1983

The Changing American Catholic University

Donald R. LaMagdeleine
Loyola University Chicago

THE CHANGING AMERICAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

by

Donald R. LaMagdeleine

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

September

1983

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Kathleen McCourt, Robert McNamara, and Ross Scherer for their patience and able assistance. I am especially indebted to my chairman, Thomas Gannon S.J., who kept me on the track when I felt inclined to wander.

Much of the data on which this study depends were available only because of the diligent work of the Special Collections Department of Cudahy Memorial Library. Special thanks to Brother Michael Grace S.J., and the other members of his capable staff.

An impressive list of others provided support and encouragement, of which I can name but a few. I spent my hours in thoughtful conversation with Jerome O'Leary O.P., who supplied numerous valuable insights. Similarly, I am indebted to James Barry, Alice Gallin O.S.U., Alice Hayes, and Kenneth Johnson.

Finally, this dissertation attests more to my wife's fortitude than it does to my own. Thank you, Kate.

VITA

Donald R. LaMagdeleine is the elder son of Donald and Dorothy (Morris) LaMagdeleine. He was born June 17, 1952, in Santa Maria, California.

Donald attended Santa Maria del Popolo grammar school in Mundelein, Illinois. After commuting to Quigley Preparatory Seminary North for his secondary education, he graduated from Loyola University of Chicago in 1974 with a Bachelor of Science degree in psychology. He double-majored in philosophy.

Mr. LaMagdeleine obtained a Master of Arts degree from the Graduate Theological Union (Berkeley, California) in 1977. After teaching secondary school for two years at Notre Dame for Boys high school in Morton Grove, Illinois, he received a graduate assistantship in the Sociology Department, Loyola University of Chicago. While pursuing his doctorate there, he became a Schmitt Fellow and a member of the National Jesuit Honor Society.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.--Continued

TABLE OF CONTENTS.--Continued

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES.--Continued

CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM AND METHODS

There are at present more than two hundred Roman Catholic colleges and universities in the United States. These schools have always interwoven educational, religious, and practical payoffs into a package which served as a springboard for young Catholics aiming to "get ahead." This dissertation is an analysis of the recent changes which have occurred at a major Roman Catholic (RC) university, and the effects those changes have had on its daily operation. To accomplish this task, I have been obliged to examine three very different sets of literature: (1) the sociology of education; (2) the history of U.S. higher education; (3) the sociology of U.S. Catholicism.

Within the last twenty years, there has been much said and written about RC higher education's loss of corporate identity. Unfortunately, little research examining the process of the purported loss in the fullness of its complexity has resulted from the discussion. This is due in large part to the need for a multidimensional method of data collection to adequately study the issue. The immigrant American RC church was an inveterate builder of institutions designed both to safeguard the faith and accli-

mate strangers to a new society (Ellis, 1970:104-123). As the component in this network designed to educate those young people who would become pillars of American Catholicism, the RC campus played a vital role. For this reason, any study which aims to assess the contemporary dynamics and prospects of the RC campus must include a strong historical awareness of both its cultural and educational processes in earlier periods.

Janowitz has termed such an approach a "developmental" analysis (1978). By this he means (building on Lasswell, 1935) research conducted on the premise that social structures are products of their own history. Rather than assume that social phenomena are at some basic level indistinguishable from that which can be discovered within their present dynamics, developmental research treats social facts as emerging from their own previous experiences (Janowitz, 1978:63-67).

I have provided the historical component of this study in the three literature reviews which follow. The methods of analysis are based on this discussion. The analysis itself is organized about the answers to three major questions emerging from the historical overview. First, since it is clear that both internal and external pressures have endangered the RC campus' traditional method of operation, can it be demonstrated empirically that the typical school no longer operates as a denominational col-

lege? Second, if it is found to be true that the case school is no longer a denominational college, has it then become a research university? Third, what are the elements of potential strain which have emerged in this unsettling period?

