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It has become fashionable for colleges and universities, in rather lofty language, to articulate a set of philosophical, societal, personal value, mental health, citizenship, vocational, economic, religious, or academic goals which they expect their students will achieve over the course of an undergraduate experience.

As an example, Sanford (1968) has outlined the necessity of education developing the responsible individual, of educating for world citizenship as well as for individual development. Tripp (1966) speaks for many educators when he emphasizes the importance of the acquisition of a personal value system. He says that educators must take responsibility for fostering student awareness of the value-making process, and must help students to integrate their emotional and intellectual perceptions of life in developing their own values. He believes that students are at the life stage when they are just beginning to recognize the need of value making in their own personal development. Sanford (1962) has said that "the college aim, of course, is to transmit culture, to bring about changes in the values and beliefs with which students arrive." (p. 59)
Chickering (1969) believes that among the most important undertakings of the college are helping students learn how to manage emotions, establish identity, become autonomous, have freer interpersonal relations, and develop integrity. McConnell (1966) also believes that students should be changed by their college experiences and that the university should be an environment in which individual autonomy and decision-making can be developed and in which students may test their values and develop a high degree of autonomy and individuality.

It is regrettable that the institution is not usually called upon to specify in any language—lofty or not—how it intends to induce, stimulate, lead, goad, or otherwise assist its students along toward the articulated goals. Further, institutions have not been asked, or at least haven’t chosen, to specify how they measure the extent to which they realize their goals of effecting change in students.

If we agree with Sanford (1965, p.42) that “the real test of the college is the amount of change it is able to bring about in students, whatever their level of ability,” then it is vitally important to specify what changes need to occur to achieve the desired goals, what facets of the institution contribute toward which goals, what changes occur as a result of normal late adolescent growth and development, how modifications in institutional programs can influence the course of a young person’s development during the college years, and how change can be assessed.

If higher education has the responsibility to provide at least some of the kinds of educational experiences that will enable students to develop in many of the areas outlined above, it is necessary for the schools to determine how they can best achieve these results. Panos (1968) has stated that it is only through comprehensive research on individual students, their environment for learning, and their growth and development during college that colleges can learn which cognitive and affective goals are being achieved and attempt to determine what can be done to help attain the desired changes in students.

A limitation in terms of practical application of many of the studies reviewed by Feldman and Newcomb (1969) is that while they are careful reports of selected aspects of student growth or institutional influence, they lack the perspective which only can be gained from an in-depth, longitudinal, and comprehensive study, such as the Harvard Student Study.

Studies such as those from the Student Study reported in this Monograph have an unusual potential for practical impact and influence upon the shaping by an institution of the nature of the undergraduate experience it provides. For the college official interested in modifying his institution to achieve particular goals with students, several features of the Harvard Student Study make it an especially good source of basic knowledge.

The Harvard Student Study

The Harvard Student Study is a longitudinal research project on personality changes during the college years, carried out by the University Health Services at Harvard. It is unique in that it utilizes a multidisciplinary approach, including on the staff sociologists, psychologists, psychiatrists, and psychoanalysts.

The primary aim of this project was to investigate the process of change or stability in the personalities of Harvard undergraduates as this change or stability is related both to their personality structures and to their interaction with different aspects of the college. A second purpose for this study was to study the socializing function of the college as an organization. A third purpose concerned the development of methods and research strategies suitable to this type of study.

These aims and purposes led to the selection of six major sets of variables on which the research design was based, according to Dr. Stanley King, project director:

**OPERATIONAL FRAMEWORK**

*Independent Variables*

2. Characteristics of members of this organization—both staff and students—including social, cultural and personality characteristics.

*Mediating Variables*

3. Patterns of student behavior, role enactment.

*Criterion Variables*
4. Patterns of student personality change and stability.
5. Patterns of student stabilization and adaptation.
6. Patterns of allocations of students to postcollege roles.

According to Dr. King, the research design is a panel design, to enable determination of personality changes in individuals over time, as well as to permit delineation of that environment-student interaction associated with that change. This panel design included the survey approach and a complementary series of intensive case studies. The survey gathered data from enough students to permit generalizations applicable to the whole class and covered a variety of social background variables, personality variables, data about ongoing behavior, and assessment of the perception of the college environment. The more intensive case study approach afforded the opportunity to trace the process of change while it was happening and to study more closely the intricate interrelationship of the personality with the social system.

Subjects for the survey were selected randomly from the admission lists for the two classes; a subsample of 50 students from the survey sample of the Class of 1964 was selected for the intensive case studies. The instruments used in the panel survey were all of the paper and pencil type, including questionnaires, check lists, attitude, values, and personality scales and projective tests. In addition to completing these instruments, the 50 in the subsample were interviewed six times in the freshman year and were given a standard Rorschach and Thematic Apperception Test, Witkin's Embedded Figures Test, and the Getzels-Jackson Creativity Battery. During the sophomore year these students were interviewed three more times and were once again given a standard Rorschach. Interviews were also repeated during junior and senior years, and the Rorschach and Thematic Apperception Test were again administered in the senior year.

In addition a number of methods have been utilized to analyze the organizational structure of Harvard. These included content analysis of documents published by the college for the interest of students, including reports, catalogues, and descriptive pamphlets; content analysis of policy statements by administrators and faculty as published in the student newspaper; and analysis of minutes of faculty meetings over a five-year period. The effect of academic departments and residential Houses was also studied intensively. Academic departments were analyzed through systematic observation of classes and interviews with teaching assistants and faculty members. Residential units were studied through interviews with staff members of the House and student leaders and information kept by the House staff and other University offices. Extracurricular organizations have also been studied to a lesser degree.

Applications of The Harvard Student Study

The conventional wisdom said that the characteristics of incoming students are an important factor in the nature of the ultimate graduating seniors. Yet how these characteristics are important and, more importantly, how they interact with various facets of the university experience previously had not been known in sufficient detail to allow for intelligent institutional planning.

The conventional wisdom further said that close contact between faculty and students is a virtue. Colleges list with pride their small student-faculty ratio as an index (albeit a crude one) of the extent to which the faculty will not be so burdened with numerous students as to be unable to give personalized, individual attention to each student.

Yet previously little had been known about what mechanisms for bringing about faculty-student contact were the most efficacious. It was of course assumed that a large lecture course provided insufficient faculty-student contact, and with discussion sections left largely to teaching assistants, a movement developed to bring the intellectual life of the community into the living units.

Involving faculty in the living units proved to be an expensive undertaking, assumed to be worth the expenditure in that the resulting student-faculty contact would contribute importantly to achieving the desired changes in students. A careful, in-depth study, extended over time, of the interaction between the academic life of the institution and the impact of the living units was necessary in order to test the assumptions underlying involving faculty in the residential areas. Such
a study has been undertaken and completed by the Harvard Student Study staff.

As reported in the chapter on the House system by Vreeland, the findings from the study challenge not the conventional wisdom that faculty have an important impact on students, but the assumption that involving faculty in the residence areas in and of itself contributes to the achievement of institutional goals. For administrators and faculty interested in developing meaningful and influential interactions between students and faculty, there is much to learn from this portion of the Harvard Student Study.

As with any research on students and institutions, there is the question of the generalizability to other institutional situations. Certainly Harvard isn't typical, nor are Harvard students considered to be representative of college students in general. What is learned about the interaction between Harvard and Harvard students possibly may not be directly generalizable to other situations. But it is highly likely that there is sufficient generalizability to merit careful replication at institutions wishing to make progress on dimensions similar to those reported on in this monograph.

Certainly the area where there should be the least question about generalizability is the portion of this research bearing upon the course of normal late adolescent development. The finding that growth is a continuous process over the course of the undergraduate experience is important, as is the careful delineation of the usual characteristics of students at each stage of their undergraduate experience.

The articles contained in this monograph do not constitute a comprehensive report of the Harvard Student Study. Rather, they are suggestive of the extent and scope of the in-depth, longitudinal, multidisciplinary design, and indicative of the timely, relevant findings which should have important influence on the planning of institutions in the decades to come.
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The Harvard Student Study

In the last decade there were a series of studies in a variety of colleges about personality change and factors within the college setting which were associated with that change. The Harvard Student Study was one of these projects, with three subprojects within the overall design: a study of large random samples from two classes of Harvard students, using "paper and pencil" tests and questionnaires, from which generalizations could be drawn on the basis of statistical results; a study of a small subsample from one class, using interviews and projective psychological tests, from which clinical or "case history" conclusions might be drawn about patterns of development; and a study of certain features of Harvard College, particularly those that impinged directly on the everyday life of students, that is, the academic departments and the residential units, from which an assessment could be made of goals, expectations, and ways of implementing
these. The two classes which were studied were those graduating in 1964 and 1965.

The Case History Sample

Within the 25 percent sample, drawn from the class of 1964, a special selection was made of 50 students, chosen to represent a cross section of the College population. Our previous knowledge of Harvard provided us with the major differentiating variables in the student body; we wished our sample to have a few individuals in each of the groups which were defined by these differentiating variables. Data for the selection came from the material available in the Admissions Office and subjects were selected before they matriculated. The major variables used were as follows:

1. Secondary school background—About 40 percent of the class were from private schools, within which were those from the “St. Grottolex” schools, from Exeter and Andover, and from all other private schools, with some from each group. Among students who had attended public schools we wanted a selection that would range from the most sophisticated urban school systems to rather small rural schools.

2. Socio-economic status—Father’s occupation, work title, and college attended gave us a crude but effective measure of social class, and students from most socio-economic strata attend Harvard. We also wanted some students whose fathers had attended Harvard because of the social implications of that background for college life.

3. Region of the country—The admission “mix” contains students from all over the country, and we drew from various regions, as well as Canada, but from no other countries.

4. Race and religion—Jews and Catholics comprised about 35 percent of the entering class, WASPS about 50 percent, and the rest were from other ethnic and religious groups. Harvard had also begun a determined effort to enroll Black students when we started our project. Each group was adequately represented.

5. Athletics—The athletic subculture was a distinct part of the undergraduate scene and we wanted some students who would likely star in varsity sports as well as those who would be active in intramural, or House sports. In both, we were not disappointed.

