as a result of their reevaluation,

however, they are skeptical of holding goals as absolute. Therefore, their views of education are characterized by some relativism.

One characteristic in their past that may make it possible for them to be self-critical is their parental relationships. Whereas parents of faculty in the first group gave their love and esteem in exchange for accomplishment, the professors in this group felt that at least one of their parents would give them love and esteem no matter what they did. For example, although Dr. Johnson did not respect his father because he was too easygoing, he was completely secure in his father's love for him. Like many of these professors, Johnson seems to have internalized high expectations from his mother but a sense of freedom from his father. The parental roles of the mothers and fathers of similar professors may not be similarly reversed, but they are commonly differentiated, producing internalized tension between high expectation and warm acceptance on almost any terms.

This combination of high personal ideals and the confidence to examine past experiences and experiment with new ones is central to the personalities of faculty members like Johnson. The skeptical milieu of present academic culture appears to have provided the opportunity for many to begin this pattern of reevaluation and experimentation. Inasmuch as this experience has been valuable for them, they wish to provide the same opportunity for their students.

#### developmental transition

We became aware in examining our case histories that what we originally saw as three separate patterns were in fact interrelated if we viewed them from a developmental perspective. Each pattern may be conceptualized as occupying a different position along a theoretical continuum. The primary issue of this transition is the tension between self and society—that is between the opportunities and limitations that contemporary social roles offer and the individual's sense of identity and integrity (Keniston, 1970). Not everyone addresses this conflict, but if an individual does confront the developmental issues of this stage, he is working out his own unique style of commitment to the existing roles and institutions of his culture.

In a recent interview with Robert Coles Father Daniel Berri-gan posed the essentials of the developmental issues that professors, and, indeed, all professionals, must face in their training:



Professional education in America, maybe everywhere, is both valuable and dangerous because one acquires important tools, but one has to fight hard to stay loyal to one's values, to stay spiritually alive. That training at least gives one the ability to *do* something, and also gives one a certain world view, a certain limited but important competence; but that training must now itself be submitted to scrutiny and evaluation and examination [Berrigan and Coles, 1971].

Here Berrigan, a man who has obviously confronted these issues in the most profoundly personal way, is describing a tension between the demands of society and one's sense of self. As Berrigan states, professional training endows an individual with competence, but it may also give him a world view that submerges his own values and integrity. If it does, the professional makes decisions among options in accord with professional priorities, rather than with personally and self-consciously determined priorities. As Heiss (1970) documents in her survey of graduate education, the socializing forces of graduate training are powerful, and can be dehumanizing and limiting when advancement of the profession is championed as the paramount goal.

In describing this developmental transition we can distinguish between a conventional and a post-conventional level of professional development.\* At the conventional stage of development there is no tension between the individual's definition of self and those definitions offered by his professional reference group. These reference group definitions are seen as absolutes, as givens which are essentially unquestionable. An individual at a post-conventional stage of professional development has dealt with this tension and found ways of resolving it. As Keniston points out, this individual may become a dedicated revolutionary or dedicated to the conventional social order, but he does so out of a sense of free choice. Since he is not motivated out of a fear of the self becoming submerged by the authority of social conventions, he need not rebel. Neither does he conform out of fear of losing the esteem of authorities. Because this individual has questioned professional definitions and realizes that these roles and conventions are but a subset of all possible identities, he or she can evolve the style of adaptation which represents a personal ordering of priorities.

\*The terms *conventional* and *post-conventional* are Kohlberg's and Gilligan's (1971).

Dr. Brown, our prototypic professor of Pattern One, is at a conventional stage of professional development. As Perry (1970) points out, individuals at this stage have an essentially dualistic world view; for her the world is divided into good and bad by some authority—in this case the standards of her professional reference group. Because she has never questioned her own values, she cannot really imagine that other kinds of values might have some validity. She dismisses the new diversity of student culture by saying “students are the same always,” and only “a few rabble-rousers and self-seeking faculty members” cause the troubles on campuses. In relying on the assimilative mode exclusively she can deny that anything has “really” changed, and she can maintain the security of her old views. Her unwillingness to question professional standards originates, at least in part, in her unquestioning acceptance of the values and standards of parents and school authorities.

Pattern Two, of which Professor Epstein is the chief protagonist, represents a transitional stage between conventional and post-conventional professional development. In her early graduate career the values to which she adhered were largely conventional. But her identification with professional standards, like her earlier identification with the standards of parents and school authorities, was ambivalent. While she acquiesced to them outwardly, inwardly she experienced at times a sense of rage and a disposition to reject these standards. Confrontation with radical values, as presented to her by peers, was intense and upset her usual modes of adjustment. Since assimilation was impossible, some form of accommodation was necessary. But her internal ambivalence would not allow for partial or synthetic solutions. She could attain independence from conventional standards and deal with internal ambivalence only by a totalistic accommodation to these new ideologies of life and education. Her views of the world had changed greatly, but it is difficult to say whether any real developmental gains were made. Her outlook was still dualistic and therefore *structurally* similar to Dr. Brown's, although in content it was diametrically opposed. She saw conventional academic standards and a traditional world view as totally wrong, and the new values and ideologies of her peer or reference group as totally right.

The faculty member exemplifying our third and last pattern, Dr. Johnson, has evolved a personal style of adaptation to his role



as a professor—one with which he can sustain his sense of integrity in relation to professional goals. He is at a post-conventional stage of professional development. He is able to question his own professional commitments and their relevance to larger social questions, and he does not hold his own values as absolute. This pattern represents a sympathetic rather than a rigid or arbitrary response to the new values and diversity of student culture. While he can accommodate the changes he considers valuable, he continues to affirm traditional values of academic achievement and standards from which he has gained self-esteem in the past. This freedom of judgment and the opportunity to exercise autonomy in meeting standards have their origins in Dr. Johnson's childhood and youth.

#### conclusion

In this paper we have examined the relation of personality change to changing social reality in a sample of college professors. We believe that the faculty members we have described exemplify certain difficulties or confusions that all professors undergo in some form. We should like to emphasize that faculty members who may be classified in each pattern have qualities that are valued by some students. No one pattern is effective with all students, and each has its function in today's university. In presenting these patterns we hope that professors may come to understand how certain social changes affect their personal lives and professional careers.

#### references

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D., and Sanford, N. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Berrigan, D., and Coles, R. "Dialogue Underground: II." *New York Review of Books*, 1971, 16(5).
- Erikson, E. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton, 1969.
- Gustad, J. W. *Career Decisions of College Teachers*. SREB Research Monograph Series No. 2, Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1960.
- Heiss, A. *Challenges to Graduate Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.
- Keniston, K. "Youth As a Stage of Life." *The American Scholar*, 1970, 39(4).
- Kohlberg, L., and Gilligan, C. "The Adolescent As Philosopher: The Description of Self in a Post-Conventional World." *Daedalus*, 1971, 100(4), 1015-1086.

- Lifton, R. *Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalism*. New York: Norton, 1961.
- Perry, W. *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development During the College Years*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.