The implications of this study are relevant to many types of organizations besides RC colleges and universities. If those predicting an imminent "information society"[1] are right, then Daniel Bell's call for a new approach to organizational management may be well-founded. Organizations, he writes, must begin to "sociologize," to seriously consider their impact on largescale social trends (Bell, 1976). Apart from its relevance for RC colleges and universities, this analysis is also pertinent to other types of organizations, many of which are experiencing similar problems defining their corporate purpose and products in the "continental drifts" of rapid social change (Drucker, 1967). In this larger sense, discussed at length in Chapter VI, this dissertation is an investigation of how social change interacts with corporate reality.

I. Theoretical and Historical Overview

Sociology of Higher Education

Clarification of the relationship between education

[1] See Bell (1976) and Masuda (1981). See also Toffler's (1980) The Third Wave, which presents the same ideas in a more popular format.

and society has not been a noteworthy achievement of sociology. Functional theorists, following Davis and Moore's (1945) work on social stratification, have tended to assign educational systems the essential task of preparing an "army of skilled technicians and professional experts" (Clark, 1962:3). They have largely neglected the question of how, or even whether, this process takes place (Karabel & Halsey, 1977:1-86).

Parsons and Platt (1973) have most explictly addressed the topic of higher education from the functional perspective. They assign it the task of preserving and accumulating the "cognitive complex"--the foundations of knowledge, rationality, and learning upon which western society is based (Parsons & Platt, 1973:33-89). The university is to teach respect for the cognitive complex, and train future researchers who can add to its accumulated wealth (Parsons & Platt, 1973:103-224). Unfortunately, as a number of other researchers have pointed out (Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Karabel & Halsey, 1977; Collins, 1979), Parsons and Platt merely assume the social cohesion their theory is based on. The dynamics of societal imbalance maintained by the university as an organizational structure are not mentioned, much less investigated (Karabel & Halsey, 1977:8-12).

The principal theoretical alternative to functionalism presumes social conflict. Within this perspective,

there are two major traditions which have examined the relationship between education and society. The first, following the Weberian tradition, is typified by Collins (1971, 1979), who perceives the educational system as the custodian of credential-based status differentiations which directly benefit corporate structures. Rather than objective "knowledge," schools teach understanding and appreciation of the genius of bureaucratic organization (Collins, 1971). Those businesses most strongly emphasizing post-secondary credentials are most interested in its "culture of bureaucracy" aspects. They stress educational credentials largely for this reason (Collins, 1971).

Collins' position is an extrapolation of Weber's work on the differences between class, status, and party as exemplified in the historical experience of China (1974a). There, a type of knowledge elitism was fashioned by a mixture of intellectual, status, and political elements (Weber, 1974a:998-1002).

A second form of conflict analysis of education is neo-Marxist. Bowles and Gintis (1972, 1976) are perhaps most representative of this approach. They find numerous class-based inequalities in U.S. education beginning with the primary grades and continuing through the post-secondary level. The history of U.S. public education, they have written, is replete with evidence of a "hidden curriculum" designed to mold the children of different

social strata for their "suitable" socioeconomic niche (Bowles & Gintis, 1976:151-179). Perhaps the most obvious aspect of social stratification operating at the post-secondary level is the differentiation among elite universities, state colleges, private universities, and community colleges (Bowles & Gintis, 1976:209).

One problem with Bowles and Gintis' treatment is that they often describe situations found in many parts of the world as if they were unique to the U.S. (Bell, 1976: 151-154). Their work also displays a disturbing inattentiveness to the actual processes of education, merely substituting for such an analysis a different set of unexamined assumptions than the functionalists do (Karabel & Halsey, 1977:39-40). Hence, the work of Collins and Bowles and Gintis is replete with statistics on the corporate prioritization of different psychological traits for different job levels, and the inconsistencies between education, cognitive ability and income. Yet they are silent on the question of what, if anything, is taught in educational systems beyond the dominant capitalist social norms (Karabel & Halsey, 1972:39-44).