6. Intellectual potential—Harvard hopes that some of its students will be outstanding scholars and draws a portion of the entering class from the top achievers in secondary school and the high scorers on the SAT’s. We trusted that our net would snare a few potential “summas” and “Phi Betas”, and it did.

7. Commuting status—The small number of commuters constituted an important group because of continuing ties to the home community, and the non-resident House, Dudley, had some unique features. We needed a few students in this status.

Forty of the students initially selected finished all tests and interviews, giving us a completion rate of 80 percent, quite a reasonable figure when compared with most longitudinal studies.

Each subject was interviewed three times a year, given a Rorschach in his freshman, sophomore, and senior years, and a T.A.T. in freshman and senior years. The interviews were tape recorded and later converted to typescript. In all cases confidentiality of information has been rigidly maintained, and no one outside the project even knows the names of students who participated.

A Clinical Approach

The evaluation of change depended on the individual’s life history and the particular level of integration of his personality. A shift in one area of functioning might be slight, but may be one of far reaching importance in his life. Lest uniqueness dominate, we searched for common features among students, or emergent patterns in life histories, but that final step was primarily inferential and not statistical.

Although all of us who were involved with the case history study spend a portion of our professional time assessing and treating people with psychopathology, our “set” in this study was on developmental trends, and on health rather than disease. This is a relative matter, and we were sensitive to psychic disturbance, but we were also sensitive to personality strengths and successes in coping. Indeed, our subjects were effective to a large degree in solving the developmental tasks imposed on them by their chronological development and by the expectations of the college. They had, and further developed, adaptive capacities
which they used to solve their problems.

Our assessment could not draw as much on unconscious layers of the personality as one might do in psychotherapeutic sessions because there was less opportunity for procedural feedback and a conscious attempt was made to inhibit transference phenomena. We had inferences about the unconscious from the projective tests and our own intuitions, but in general the emphasis was on the more conscious ego operations.

Lest the reader be disappointed, the data are not dramatic, if one uses that term to mean vivid, exotic, or deeply moving. The changes we observed were small and silent rather than ones that drew attention by the “noise” of pain and suffering. We saw growth and adaptation occurring, but because of the very nature of its process we had to look carefully for it. That does not mean it was unimportant; quite the contrary, the change we saw was for these people significant.

**Manner of growth**

These conclusions prompt some remarks about the manner in which growth occurred. The model represented by the majority of our subjects was that of *continuity* rather than *crisis*. The latter has been advanced by some theorists as the way in which major growth takes place, especially in the adolescent and early adult years. Anna Freud (1969), for example, speaks of adolescence as a “developmental disturbance.” Students as well as adults have seized upon Erikson’s (1968) concept of ego identity and identity crisis and in the ensuing popularity the concepts have generalized, so that some people now think an identity crisis is characteristic or “normal” for adolescence and early adulthood. The popular literature of the day, in novels or in essays by observers of the American scene, often emphasizes the turmoil and crisis of late adolescence, as if it were true for most people rather than for only a small number. Unfortunately, many of the writers have based their conclusions primarily on data that has come from the consulting room.

We were prepared, as a result, to find crisis but were forced to revise our ideas because crisis and disruption in years before college, or at Harvard, was an infrequent occurrence among our subjects. They did have failures, did become depressed, did feel tension — at times — but these feelings were limited in extent and in the degree to which they affected personality functioning.

- In contrast, we were impressed by the degree of continuity between experiences in the past and those in the present. Even when patterns of behavior from the past were modified during college the sense of continuity remained. Our subjects brought forward successful coping strategies, workable identifications, and a system of values that had helped them feel a sense of unity in their lives.

Another caution to the reader is in order, lest he feel we were unduly impressed with nondisruptive and ordered behavior. Most subjects had events in the past which were painful, which still made them angry, or produced shame, or brought despair. By and large, however, those did not intrude into their college lives in such a pervasive manner as to make their coping with college more difficult. Also, some of our subjects had full blown crises at Harvard; some left for a time, some requested professional help, and some brooded in silence only to seek a referral for help in the years after they had graduated. Our emphasis on continuity rather than crisis comes from the majority pattern, but it was not unanimous.

**Variables of Change**

With this general statement about models of growth in mind, there are a number of variables that were part of personality change in our students. These variables are important, not only because they stood out in the data, but because they lend a better understanding to the process of interaction between the student and his environment, and thus to understanding adaptation.

1. **Object relations** The term is used in much the same sense as in psychoanalytic ego psychology, to mean the quality and number of emotional relationships with other people. Good object relations means the capacity of a person to give and accept emotional involvement with others; to form stable identifications with peers, and particularly with adults; and to vary responses according to the social circumstances, limiting or opening up behavior as the situation demands. Finally, there is concern for the social group and the ability to take social responsibility.
The salience of object relations for the subjects in our study can be inferred from some questionnaire data, drawn from the total samples from both classes that we studied. Prior to matriculation, they were asked about their anticipations of Harvard — what they expected to derive from the experience, where they would receive their greatest satisfaction, and what they thought their major problems would be. In senior year the same questions were asked from a retrospective point of view. Before matriculation, the majority of students listed academic factors and problems as of greatest importance and satisfaction. By their senior year they had shifted rather strikingly and said that interpersonal and personal issues had been areas where they had derived the most satisfaction and where they had found the greatest problems.

The changes we found in our case history studies related primarily to peer relationships. Close friendships developed with both the same and the opposite sex. The “working through” of feelings over the four years involved a greater capacity for sharing intimate feelings without fear of ensuing vulnerability.

Some students formed strong identifications with adults in the community but this did not occur as frequently as we had expected. More often they identified with admired qualities in peers.

A number of students had close relationships with women by the senior year; some had married or were planning on it in the near future. The capacity for intimacy was more pronounced in relations with women, and most relationships had moved from infatuation to mutual sharing and fidelity.

Movement toward acceptance of social responsibility was subtle. At first, one might think it had lessened because it was not as noticeable. The change, however, was from high idealism in social matters to a concern for social participation, tempered by a sense of practicalness and the art of the possible. Fantasies in social matters became bound by reality.

2. Self-esteem This term refers to one part of the self concept, that of respect, a feeling of worthwhileness, and of satisfaction with one’s self.

There were fluctuations in self-esteem in many students during the early college years, brought on most often by concern about meeting academic expectations, or by rejection in a love affair. Some students experience a “sophomore slump,” not related so much to doubts about academic ability, as to the question, “Am I good for anything?”

The changes we observed were not so much an increase in self-esteem, although that occurred, but in other aspects of this variable. First of all, by senior year there was less fluctuation from doubt to high regard; and self-esteem had become more constant. Secondly, there was more realistic appraisal by the student of his particular aptitudes, and his personality strengths and weaknesses. We noted that the majority of students were more aware of their effect on people, thus better able to differentiate others’ negative actions toward them from actions which were due to casualness or preoccupation, or some kind of temporary disturbance of feeling state. By senior year self-esteem was better anchored in reality appraisal.

There was also an increase in competence and sense of worthwhileness. Most students had decided that they were “good for something.” The assurance about skills, and acceptance by others, led in most cases to a greater amount of self-esteem by graduation.

3. Interests For our purposes, we defined interest as a readily-identifiable, relatively constant configuration of attitudes and behavior toward a person and/or physical objects which fulfills needs as these are integrated with the demands of reality, with superego requirements, and with the abilities of the person. An interest can be relatively autonomous from drives (used in the psychoanalytic sense), from defenses, and from social forces, but when it is dominant and persistent it can gratify instinctual tendencies, utilize skills, and be directed toward highly cathexed objects.

The least surprising change was in the broadening of interests, the opening up of new areas through particular courses, or through sharing different interests with peers. To cite a small example, one of the popular courses at Harvard is Fine Arts 13, dubbed “Darkness at Noon” because it is held from 12 to 1 and the lights are always turned off for slides of paintings and architecture. Many students had little previous experience with or interest in art but found through this course
that the world had been opened up in exciting ways.

Also not surprising was a change toward a focusing of interest, or what R.W. White (1958) refers to as “deepening of interests.” There was a tendency for a student to become more absorbed in a particular interest and to be more aware of the reasons for his interest. Though not limited to areas of occupational choice, this deepening of interests often occurred there. For some students, the experience of writing a senior honors thesis most clearly exemplified this kind of change.

Finally, interests became more allocentric and less egocentric. This was often a subtle shift for the individual, represented in part by a greater awareness of the manner in which outside forces impinged on his interests, but also by a growing awareness of the way his interests might contribute to society. Our students did not necessarily become very “service oriented,” but they were more attuned to the interrelationship of their interests and the social order.

4. Mood The usual definition of mood is a pervasive emotional state, strong enough to affect a person’s perception of events and his behavior toward people and things; it is not a permanent quality of personality. We use it to refer to various states of mind or emotion; humor, joy, desire to work, despair, or peevishness. Mood is not often included as a variable in longitudinal studies because it is not constant, but we found that the handling of his moods by the person was an important factor in change.

In most of our subjects much progress occurred in the direction of mood stabilization. Shifts in mood did occur, but the frequency of the shifts and the intensity of the mood swing were less in the senior year than in the freshman. Also, when shifts in mood did occur, they seemed more the result of some demonstrable environmental event rather than of some kind of internal trigger.

Stabilization seemed to occur in part because mood came more under rational control, that is, the student more often understood the reasons for a shift in mood and could take conscious action to change the mood, if it was a negative one. Students talked about “losing myself in my work,” or going to the movies, or playing squash, or calling a girl, as ways of altering unpleasant moods. At the same time, they talked of ways of “bringing myself down to earth,” by getting away and thinking things out when they were in a particularly euphoric mood.

5. Goal-directed activity We define this to mean a consciously-felt motivation for behavior that has a future orientation. Thus goal-directed activity is different from interests. Goals are to an extent the representation of values, and, as such, they may provide for the expression of some interests and the denial or postponement of others. Goals serve in an organizing way for the personality, by giving meaning to disparate kinds of behavior. Goals may enable a person to endure psychic or physical pain without damaging effects, and to continue a given course in spite of discouragements and setbacks.

The major change in college was in clarification of goals and the alteration of life styles to fulfill the goal. A good illustration was found in many of our black students, because the beginnings of black power and militancy had started by the time our students matriculated. They had come to Harvard with the idea of doing something eventually to help other blacks; clarification came in terms of using their power to affect the political structure. To fulfill that goal, they shifted from earlier plans for a teaching or business career to that of the law; in that direction lay the power they needed.