The fragmented nature of sociological theory on education is ironic, in view of Durkheim's central interest in the topic. Durkheim spent considerable time examining the relationship between systems of education and their societal contexts. Between his dissertation research and

his last work on religion, he delivered a series of twenty-seven lectures on the topic which have only recently (1977) appeared in English. These lectures are remarkable for their inclusion of microsocial and macrosocial data. As a unit, they represent a lucid analysis of the relationship between educational systems and their social environments in the history of Western Europe (Karabel & Halsey, 1977: 77). Moreover, his method avoids the over-reliance on prior assumptions which plagues both the functionalist and conflict perspectives.

Durkheim's research on education presupposes that schools both affect and are affected by patterns of social thought and activity in the larger society (1977). Many of his data are drawn from historical linkages between religious belief, political succession, and educational thought in Europe following the Roman Empire (Durkheim, 1977:3-215). Also included are the classroom activities which characterized the educational systems of different periods. One of the highlights of Durkheim's use of macro- and micro-level data is his treatment of the phenomenal success of the Jesuit educational system in Enlightenment France. He considered the Jesuit program a well-engineered RC response to that society's widespread rejection of RC intellectual and religious authority.

Since Durkheim's approach is more useful for the purposes of this study than that of either the functional-

ists or the conflict theorists, it is the basis of this study. The data reflect both the internal operations of the case school and its interactions with surrounding social systems.

History of Higher Education Literature

The earliest U.S. colleges were founded and heavily influenced by religious denominations (Jencks & Riesman, 1968:1-27; Veysey, 1970:1-9). In addition to training ministers, these colleges were intended to educate the "cream" of a denomination's young (men) so that they would be broadly educated pillars of the community (Baltzell, 1964; Boyle, 1983:18-19). Their curricula were often designed on a classical model of education dating to before the Enlightenment (Durkheim, 1977:202-264; Veysey, 1970:9).

In the late 1800s, however, an alternative conception of higher education was developing in Europe. Based on the priority of academic research, it was a particularly German phenomenon designed to foster "knowledge for its own sake" (Veysey, 1970:125-133; O'Boyle, 1983). It reoriented the college's corporate purpose to the gathering of new knowledge in a community of scientist-scholars actively conducting research. Theoretically, the new research emphasis was to recast the undergraduate program into a first experience of the scientific enterprise. It performed two functions contributing to a more cohesive Germany. First,

it trained bureaucrats for the immense German civil service. Second, it provided a safety outlet for the considerable number of disaffected intellectuals who had been struggling to gain a viable social identity (O'Boyle, 1983: 8-10).

The latter process occurred during the professionalization of German college teaching. The previously underpaid and part-time college educator became a full-time member of an emerging profession (e.g., philologist, classicist, biologist). An essential component of this process involved garnering a set of abstract principles which had to be mastered under the tutelage of peers in special postgraduate training programs (O'Boyle, 1983:5-6). Shortly thereafter, what O'Boyle (1983) has termed a "shared culture" developed, complete with professional associations. With this step, the first three of Wilensky's (1964) prerequisites for successful professionalism had been accomplished by German academics in less than fifty years.

When transplanted to the U.S., the German university model was also very successful. On the one hand, its "advancement of knowledge" rhetoric easily accommodated American society's emphasis on humanistic progressivism (Veysey, 1970:124-125; Ben-David, 1972:69-70). On the other, it presented the likelihood of upward mobility for denominational college faculty who had been laboring under the same dismal conditions as their pre-professionalized

German counterparts (Veysey, 1970:6-7; O'Boyle, 1983: 17-25).

Although not as clearly evident as in the case of faculty career patterns, the adoption of the German model carried definite curricular implications. The primary one followed from the base of formal knowledge which supported professorial careers. Since it was necessary that the set of abstract principles undergirding professionalization follow disciplinary lines, the curricula were changed to reflect disciplinary perspectives. Degree requirements were changed so that one major disciplinary concentration was to be mastered (Veysey, 1970:320-324). This development effectively introduced the student to the basic methods and discoveries of a significantly narrowed scope of knowledge than had formerly been the case (Bowles & Gintis, 1976: 201-223; Boyer & Levine, 1981:5-22).