For other students, clarification of goals meant greater certainty about goals that had been only partly formed when they arrived at college. By senior year the certainty was based on greater experience and more closely defined reasons.

It was in the area of goal-directed behavior, however, that we noticed the greatest differences across our group of subjects. Although they represented a minority, there were some who faced graduation with few clear cut life goals. For the immediate future they planned a number of things; get their military service out of the way, join the Peace Corps, travel and study abroad, or work at any job that happened to come along. They did not know where to seek satisfaction, and college had aided that seeking but little.

6. Integration and control This term denotes the action of the ego in bringing into harmony the various aspects of the personality, and in turn rendering them congruent with reality. In psychoanalytic terms this means a balance of psychic forces among the
id, ego, and superego, but it does not mean complete control by the ego because that would be a caricature of rationality. The integrative effort is considerable, coming as it does after a developmental phase when much was in flux. The variable may become clearer through a description of the changes that took place.

Almost all students showed an increased understanding and control of their emotions. They did not necessarily suppress strong emotional expression; rather, they became aware of touchy areas, of the things that set off for them anger or depression, or joy and love. Through emotional insight there was a better basis for increased rational control.

Reality testing became more acute. For some students this was exemplified in part by learning that the answers to most questions do not come in black and white but in shades of gray. For others, it lay in part in understanding that human behavior is often guided by irrational motives, and that social organizations often move with the practical and the possible rather than the ideal. But of most importance, most of our students were better able as seniors to gauge how their own abilities and traits would fit into social interaction networks.

A third aspect of change in integration and control was an increased capacity to work under frustrating or ambiguous conditions without losing energy or becoming disorganized. One student put up with near chaos within a branch of the Harvard Student Agencies for a whole semester, because he knew there was a good chance that he could gain control of it during the summer and that he had the necessary skills to reorganize it.

Finally, and what may seem to be the most obvious, most students were able to fit together more effectively their interests, values, occupational plans, skills, and social behavior. Often they described this as “feeling more of a piece,” meaning that they felt a greater sense of unity in themselves. With the unity was for most a great sense of autonomy, that the student could work more easily on his own and that his ideas were valuable in their own right.

**Conclusion**

These changes on the six variables were not true in entirety for any one student. Lumped together, they represent an ideal type. Our subjects approximated the prototype to varying degrees, moving ahead strongly in some areas, not so much in others. Most of them did it rather quietly and without much turmoil, but few looked back over the four years without feeling that they had changed, and that for them the changes were important.

**REFERENCES**


the effects of houses on students' attitudes and values

REBECCA VREELAND
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

A number of years ago David Riesman, in an article on the problems of higher education, decried the separation of the academic and the recreational side of college life and called for a more comprehensive intellectual college atmosphere that would encompass the hours the student spent in the dormitory as well as those he spent in the classroom.

The idea of a comprehensive intellectual life that included the dormitories as well as the classroom has since become very popular on many college campuses. It is now fashionable to build "houses" instead of dormitories and to design them as intellectual centers as well as living units. For example, Radcliffe has recently spent millions of dollars to build a new "house" and to convert its existing dormitories into "houses." The students last spring protested against the vast amount of money being spent on the house plan, arguing that they were content with dormitories and that the money could be used instead to provide more scholarships for needy students.
The Radcliffe administration, however, ignored the ideas of the students and proceeded to build the houses because it was felt the Radcliffe students had missed the intellectual stimulus of the Harvard houses and that such stimulus was absolutely necessary to a true liberal education. In simple terms, the Radcliffe administration felt that living in houses rather than dormitories changed the students in some way--a way in which they wanted the Radcliffe students changed.

It seems necessary, however, before we get too carried away with the idea of houses that we stop and consider the structure of these residential houses, what they are designed to do, and what effects they are actually having on students. Since our research was done on Harvard houses and since they are so often used as models for other college administrators, we will confine our discussion to the Harvard houses.

Lawrence Lowell felt that he could create a comprehensive intellectual life at Harvard through a system of residential units which were spacious and comfortable enough to be desirable places for both students and faculty to live and which would bring these two groups together in an informal, intellectual atmosphere where they could talk about topics of mutual interest. The houses would serve to bridge the gap between a student's academic life in the classroom and the social life he had formerly maintained in his Cambridge apartment, literally bringing him more into the college. This informal contact with faculty would serve to further his liberal education, and to smooth off the rough edges of his personality. Lowell felt that being in a house would not actually increase a man's skills, but would instead change his attitudes and values because of the ideas of the prestigious but accessible faculty rubbing off on him. Moreover, the student would broaden his ideas by living closely with other students from different backgrounds and with different interests. They, too, would share ideas in the quiet, comfortable atmosphere of a gentlemen's club. One of the students in the Harvard Student Study expressed his idea of what he thought the houses would be like in this way:

"It's what I still think Oxford must be like...or Oxford a hundred years ago...I expected that every, or practically every, day I would be sitting in the common room, drinking coffee, and people smoking pipes and everyone wearing tweeds and we'd be talking about great things for an hour or so, and I would be reading, but not in the sense of reading for an exam. But I'd be reading and getting a big burst of knowledge somehow and that I would continue writing poetry and would study very hard and make straight A's because this is the place where only the academic is considered important. It would be, in a way, a small community and we'd all know each other and we'd know so-and-so as the poet and so-and-so as such-and-such, and that we'd have lots of intramural contests and a great many dinners."

The question is, of course, how has the house system worked? From the reports of alumni and house masters, it has appeared to be a great success. Many students have said that the house was their real focus of life at Harvard and that they have been greatly broadened and educated--not in the classroom but in their contact with the master, tutors and students in the houses. The masters also report that they have great effects upon the men in their houses.

However, no systematic research had ever been done on the houses to see if being in a house had any effect on the Harvard men. The glowing reports of alumni may not represent a true picture of the effects of the houses on all the students.

The eight houses at Harvard are large residential structures containing about 350 students, who live in suites accommodating from three to six men. Groups of suites are reached by individual courtyards and entries to the house. The graduate students are all teaching fellows in various academic departments and are provided board and room in the house in return for mixing with the students. Most members of the senior faculty at Harvard are assigned as associates of some house and are expected to eat meals there occasionally. Their participation in house life, however, is very uneven, many of them rarely darkening the doors of the house.

The master of the house is a senior faculty member who, in return for board and spacious quarters in the house, admini-
sters the organization. He monitors the budget and house activities, keeps track of the non-professional staff, and entertains students and visiting dignitaries. The actual work of counseling students, writing letters of recommendation, and other "dean" type duties are taken over by a senior tutor who is usually an assistant professor in one of the academic departments and who lives in the house.

At the time of our study, students applied to houses of their first, second, and third choice in the spring of freshman year. The selection process, however, was very complicated since the house masters tried to apportion the applications in terms of both their own desires and the desires of the students while, at the same time, preserving the sanctity of roommate groups who apply together and also balancing the incoming sophomores among the houses in terms of grade average, background, academic major, and activities. Despite this elaborate attempt to make each house a cross section of the university, the individual houses have gained their own reputations and their residents have been stereotyped by the students. At the time of our study in 1964, one house was the "hippy house," another the "grind house," another the "jock house," etc. Since the differences in architecture, material comforts, and activities among the houses are minimal, much of the self selection of the students to various houses is in terms of the house stereotypes.

The house is designed to be a small microcosm of the university and a "home" where the student can make close personal contacts with other students and faculty. A few courses, especially sophomore tutorials in the humanities departments, take place in the house and all of the houses have libraries supplied with required books for undergraduate courses. Each house has its own athletic teams, drama and musical groups and some even support their own newspaper and journal publications. The houses also have facilities for group meetings, hobbies, and relaxation, such as TV rooms.

Although the houses were designed as powerful, self-contained communities whose intellectual atmosphere and faculty resi-
dents would socialize, broaden and liberalize them, a number of strains present in the houses militate against their socializing effects:

1) The tutors are also members of academic departments which make demands upon their time and interests. The tutors cannot devote much time to the students since they are also graduate students with exams to pass and theses to write. Moreover, the senior tutor who is supposed to be a counselor to the students in the house must attend more to his career since he probably must move to another college before he is promoted to a senior faculty appointment. Moreover, the department determines the placement of students in tutorial groups so that these classes are often unconnected with the student's house affiliation.

2) The master himself is constrained from developing a powerful communal organization by the fixed formal structure of the house, and by the conventionalized activities. In terms of the variable components of the house, the tutors of students, the master is constrained by the departments in the selection of tutors and by cross-sectioning requirements and roommate groups in the selection of students. Moreover, he has no effective sanctions, such as grades, to apply as leverage in molding tutors and students toward his model of the educated man.

3) There are few science masters and fewer tutors from the science departments with the result that the science majors at Harvard are left out of the intellectual life of the house.

4) The sanctity of the roommate group and the entry arrangement of architecture in the houses encapsulate small groups of students who are not forced to meet other students or faculty members.

5) Although the house activities were designed to foster amateurism, the activities have, in fact, become very professionalized and most of the students remain spectators rather than participators. For example, when a house puts on a dramatic production, it selects the cast from all of the houses--effectively making it a college-wide activity.

6) The high rate of turnover among both students and tutors makes the norma-
tive climate very unstable, rendering it highly improbable that the press toward any particular values and attitudes will be consistent. In fact, there is little correlation between masters' house goals, tutors' norms, and student norms, either at the same point in time or across time periods. This lack of congruence among the norms of the various groups in the house means that the students are actually cross-pressured by groups with competing attitudes and values.

All of these strains in the social structure of the houses suggest that in general houses are not as powerful socializing agencies as they were designed to be and as they would seem at first glance. The houses at Harvard do vary, however, in their potential power to affect students.

1) They vary in terms of the content of the master's goals and student norms ranging from a goal of interpersonal encounter to one of privatistic withdrawal. Some houses are characterized by a strong sense of the house as a collective unit where members should be actively engaged in promoting a communal spirit and activities while other houses are characterized by a strong sense of the privacy of the individual and of the importance of his own development of skills and knowledge outside the bounds of collective settings.

2) The houses also vary in the consistency of the norms of the master, tutors, and students.

3) Finally, they vary in the level of participation in house activities, and the level and intimacy of interaction between house members and staff and among house members themselves outside roommate groups.

We would hypothesize that those houses which are more oriented toward collective aims and which have consistent norms of staff and students and a high level of participation and interaction among members would be the most powerful in affecting students' attitudes and values. We would also suggest that the students for whom the house is the focus of their college life, who participate in house activities, who have most of their friends in the house, and who interact most frequently with the faculty members in the house would be most changed by their membership in the house.

To test those two hypotheses, we ordered the houses by their aims and the general level of involvement of their members, using the data from interviews with the house master, the tutors, and the formal and informal student leaders in the house, and records of attendance at events and in activities. Then we measured the attitudes and values of house members, using samples of Harvard students from the classes of 1964 and 1965. Each student in the study was asked the same questions about his attitudes and values during each of his undergraduate years so we could measure the effect of the houses upon changes in students' attitudes over time.

The questions we asked this survey sample concerned many facets of their life including their political opinions, perceptions of Harvard, their general philosophy of life, their attitudes toward dating and marriage, career choices, ideal job and life style, general orientation toward college, interpersonal style, participation in house and college activities, departmental affiliation, and academic performance. We then compared men from the eight Harvard houses on these various attitudinal, value and behavioral variables. The means of the groups of men in the various houses differed significantly on some attitude and value measures, but the means of the house groups did not order themselves in any consistent way. Sometimes the greatest differences on attitudes would be between men from houses with very different aims and structures. Sometimes, however, the greatest differences were between groups of men in houses that were quite similar in goals and structures.

Turning to the analysis of change, the same inconsistent patterns of results occurred. The groups of men who changed the most during college were not from the houses with collective aims and high levels of participation, as we had hypothesized. The mean changes across houses were different, but not consistent with our prediction. In fact, when we compared the effects of the student's background, the personality characteristics of his freshman friends and his house affiliation upon changes in his attitudes and values, his house affiliation had absolutely no effect.
What made the difference in his value and attitude change was the characteristics of his friends.

The houses recruit different types of students and therefore look different when the groups of students in various houses are compared, but the house structure itself—the master, tutors, other students, and activities in the houses—are not affecting the values and attitudes of their members. It would seem that for most students the freshman friends who become roommates are the prime moving force for attitude change. The students appear to become encapsulated in their own suite of rooms and effectively insulated from the house. It becomes only a place to live—not an intellectual community with important consequences for their education, in the broadest sense.

The impotence of the house is further substantiated by the individual level of analysis. Contrary to our hypothesis, the men who were more involved in house activities and who had a lot of friends in the house were not changed more during their undergraduate years than were the men who were less involved in the house. Even for those men for whom the house becomes a focus for leisure, the master and tutors are apparently not important influences upon their values and attitudes. Instead, it seems that Newcomb's hypothesis is substantiated: A student’s background and personality determine his choice of friends his freshman year and they serve as the primary influences upon his attitudes and values during college.

However, the college effects upon attitudes and values are not entirely due to the influence of close friends. If we add students’ academic departmental affiliation to our analysis, we find that the department has an independent influence upon attitude and value change, over and above the influence from close friends. Moreover, that influence comes as much from the faculty in the student's field as from friends in the field.

Why are the faculty and the other students in a field powerful influences on him when the faculty and students in the houses are not? We can suggest several reasons for the greater socializing potency of the department relative to the house: 1) The departmental faculty is more powerful vis a vis the student than the house staff. They have the important sanction of grades and graduate recommendations at their disposal. Although this does not insure their moral influence, it certainly does not weaken it. 2) The students in our sample were a very serious and able group of young men. They were very interested in their academic work and generally able to perform at a level with the best graduate students. It is not surprising that they would find more in common, more to talk about, with the faculty in their departments than those in the house. This would be especially true of the science majors who had little in common with the humanistic house tutors.

3) Faculty-student contacts in the department have a raison d'être that closes the gulf between staff and students, while, according to our subjects, the house contacts were often forced.

4) The strains in the house system, mentioned above, keep it from providing the warm, intimate, communal society for which it was designed.

What policy implications do these findings have? Perhaps the elaborate residential structures that are being built on campuses all over the country with the purpose of bringing students and faculty together ought to be reconsidered. It is clear from the Harvard data that the houses are not influencing students' attitudes and values. Perhaps, however, other considerations should take precedence in determining whether houses should be built, such as the physical comfort and the opportunities for gregariousness they provide. Having faculty in the houses also lends an intellectual tone to the residential units and provides graduate students with a stipend and a pleasant place to live and work.

If the houses are intended to be influential in changing students' values and attitudes, however, they probably will need a more relevant raison d'être than the values of amateurism, gentlemanly conversation and intellectual leisure that are somewhat outmoded among today's students. Perhaps the idea of small colleges with academic affiliations would provide a warm, small academic community in which the faculty and students could interact informally but within a framework that is of mutual interest. In this
way, perhaps, some of the major strains and
cross pressures in the house system could be
minimized while the strengths of the depart-
ment would be utilized in providing a truly
broad liberal education.
RORSCHACHS AND HARVARD MEN
CHARLES C. McARTHUR
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

For predicting the behavior of college students, professional men or executives, the Rorschach is one of the tools of choice, if only because it is one of the few psychological tests that directly samples cognitive behavior. It is the purest "Think on Your Feet" task.

Let's face it: the Rorschach is the most open-ended question ever devised by man! "What can you see in this ink-blot, when we both know there's nothing there?" It's very much like the Harvard final examination question. "Discuss: you have forty minutes!"

And there the boy is! He has to do something! No two boys ever do the same thing. That, of course, is the elegance of the procedure.

Questions Related to Rorschach Responses

How, then, can we make any sense out of their responses? By asking ourselves what the intellectual processes were that the boy (or man) chose to use in order to
cope with this unusual task. We ask ourselves four questions about each of his responses.

First: What portion of the blot did he choose to discuss?

Some men are not content unless they have used the whole blot, offering The Answer that Accounts for Everything. They will complain if they can't achieve this level of generalization. "I could make something out of this part of the blot, here, but it doesn't fit with the rest of the picture so I assume that doesn't count."

Other men respond to the way many of the blots divide up into chunks, and give a response to each of the major pieces. "There's this pine tree up here at the top and these two animals, one on each side, and this colored rock down here at the bottom." Such a man may not respond at all to the possibility of adding these pieces up into a little scene.

Then there are the men who go into tiny detail. They pick off spot features of the blot here, there and everywhere, peering into these minute areas closely. "I see a face here, Doc: see it? There's the nose (the boy is tracing with his fingernail as he talks) and here's the chin. See it, right there, Doc?" Such a young man may go out three places to the right of the decimal point at the start of his test and never come back.

The second question we ask ourselves about each response is: To what aspect of that part of the blot was the boy responding?

Most simply, he may be using just the blot's shape. "That's a dog: there's his head, there's his front feet, there's his back feet, there's his tail," pointing as he tells it. A little more subtly, the lad may add small features of the shadings and markings to his evidence. "That dot, there, is his eye and (rubbing the blot with a fingertip as he talks) he looks kind of furry. In fact, see that lighter part along the edge, there? I think he's got his hackles up!"

This last remark sounds like the beginning of the process of breathing life into the dog, perhaps of creating a scene of action. "These two dogs on the side are standing with their hind legs on the rock at the bottom and reaching up with their front paws to get something that's in the pine tree. See how they're balancing on one foot, holding themselves upright, like one of those little dogs in the circus!" Surely a richer way to use the resources provided by a splotch of ink spattered around on a piece of paper!

Another richer way to respond is to make good use of the colors. "This rock at the bottom looks like Grand Canyon because it has orange and brownish colors. Sandstones, aren't they? And the pine tree is a grayish green like up in Maine." Or maybe just, "Red! Ugh! It's bloody!" Or perhaps to achromatic colors: "This is a bat. A black bat. It must be a vampire!"

The third question we ask about the response concerns its content: What kind of ideas did this young man choose to talk about? How wide was the range of his mental furniture? Specific content of any one response need not have any significance (after all, the blots do have some stimulus value!) but we are interested in what generic categories were covered. What, for example, do we think if this lad went through all ten blots and never saw a human being?

The fourth question we ask ourselves is: How often do other people see similar things in that part of the blot?

No two responses are precisely alike but some general kinds of answers recur. As everyone knows, whether from Psychology I, an old Bette Davis movie or today's television, the blots often can be seen as "a bat." Or a bird or butterfly or moth, or some winged creature who is the logical corollary of the fact that the blots are symmetrical. What if a man never sees any of these possibilities? Maybe nothing—but the examiner will want to ask. (With Harvard men, it can turn out that the testee saw all those things and then rejected them because "they were obvious.")

Contrariwise, our boy may have given us responses that were highly original, in the sense that no one else has seen those answers. We then care whether this new idea is merely personal or as bad as many ideas that arise in brainstorming or whether, once he's shown the picture to us, it has a real "Columbus and the egg" sort of impact. Every Rorschacher has his own album of favorite responses that he
has been shown and that he sees now whenever he looks at that spot in the ink-blot. "This is a man’s head sticking up over the edge here, and these dots above his head are musical notes: he’s singing in the bathtub, doc!" And so he is, every time I invert Blot Number I nowadays.

From making these four observations, we can say something about our respondent’s cognitive style or styles. That is our data. Cognitive behavior. Which, of course, comes to us with little wisps of personal emotions trailing behind it. We translate this ink-blot style into a prediction or a statement about personality simply by generalizing. It is not a profound theoretical leap to expect that a boy who gave seventy dull factual ink-blot responses will be accounted to be "dry as dust" in other situations. Behavior predicts behavior. He couldn’t call what he couldn’t see. His girl friend probably could give you parallel data about him.

Results of Harvard Rorschachs

What, then, were the styles of our Student Study freshmen when they were let into Harvard? We give every Rorschach more than a hundred kinds of scores. In what follows, we will describe how some of the more important scores behaved. In this process, we will have begun to describe the personalities of our freshmen.

Take just the number of their responses. Klopf er (1, pp. 207-8) remarks that, "the range of responses found most frequently in all large-scale investigations of adults seemed to be between twenty and forty." Our tests average over forty responses apiece. Rorschach (7, p. 21) suggests that in this range we are seeing happy, interested youngsters, who enjoyed the fantasy task and aimed to please. Model pupils. It may be pertinent to notice that, in assessing executives, we expect as few as thirty responses from "productive" men.

Less good can be said of those students who gave more than fifty responses. Some of these were "model pupils" in a less flattering sense. Obsessive producers, some. Others obsessive talkers. I may be especially sensitive to the former because I once spent an entire evening hearing an engineer give two hundred small facts about the first ink-blot. (We never did get to Blot Two. Had we gone to all ten blots, would his response number have been over two thousand?) I may be especially sensitive to the latter because of Student Study men who had already written their first novels and gave me twenty responses to each blot in spite of my rule to interrupt after ten responses "as soon as it is courteously possible."

At the other end of the distribution, we had but few short, "guarded" Rorschachs or tests whose productivity was impaired by anxiety. Also missing at the low end of the Response Number scale were a type of people first described by Rorschach (7, p. 21) who, "ambitious to give answers of the highest quality, occasionally choose to give ten excellent interpretations." Young men with this sort of essay question mind used to be met frequently at Harvard, especially among private school graduates and members of the Eastern upper class. Their absence from our panel was striking. Investigation showed that it was not the result of a Student Study sampling error but rather of a change in the policies of Harvard College's admissions committee. Indeed this scarcity was for the first time a drought in our very class, that of 1964.

The sad conclusion to which this investigator is driven is that all too many of these men of Harvard '64 brought to the College Doing (2,3,4,5) orientations and quantity-ambitious, multiple-choice minds. High Response Numbers are easily seen as a Good Thing in a world of meritocratic competition.

Rorschach’s (7, p. 40) expectations were that "Only subjects with great freedom and wealth of associations produce more than seven responses to the whole blot." Harvard men, who modally produce 12 to 15 whole responses, range as high as 59. By Rorschach’s (7, p. 41) generalizations we would adjudge 40 of our men “imaginative and abstract,” eight of them “intelligent normals in an elated mood,” and but one of them to be “average normal.” This excess of Wholes is partly a result of the Harvard men’s high Response Number, partly of I.Q., but scarcely to be explained entirely in that way. We suspect happily that we are seeing in some of our Harvard
men a preference for a conceptual style and intellectual ambition, both traits having increased their production of responses to the Whole blot, intelligence aside.

However, this ambitious generalizing did not go on without some self-criticism. Many of our freshmen would say something like, "The whole thing is a bat. No, wait a minute, bats don’t have those protrusions out at the end of their wings; I’d have to cut them off." Our freshmen made much use of these "cut-off wholes"—a majority of them used the location at least once. The one man who used cut-off wholes twelve times must have been remarkably addicted to this strategy!

Phillips and Smith (6, p. 14) offer an interpretation of cut-off wholes, which they see as "associated not only with manifest anxiety but also with feelings of tension, self doubt and uncertainty. The tension appears to be a consequence of conflict over the desire for, yet inhibition of, self expression." Not improbable traits to find in college freshmen!

Men in the College, proper, did not often use the blot’s major pieces. This approach is usually taken to be a practical analytic attack: the problem is sliced up into its most obvious pieces, dealt with one step at a time, in an exercise of common sense. Rorschach-wise (and otherwise?) one finds no common sense at Harvard unless one ventures over "across the river" to the Business School.

But using small details is quite another story. Among a significant minority of our freshmen, the reporting of minutiae raged epidemic. The meaning of this phenomenon is as yet unexplored. It can be mere Quantity Ambition (2,3,4,5), true. Perhaps such a record reveals all that is Satanic in our multiple-choice, meritocratic culture. It can be obsessive, true. Certainly this is "perceptual vigilance" carried to an extreme. It can be obsessiveness, certainly intellectualization. Who are the members of this most visible subtype among our men? We don’t know for sure except that they were often self-styled artists or the authors of unpublished novels.

As to the aspect of the blot used, a majority of the responses of our Harvard freshmen used only the shape of the blot. These lads were interested in "Nothing but the facts, ma’am" quite in the style of Dragnet’s Sergeant Friday. Their responses came in the format of a laundry list. Klopfer (I, p.234) says of such dryness that: "Among presumably normal adult subjects any Form Per Cent between 50 and 80 invariably corresponds to signs of inflexibility, or, in clinical terms, constriction with compulsive elements." The choice of defense in such a man is presumably repression and very likely takes the special form of intellectualization. These freshmen find safety in facts, discover how handily emotion can be avoided by logic. Their style suggests one adaptive function of the apparently pointless and endless argumentativeness of adolescents. Often, those tiresome long Rorschachs in which the boy matter-of-factly but endlessly lists all the factual observations to be made about each blot, quite in the manner of a train announcer, are relieved of being nothing but a list of forms by interspersed bits of use of the shadings and texture. This observation fits neatly Klopfer’s (I, p.235) description of the slightly more hopeful profile interpretable as showing a personality with "modified constriction." Such a picture, he says, "indicates that the subject has at least developed sufficient insight and tact not to trouble other people too much with the ill effects of his rigidity (so long as he does not live too closely with them)." Just so. A tolerable grind! Beginning to show signs of socialization but not yet ready to do the growth task of Intimacy. Freshmen year, we had a lot of those!

The Student Study freshmen were underproductive of Movement responses, especially those in which are depicted some Human Movement. This fact admits of many and complicated explanations but fact it is, and Movement is a pivotal score in the Rorschach. To win Rorschach’s (7, p. 281) accolade of “Good productive intelligence,” our freshmen should have produced five or more such images. Only seven men did this well.

What of the rest? Perhaps, as Rorschach (7, p.28) says of those who produce one or two Human Movements, they had an "intelligence predominantly reproductive,"
that got them the National Merit Badge and into Harvard. My predecessor, Fred Wells (8) was writing about a similar lack of empathy for human activity among the boys to whom Harvard was giving National Scholarships, thirty years ago.

Anxiety will lower the production of Movement responses, also. As Klopfer (1, p.277) puts it, Movement shows "how much one is at home with oneself." Evidently these Harvard freshmen were not.

The other kind of richness is the use of the color. A critical observation here is the manner of its use. It is one thing to react to the first appearance of a red spot with "Ugh! Blood!" and another to see a caterpillar on the last card "because it's long and curved like a caterpillar and it has lots of little legs on the bottom here and a spot that could be the eye and it is the green that common caterpillars often are." The latter response shows an awareness of the stimulus that has been passed through the cerebral cortex in several editorial readings: in the former response, the color has stimulated blurtling. Such impulsiveness seems a bit callow; it should at least be offset by some more considered, "take a deep breath and have second thoughts" kinds of responses. In the records of our freshmen, this is usually not so.

In summary, then, our freshmen were productive intellectualizers, given to conceptualizing or picking up the smallest details, dealing primarily with logic or with facts, but not always confidently and seldom with any mature utilization of the resources of their own emotions.

How did four years at Harvard change these young men?

Their personalities expanded. They gave more responses by senior year, but we can see their greater richness even when we are careful to hold sheer number of responses constant. They stopped using nothing but the Form. They became more able to draw on the resources inside them to breathe life into the blots and, when they did, betrayed more mature human empathy. Above all, they matured in their ability to use and to edit their responsiveness to the stimulus of colors. They gave fewer responses of the "Ugh! Blood!" blurtling of emotion kind. And they gave many more of the well considered, socialized responses in which we saw color being integrated fruitfully with all the other evidence. Very many more. That change is "significant" as our statistical friends say, "at the .0004 level." It is the banner headline.

For reasons that are a little more complicated than most Rorschach interpretations, this kind of change is taken (7, pp.33-34; 1, pp.281-285) to show an increase in social intelligence or in the ability to relate to people. One way to read our headline would be just to say that Harvard taught these undergraduates manners. And, indeed, Harvard is a finishing school in many ways. However, the suggestion of a deepening of interpersonal skills seems stronger than the mere application of polish. It has support from other parts of the Rorschach. It is exactly parallel to the growth process seen in the Harvard Student Study interviews and questionnaires. Our men came to Harvard as gradegetters, expecting to earn yet more meritocratic kudos. They left socialized, reporting the great lessons in living they had learned at the hands of their fellow students.

Did they not change at all intellectually? They did. And in an interesting direction. All of Harvard's official publications emphasize General Education, the development of the student in breadth of conceptualization. The actual effect of Harvard's four years was to diminish the habit of generalization and greatly increase the number of major details to which the student attended. This heightened concreteness and awareness of common sense aspects of a problem is consistent with the other Student Study material that shows our students outgrowing jejeune idealisms and getting down to the art of the possible.

Of course, Harvard students can explain this finding. They point out that they soon learn to be concrete and circumstantial because when a final exam question says "Discuss" what it really means is "List each argument pro and con, giving the names and dates of the author of each argument and setting the whole thing out in tabular form." Not more than once will a freshman risk the instructor's icy silent stare by protesting a low exam mark with "But sir, I had the general idea!"

So our men become more concrete. In
fact, they may even come more and more to resemble those practical types "across the river." This in a political atmosphere in which Business is anathema. The result is often a moment of comic tragedy when the undergraduate who has come for vocational guidance must be told that "your approach to problems is like that used in the Business School." The poor lad's jaw drops; he stares wildly back and blurts, "Do you mean I'm no good?" He may outgrow this undergraduate value.

There are other changes during the Harvard College years—like a sharp increase in ability to control moods—but the changes already described are the chief ones. The next question really is: what becomes of these men?

They now enter a reciprocal process of social and self-selection that more and more closely matches personality with graduate school and then vocation. The perceivers of myriad details write; the more practical and to the point edit. The meat and potatoes men go to business schools where those of them who can put the problem back together after they've laid out all of its parts become honors scholars and such professionals of business as management consultants. Those who go fast, fast, fast and react with the unedited immediacy of an extravert's extravert go into selling, while those who demand that everything be just right set up systems. In the end, they all lodge in some one hole of the gigantic pinball machine that is the career world.

When we see ten, twenty, and thirty-year Harvard alumni for executive assessments, they are evolved still a longer way from our freshmen's Rorschachs.
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As I say this to you in 1970 the topic of our concern is in far different position than it was when this study was begun 10 years ago. Now colleges and universities and the events taking place there are subjects of daily news and topics of general conversation. Then, no one foresaw this particular development which has come to be called "student activism." Our project, known as the Harvard Student Study, was organized in order to describe and analyze the general processes of change in college students as a result of their four years in Harvard College. That is how we began and that is what we remain committed to: it is the external world that has changed. All this hardly needs to be said except to demonstrate to those who would prematurely assign us to obsolescence that we are aware of the issue. We think that what we have to say is of more general import and invite listeners to judge for themselves.

Methodology

Since the time is limited I will only give the barest bones of the methodology and
procedures in order to save most of the time for presentation of the data itself. Participation in this study was voluntary and it was longitudinal; therefore we were afflicted with the difficulties of all voluntary and longitudinal studies: sample attrition. Very few people refused to participate initially but inevitably people dropped out as time went on. We ended up with 60% of our initial sample for the Class of '64 and 54% for the Class of '65. Some of this attrition, of course, is caused by people leaving school, but since Harvard has a very low dropout rate this accounts for only a small portion. In the comparisons we have made so far there does not seem to be any great difference between those who remained in the sample and those who dropped out.

Just some quick demographic data to set the findings in perspective: These students are predominantly Eastern, urban, middle class, from stable families, where parents are college graduates themselves. They are oldest or only children, and were in the top 5% of their secondary school class (SAT-Verbal average is 673, SAT-Math average is 698). One final piece of background information - the one that is the most important - 40% of the students themselves went to private schools and 22% of their parents went to private secondary schools.

The foregoing statistics characterize the human input, at least partially, that the institution had to operate upon. These characteristics (with the exception of the family income) are those that presumably will remain fixed. The emphasis within our study, however, was on those things which would not remain fixed - those things that the college would have an effect upon and therefore might change. This leads us to the problem of measuring change. This issue is a very complicated one both philosophically, theoretically and procedurally. We have adopted one particular method of dealing with it in this study, but we don't pretend that it is a final solution to this problem. Since the results I am going to report depend on this method I should spend a little time, without getting too involved in technical details, on it.

The purposes of this method were two-fold: to be able to easily and validly compare scores at different points in time, and at the same time to reduce the enormous number of variables to a more manageable size. The first step we took involved arranging the variables in groups by pattern of administration, and by theoretical coherence. Presumably all variables could be treated at once, but even computers have their limits, and this much data exceeds even their capacities. For example, we put together all general attitude items that were asked four times; likewise for all the remaining categories until all items of information were assigned. We also put together data from both classes, then by treating each person's score at each time period as a separate observation we applied the statistical technique known as factor analysis. This operation produces a set of statistical dimensions underlying the interrelationships of all the separate items. Each person can then be assigned a score on each dimension. These factor scores are expressed in a standardized form, that is, relative to the overall group average. Since the components of these scores were all the measurements from both classes and all time periods we have scores that are standardized about the overall average. Furthermore the initial large number of separate variables, items, and test scores has been statistically reduced to a smaller number of independent factors.

The final task is to name the factors - that is, give some conception to the underlying meaning of this statistical construction. This is done by examining the component tests and items which are highly representative of the particular factor. The results that I will present are all (or almost all) in the form of comparisons between classes and time periods of averages of scores derived in the previous fashion. Because of the manner in which they were derived we believe straight-forward T-tests and F-tests can be appropriately applied to these scores in order to assess (statistically) the significance of changes. Thus these values serve the purposes for which they were intended. We can tell whether or not some variable has gone up or down, and whether or not this change is significant in a statistical sense. We can also tell whether or not the two classes in our sample differ from each other, at any given point in time. What we can't tell - that is - using these numbers alone, is the absolute level of the variables. So what I shall be discussing is relative movement. This is an
extremely important point—because if it is not kept in mind confusion can easily result. Remember when I describe a change as occurring or not occurring—what I'm talking about is relative movement. The variable has increased or decreased compared to where it started, independently of its position on the scale in absolute terms.

All of the foregoing produced 279 variables, 66 of which we classified as independent variables and the remainder as dependent variables. The independent variables are such things as family background characteristics, high school experiences, patterns of child rearing, and expectations about the college experience. They receive status as independent variables because they precede the others in time. Once we had determined the scores on each of the 213 dependent variables to assess whether or not there were significant changes for the sample as a whole for the four years, we then subjected all of these change scores to another analysis controlling for each of the 66 independent variables. This allows us to check whether or not the gross change we observe in the dependent variable is affected by other factors.

Results

The first group of variables I shall talk about are those where the evidence for change is the strongest and most clear cut. Every one of these sixteen variables show strong changes in both classes which are unaffected by the application of the controls for independent variables. These variables then could be characterized as those which show the most pervasive change. First, let's talk about those that show a large increase:

1. Time spent dating and socializing
2. Amount of money spent
3. The homogeneity of friends' characteristics
4. Criticism of Harvard stuffiness
5. Seeing teachers as equating grades and success
6. The number of problems students have at Harvard (particularly interpersonal)
7. Choosing occupations on the basis of status and prestige
8. Self-confidence and creativity
9. Particularistic obligations in the academic arena

This last perhaps needs some explication. Particularism is defined as the tendency to choose for the personal when confronted with the dilemma of a choice between an abstract moral value and a friend. In this context, increasing particularism then refers to the increasing tendency to be willing to bend or modify abstract principles, such as honesty, in the favor of one's friends.

Now to those variables—six in number—which show a decrease:

1. Ties with home-town friends
2. Time spent studying
3. Amount of aggression, that is, the number of aggressive acts committed
4. A variable difficult to describe, which for lack of a better term I've called good student pattern, involving items like discussing the day's lecture after class with the instructor, doing extra reading on their own, loaning money to other students, etc.
5. Self-effacing dependence and nurturance
6. Authoritarian ethnocentrism (the F scale)

One variable of the sixteen showing massive changes unaffected by controls of the independent variables remains. It is a variable which comes from the "Who Am I Test," a free response form allowing people to describe themselves in their own words, and describing themselves in terms of consumption and achievement. The change pattern here shows an initial large drop between Freshman and Sophomore year and then an increase in the later years although never rising back to its initial level.

What then do all these changes have in common? One clear theme that is apparent here is a strong rejection of authority with a corresponding increase in autonomy and self confidence. The common feature to authoritarianism is its uncritical acceptance of authoritative pronouncements in matters social and moral, and that clearly drops precipitously. Harvard itself is an authority for its own students and it is increasingly criticized as being repressive and stuffy. Being self-effacing and dependent is the opposite of being authoritative and decisive, and that characteristic declines. So we find a number of changes whose common feature is movement in the direction of rejecting external authority and embracing internal authority or self confidence.
A second theme in this collection of variables with consistent strong changes is the interpersonal area. Dating is increased, spending is increased, and we can assume that a large portion of the latter is caused by increase in the former. More time is spent socializing with a corresponding decrease in time spent studying. One's friends, as one associates with them more, become more homogeneous. While friends at college become more homogeneous one sheds the ties with former friends from pre-college days. Even the problems which increase over time are predominately in the interpersonal area: finding and meeting friends of both sexes. And lastly, tangentially related to the interpersonal area, is particularism, which is the preference for the personal in a value context.

Two of the changes I would interpret as being sub-parts of increased impulse control, both of which we would expect as a concomitant of increasing adulthood. One is the decline in aggression and the other is the decline in what I had called the good student syndrome. From a slightly cynical point of view both could be seen as components of kind of a youthful energy-laden naiveté which declines with the ending of adolescence.

Lastly, three of these variables seem to be subsumed under the heading of status and success. The choice of occupations with this as an underlying dimension increases. The opinion of one's teachers is increasingly seen as equating the getting of good grades and success. Since it seems less likely that the teachers' opinions themselves have changed than that our respondents' projections concerning them has, I will ascribe this to our students' own increasing concern with status. And finally, their own self descriptions, although taking an initial dip away from concerns of achievement, begin to rise again in the last two years and at the conclusion of the four years are still headed up.

One particularly Harvardian footnote to this subsection ought to be added. Our data in the area of dating and general interaction with girls was extremely detailed and complete. The variable that I refer to in this section as showing a consistent and strong increase was only one of the dating variables - the one we have called intellectual dating, that is, going to concerts, taking walks, and reading, as opposed to going to parties and other youth culture-type activities. Evidently sex doesn't conquer intellectuality when they come into conflict, at least not for Harvard men. There they merely merge.

As a further indication of the strength of these overall changes fully one third of these variables showed significant between-class differences in the freshman year which were obviously not strong enough to affect the changes which occurred over time. Thus, even though for these five variables the two classes' initial positions were significantly far apart, nevertheless, the changes exhibited over time were strong enough to override the initial differences and to exhibit consistent change themselves within each class.

The next set of variables are those where the application of various controls selected from the independent variables eliminates or modifies the changes over time in these variables to a greater extent than it does in the former set. Further variations on the same themes as we saw in the first set of variables are present in this set. External authority comes in for more rejection and internal authority for more acceptance. This appears in the variables of self-acceptance and church-going, the former shows consistent increases and the latter consistent decreases. The interpersonal area is represented again in this set with four variables - the amount of social drinking goes up; the amount of time spent in social activities away from campus goes up; the amount of dating non-steady girls goes down; and the choice of a job dealing with people as opposed to those dealing with things increases.

Several variables involved with academic matters also appear in this set. We find a consistent increase through time for both grades in Humanities courses and Social Science courses. We had a series of items in which students were asked to rate whether certain policy areas should be ones where the control resided in the students or in the college. A variable generated from these items shows a consistent change in the direction of increasing control by the college. We also asked that best teacher and worst teacher be rated on a check list of various behaviors. One of the variables generated from this set was characterized by the teacher taking a personal interest in the student. Ascribing these characteristics to one's best teacher declines over
time, although predominately in the time between the freshman and sophomore year.

We had another instrument called the Expectations Check List in which each student was asked to tell us what each of a set of various significant others in the environment had as expectations for Harvard students' behavior. One's friends having the expectation that you be a hard-working scientist declines over time; one's parents having the expectation that you be what we call an intellectual superman declines over time; and one's parents having the expectation that you be a hedonist increases over time. We also had a semantic differential which we applied to various roles in the Harvard scene - one of which, of course, was the Harvard professor. On the dimension of volatility the Harvard professor was seen as declining. Whether or not one wants to interpret these last few changes involving the description and characterization of others as projections seems to me an arguable point, but, in either case, the conclusion is clear and consistent with the previous results. Authoritative figures, such as one's parents and Harvard professors, are increasingly seen as less powerful, less potent, and as relaxing and ameliorating their formally tough standards. Conversely, if one makes the projective analysis these personages have not changed but one's own self, having become more confident and authoritative, can safely ascribe less authority to powerful figures. Either way - the conclusion is the same.

The previous sets of variables, although differing in their consistency of freedom from effects of controls, were nevertheless similar between the two classes. The next set of variables shows some difference between the two classes in the consistency of the observed changes. Nevertheless, this is a matter of degree and, from a broader prospective, these also could be called strong changes. In some cases the change trend is strong for one class and weak for the other but I have not attempted to make these finer discriminations here.

The theme of increasing sociability and concern in the interpersonal arena continues with a number of variables in this set. The most general characteristic of this whole area is the broad classification of introversion vs. extraversion. The change, consistent with the previous findings, is strongly toward extraversion. Several other variables deal with sexuality in its various forms. Intimate heterosexual activity shows a strong increase; homosexual activity shows a strong decrease; and a variable we might call aggressive heterosexuality, that is, stealing other people's girls, ditching dates (and having the same thing happen to you), shows a consistent decline. The sheer number of friends that one has, as well as the generalized trait of desiring friends, shows an increase. Academic affairs are represented in this set by three variables. Grades in Behavioral Science courses and total overall grade average increase.

Similar to the earlier variable, college control vs. student control, is another variable which we call student-related discipline. In this context our students show an increased desire for student control.

Three variables in the value realm conclude this section of variables which show strong change trends but differ between the two classes. The first is a variable which we have labeled "liberal agnosticism vs. conventional religious values." Harvard students show strong change toward the liberal agnosticism end of this dimension. Another variable in the value area which came out of our initial factoring was an amalgam of the various Kluckhohn value schemes. It was defined on one end by subjugation to nature, individualism, being-orientation, and present-orientation, and, on the other end by opposites of those, namely, an over-nature, collateral, doing, future-orientation. Thusly defined, Harvard students show a change toward the latter or future end of this dimension. The last variable came from a list of items which were rated on their importance and value in keeping the world free from war, and was defined on one end by diplomatic devices such as conciliation, cooperation, and the United Nations and on the other end by militaristic devices such as Polaris-carrying submarines and the atomic bomb. On this dimension our students show a strong change toward the militaristic as opposed to the cooperative or idealistic as an effective manner of conducting oneself in international affairs in order to avoid war.

Before summarizing and attempting to bring this group of findings together under a common framework, perhaps mention should
be made of the fact that some variables did not change at all. A large portion of them are those which are in the realm of self-reported personality traits and dimensions. Some variables show change for the whole sample, but these changes disappear when controls for the independent variables are applied. An interesting example of this class is political liberalism, whose overall increase disappears when controls are applied.

Summary

Now, how does all this admittedly too fast once-over of the core findings fit together? What would the abstraction of all these changes into a process of development and change for a single prototypical Harvard student look like? We must start with the students' backgrounds, in my opinion. Even if one operates with a simple notion of the allocation of energy, clearly the level of intellectual output at which these Harvard students have been performing in the past prior to Harvard entrance would point toward a somewhat lopsided development up to that time. The extraordinary intellectual commitment and energy may have been somewhat at the expense of social and emotional development. Remember also that in the realm of heterosexual contact about 40 per cent of our sample attended private schools which are predominately all-male institutions.

These then are a group of students highly charged, highly committed, desirous of challenge in intellectual realm who then get put into an environment which encourages, even demands, freedom to make one's own choices of field of concentrations, of allocation of time, of values, of friends and the whole round of activities. The Harvard system presents very few formal demands, but a very strong set of well-communicated expectations and norms.

Furthermore, these norms which highly value intellectual and academic achievement have been re-enforced by the home environments of these students also. When they arrive they have great expectations about the level of intellectual challenge and activity that will prevail. I suspect they also have either given less thought or concern to emotional issues or they think that they will deal with those issues in the same way they deal with all others (by applying the intellect rationally). They are confident of their abilities, but not over-confident, since they are well aware of the tough competition and they expect to have to work very hard. But over the four years at Harvard they find they can master the intellectual challenge. Furthermore, they do it increasingly well, if grades are used as a criterion, and they do it with less effort, if studying time is used as an indicator of effort. So, if the already minimal demands are met with increasing ease, it frees up time and energy for exploration and mastery of other aspects of the total environment. The interpersonal world of friends, classmates, extracurricular organizations, and in particular, girls, is becoming more available at the same time it is becoming more valued.

This description was shared by our subjects themselves. We asked prior to the start of Freshman year what kinds of things they expected to happen and we repeated the same question Senior year, this time asking what had happened. A clear, strong shift occurred from expectations of academic happenings toward retrospections of interpersonal and personal happenings. Whether or not this development represents learning of a new cognition which could be oversimplified into the statement that "books don't love back," it is clear that a corresponding change in the academic sphere takes place. My guess is the combination of adolescence and a high degree of ability and commitment results in an "extreme" form of idealistic attachment to idealational materials. This mode of orientation has been performed in an environment where there was a great deal more support and structure; the family in all cases and for some, in addition, an in loco parentis prep school. It seems to me likely that such students might have expectations of a continuing accretion of evermore complex "truth" under the guidance and help of larger-than-life experts until some vaguely-defined end point. What the college presents to them instead is a two-faced set of uncertainties: a large degree of personal behavioral freedom and the intellectual confrontation of freedom versus control as an abstract issue. Even the great men disagree, not only in substance (which was known before) but even in the definition of the legitimacy of varieties of ways of knowing. I contend that realization of this has both
cognitive and emotional aspects and consequences.

Cognitively Harvard students “loosen up” considerably. They become less extremely intellectual, more tolerant, flexible and more capable of accepting control. Too much freedom is debilitating too, since some minimal structure is always self-imposed. The relative balance of freedom and control is crucial in dealing with other persons also, since in order to have a meaningful relationship with another person, each person must feel comfortable enough with surrendering some of his or her autonomy to the control of the other. As our students increased their activities in the interpersonal realm these two aspects of the same issue paralleled each other in their outcome.

Thus the changes can be seen as a movement from the inward lookingness of adolescence toward the outward lookingness of the adult, and the mediating factor which serves as the vehicle for this change is increasing self-confidence.

One short coda – which comes from the closest thing we had to a control group – a comparison of applicants from the same years who were rejected by Harvard and who were accepted but rejected Harvard – will serve to point out in a small way how the structural conditions of the organization both create the conditions for and encourage the kind of development that I have been describing. When Harvard students are compared to the rejectees and rejectors, it turns out that they spend much more time talking, eating, and sleeping. This is true initially and becomes even greater over time. The Harvard House system allows, with all its excess capacity, very leisurely meals as well as the wherewithal for a total life style which encourages the communication with others which both facilitates, and is part of, the growth from inward to outward.

Also, lest anyone begin to worry that all this money and effort was being spent just so some adolescents could grow up – let me add that they also learned some mathematics, physics, history and even some psychology, too.
When a man marries a girl he needs to know a great deal about her. When he makes a choice, at the time he decides what girl he's going to marry, his choice will determine many important aspects of his future lifestyle. The girl that a man marries will certainly have ideas about the number and spacing of children. She also will have her own values which cannot be ignored in deciding residential and occupational patterns. I thought it terribly important that we find out something about the choices of dates and wives that Harvard men make. More importantly, we needed to learn something about how these choices change over time and what kinds of men choose what kinds of girls?

I am going to discuss three kinds of change in dating patterns during the undergraduate years. First I am going to discuss dating motives. We asked all of the participants in
the Harvard Student Study* why they dated girls. We gave them several choices; recreation, finding a friend, finding a wife, sexual experience, and enhancing one’s reputation among peers. All of these different motives can be condensed into three general functions of dating, each of which has been advanced in earlier studies of courtship as the raison d’être for dating.

Willard Waller, who did an early study of dating patterns at the University of Pennsylvania, argued that dating has really no relationship to future marriage. It’s really a game the students play in college; which he called the “rating and dating game.” The idea of the rating and dating game is that if you are able to date somebody of high status, someone that everybody else wants to date, you gain social status in your peer group. This is the whole “campus queen syndrome” which I’m sure a number of you are familiar with. Later studies have shown that it’s probably not as prevalent as it was in Waller’s time, but it still exists in the sorority and fraternity culture of our smaller universities. Waller argued that the motive for dating in this kind of campus culture was to enhance one’s reputation with peers and he considered it dangerous and exploitive.

A second dating theory, advanced by Samuel Lownie, is that dating is a learning process, that through dating one learns what kind of girl one wants. Dating is then an exploratory process which eventually leads to courtship. The third theory is that dating is sheer recreation, just like watching a ballgame, football game, or anything else.

We find in our data from the Harvard Student Study that there really isn’t too much interest in rating and dating. Most of the Harvard students spend time in their college years finding a friend and finding a person to go out with for recreation, or companionship. The extreme importance of dating for companionship is true for both the original study of the Harvard classes of 1964 and 1965 and also of the classes of 1970 and 1974. It is important to note, however, that the amount of dating for companionship increases with age. The seniors in both the original and follow-up studies are more interested in “finding a friend” than are the freshmen.

We find that the most important activities are really informal pair activities. Harvard men don’t go to night clubs much. They don’t take girls out to dinner very often. They mostly stay around the campus. The big thing is going out for coffee, taking a walk, and similar informal recreational activities. However, the most important activity checked by the 1970 senior of both groups is going to bed with a girl. Although the major motive for dating is companionship, sexual experience is certainly part of the dating pattern, although more for the seniors than for freshmen. Otherwise dating activities are very stable during these years.

Finally, we were interested in the characteristics of a good date in the minds of Harvard men; what kind of girls do they want to date? They say that they want to date a good conversationalist, who is sexually attractive, intellectually sophisticated and well-dressed. This combination of traits has been reported in other studies of dating. What’s different about the Harvard men is the inclusion of intellectual sophistication in the syndrome of traits they desire in dates. The Harvard men in both the original and follow-up studies also stress sexual attractiveness as an important characteristic of a good date. They want an intellectual, companionable girl, but they are not going to date a “dog.” Dating is much more than a nice conversation between two people of the opposite sex.

The same kind of characteristics are also important to the Harvard men in choosing future wives. A great deal of continuity is evident between the kind of girl desired as a date and the kind of girl desired as a wife. Interestingly enough, Harvard men, etheral and intellectual and cerebral as they may be, choose good cooking and housekeeping as important characteristics of a wife. These two characteristics represent almost the only difference between characteristics desired in dates and wives.

To examine more intensively the changes in dating patterns during college, we factored
the dating motives, activities and characteristics of good dates. Four general dating patterns emerged that classify very well the type of dates preferred by Harvard men. (With some exceptions, these patterns are similar for the classes of 1970 and 1974 in the follow-up study.)

The first pattern is the rating and dating pattern, which we call the instrumental attitude toward dating. A man who scores high on this factor is the kind of man who dates for sexual motives or to enhance his own reputation among his peers. He takes out a girl to go to bed or to make the scene with her. In general he wants a very attractive, dumb broad and he takes her to a football game or a night club. This pattern of dating is not new since it was described by Waller in 1937.

The second kind of dating pattern is the traditional date, the “girl next door” that one could take home to mother with impunity. It’s important to the men who score high on this factor that a date be of equal or higher social class and they want a young rather than an older girl. They’re looking for a wife and they say they want one who is sexually inhibited, not “heat”, and not particularly intellectually sophisticated.

The third pattern, the intellectual pattern, is very prominent among Harvard men. The kind of date that men scoring high on the intellectual scale prefer is very smart and not afraid to show it. Secondly, interestingly enough, she should be artistic and altruistic. By altruistic I don’t mean a kind of “good-to-your-friend” sort of altruism; I mean a kind of Peace Corps altruism, a group concern. One could speculate that these men and women might go out and demonstrate together on a date. They also go to lectures and other intellectual and political activities. The follow-up study especially shows the political cast to dating activities.

The fourth and final dating pattern to emerge from our data is the companion dating. This companion dating pattern contains very few characteristics of “dates,” but does include most of the pair activities on this factor. This pattern seems to describe an intimate relationship between two people as personalities. The man who scores high on this factor does not care too much about what kind of girl he dates; he cares more about what they do together.

The changes that occur during the undergraduate years occur mostly in the companion and traditional dating patterns with the former increasing greatly at the expense of the latter. The instrumental and intellectual patterns remain very stable during the four years of college. If one compares, however, the changes in dating patterns over time among the public and private school secondary school graduates, some striking differences appear. The public school graduates are less interested in intellectual and companion dates as freshmen but become more enamored of this type of girl as they get older, so that by senior year, there are few differences between the two groups. If one makes a graph of the traditional dating patterns of these two groups, the graph looks like a large X. The public school graduates are much more interested in traditional dating in their freshmen year than are the private school men while by the senior year the private school graduates show the opposite tendency. Perhaps as the private school graduates become seniors, they realize that they have to have a girl they can take to the Country Club. A number of other striking differences occur in the dating behavior of the public and private school graduates, but these will not be discussed here. The differences between public and private school graduates will be discussed at length in “Dating Patterns of Harvard Men.” (manuscript)

In general, the changes in dating patterns among Harvard men reflect a maturing process that is bringing them closer to responding to other humans as personalities in their own right with their own feelings and desires. Stan King comments at greater length on this process in another paper in this series.

One quick word about dating behavior: Dating behavior follows a very peculiar pattern. The frequency of dating, for example, starts out very high in the high school years, drops precipitously in the freshman year, and then climbs until the senior year. It never, however, reaches the level that it reached in high school. By their senior year, the Harvard men in our sample are dating less frequently than they were in Sunday school. In addition, the degree of commitment to girls (steady dating, engagement) follows the same pattern; it drops
precipitously in the freshmen year and rises in the later years. In their senior year, however, the Harvard men are less committed to girls than they were in high school; they are less likely to go steady, less likely to be engaged. I think these findings suggest that a commitment is more serious in the late college years. The senior can’t, for instance, say, “Well, let’s go steady for another five, six or eight years and some day we’ll get married.” His girl friend begins to pressure him for marriage. So the Harvard men in both the original and follow-up studies go steady much more in high school than they do at the time they are seniors in college.

The final question to be discussed today is the characteristics of men who have different dating patterns. In this presentation I will only be able to discuss the four major patterns of dating: Companion dating, instrumental dating, traditional dating and intellectual dating.

First let us discuss the companion dating pattern. I shall describe first the characteristics of men who score high on this pattern as freshmen and then two changes in the characteristics of companion daters during college. This means I will be describing men who are becoming more interested in companion dating relative to their fellow students in the class during their undergraduate years. It is not an absolute measure of companion dating interest but is only relative to other students. First, no family background characteristics, in terms of the usual demographic variables, distinguish the companion daters in freshmen year. These men do, however, have a peculiar type of mother, a “volatile mother.” What this really means is that these men perceive their mothers as flighty and not very stable. She doesn’t provide a very warm sort of relationship. One can argue that the companion daters are looking for the kind of relationship with a woman that they didn’t have with their mother. These companion daters are warm, dependent people with personality characteristics that seem to propel them toward strong emotional ties with women. The companion daters are also an experienced group sexually. They dated a lot in high school, they’ve gone steady in high school, and they seem familiar with warm relationships with girls. The variables men-

tioned above are the major determinants of companion dating in the freshman year. However, they are not the important variables in determining changes toward a more companionable date pattern in the upper class years. The men who change toward more companion dating are members of the collegiate college subculture to use Trow’s definition. They are neither the most capable nor the most dedicated students on the college. They have a very active social life, and are unsophisticated members of a subculture centered around “fun.” Many of them have a large friendship group that contains some girls whom they do not date. The companion daters are more oriented in their reference groups toward their peers than toward the faculty.

On the other hand, the men who, as freshmen, date traditional girls, are shy, inexperienced, orthodox, and dumb. These four independent variables almost entirely determine the traditional dating syndromes in the freshman year. The traditional daters are less capable intellectually and socially than their fellow students. They are just home town boys who did not do much dating in high school. They haven’t gone out often with girls and actually don’t know much about them. They are also very orthodox or conservative about the kind of church they attend and the frequency of their attendance and about the opinions they hold about political and social issues. These men have many friends but these friends do not form a reference group for them. They don’t belong to any particular campus subculture. They seem to be shy, quiet men who go about their business and participate very little in campus activities. Interestingly enough, they love Harvard. They have unrealistically conventional opinions of the college, but they despise Harvard students as being phony, unemotional, cold, and over-intellectual.

Although the interest in traditional girls falls off sharply among the Harvard undergraduates as they become upper classmen, a certain group of students become more interested in the traditional dating patterns, mainly the students majoring in the hard sciences. These men do very little dating until their junior or senior year, but when they, in a sense, come out of their shells, they seem to prefer traditional girls, perhaps because such a
The group of men who score high on the intellectual dating pattern their freshman year generally come from liberal families with very dominant intellectual mothers. These men are primarily interested in the academic life at Harvard, but at the same time they are very concerned about politics and social evils. These data accentuate the role of value homogamy in mate selection. The values of the man fit the values of the girl he picks. More importantly, it seems that the personality of the girl the Harvard man wants is not complementary to his but similar. For example, the more dependent men pick companionable sorts of girls; the shy and simple men pick traditional girls; men concerned with intellectual ideals pick intellectual girls.

One personality characteristic also distinguishes the men with intellectual dating patterns freshman year. They have a great deal of anxiety and concern about themselves; they worry about how well they're doing in the world and how they're getting on, if they're normal, and if they have problems. These are the really introspective men.

The men who become most interested in intellectual dating during their undergraduate years relative to their classmates are also very involved in the aesthetic subculture of Harvard. They also perform very well intellectually, usually in the more difficult humanistic fields. The faculty forms their reference group and they're interested in many different intellectual activities at the university. It seems natural that they would desire intellectual girls.

Finally, the instrumental daters are similar to Waller's "raters and daters." These men who score high on the instrumental dating scale their freshman year are not particularly distinguished by their background, except that they perceive their mothers to be "cool operators." They also consider themselves "cool operators" and are quite narcissistic and exhibitionistic. In addition, the instrumental daters are distinguished by having a few very close friends. It would seem from these data that their friends serve as a substitute for the warm, intimate sort of companionship that men might ordinarily seek from a woman.

The pattern of instrumental dating doesn't change much during the upper class years. The same sort of men who display an instrumental dating pattern freshman year keep the same pattern during their entire undergraduate career. This pattern of dating doesn't attract many recruits, but neither does it lose many adherents.

What conclusions about heterosexual relationships in college can we draw from this very hurried overview of the Harvard Student Study data?

1) Dating among these Harvard men seems to serve primarily the function of providing a close, warm relationship with another human being. The college years allow time for casual relationships to mature into more emotional ones. However, it must be noted that even as seniors, most Harvard men are not permanently "hooked." These warm relationships with women are not necessarily committed ones; marriage is still very much in the background for these men.

2) The Harvard men want girls whose values and personalities are similar, not complementary, to their own. The intellectual men want intellectual women and the shy, orthodox men want traditional girls.

3) The dating pattern a man embraces in the freshmen year is determined in part by his previous dating experiences and in part by his personality traits. Family background seems to be an unimportant influence on his dating patterns except for the perceived personality of the mother. In the upper class years, the dating pattern is influenced by the kind of college subculture the man belongs to, the focus of his reference group, the importance of same sex friends and the energy available for dating as opposed to other types of college activities.

4) Finally, the dating patterns of the men in the classes of 1970 and 1974 are quite similar to the patterns of the original sample of Harvard men from the Harvard classes of 1964 and 1965. The function of dating and the characteristics of dates preferred by different types of men has not changed in six years. The "sexual revolution" has affected the behavior of the current classes. They are more sexually intimate earlier in their college career but the basic pattern of emotional growth in college heterosexual relationships has remained static.