The curricular elevation of disciplines (in the form of departments) over institution-based concepts of classical liberal education dramatically altered the educational dynamics of the denominational college.[1] Students were increasingly taught to be narrowly proficient, rather than broadly conversant (Boyer & Levine, 1981:17-22). Often the only broadening educational exposure was theoret-

---

[1]Usually, such notions combined the classics with the Bible. Curricula were largely prescribed, relying heavily on Greek, Latin, and Mathematics (Veysey, 1970:21-36).

ically supplied by piecemeal "electives" left over after the requirements of the main field of study had been fulfilled (Flexner, 1970).

As the importation of the German model progressed, post-graduate programs rapidly emerged to train the next generation of professors (O'Boyle, 1983:17-25). This, in turn, influenced the faculty to concentrate more narrowly as their own research, since the yardstick of professional success was articles published in disciplinary journals (Veysey, 1970:317-332).

With the acceptance in the most prestigious universities of the new research-oriented model, the denominational college rapidly lost influence. Besides being perceived as a stumbling block to the professionalization of academics, it also ran counter to powerful social trends. By the twentieth century, the U.S. had entered a period of rapid industrialization. Large corporate enterprises such as General Electric, International Harvester, and U.S. Steel were rapidly expanding; they required an increasing number of trained white collar workers (Bell, 1976:49-119; Collins, 1979:1-48; Edwards, 1979:37-89). Much as it had been welcomed by Germany's large governmental bureaucracy, the research university was warmly received by U.S. corporate interests. It promised a continual flow of narrowly educated college graduates to take positions in the gigantic bureaucracies typical of the period (Edwards, 1979:111-

162). Such workers easily adapted to the standardization of white-collar work (Bowles & Gintis, 1976:210-223).

U.S. Catholicism and Catholic Higher Education

Not surprisingly, many proponents of the denominational college sharply criticized the research university model of higher education. Its educationally fragmenting tendencies were loudly criticized by liberal humanists, as was its marked emphasis on departmental majors (Flexner, 1970; Veysey, 1970:180-233). Catholic college administrators also disliked the new model. For one thing, it threatened their own curricular philosophy, which relied heavily on the longstanding system of education constructed by the Jesuits (Durkheim, 1977:227-264; Gleason, 1967). For another, it undermined the humanistic basis of education which was seen to be a necessary part of reinforcing student's membership in the church (Ellis, 1970:206-209).

Generally speaking, however, the denominational college gradually adapted to training undergraduates with curricula organized according to the departmental emphasis. Most college faculties increasingly began to be hired on the basis of ability as judged by department standards. Schools which developed into universities trained Ph.D.'s who made careers in the new profession of college professor (Jencks & Riesman, 1968:12-27; Veysey, 1970:263-341). Not so the RC colleges and universities. Many of them, in

fact, had not even separated the college from the secondary education program even by 1920. Electives only grudgingly appeared (Gleason, 1967:33-34). As compared to non-RC schools, RC colleges lagged behind in doctoral output until well after World War II (Gleason, 1967:40; McNamara, 1967). They trailed even further behind in the training of future natural and social science researchers[3] (McNamara, 1967).

Not all the reasons for RC reticence to embrace the research university model had to do with religion. It was also essential for their institutional solvency that RC campuses not outstrip the needs and aspirations of their clientele. By World War I, only the first two waves of RC immigrants (the Germans and Irish) had attained the U.S. average college attendance rate (Greeley, 1977:44-45). As a group, RCs did not achieve parity with U.S. Protestants until well after World War II (Greeley, 1977:42). It would have been extremely unrealistic, therefore, for RC colleges and universities to suddenly drop their emphasis on religious socialization. Many RC college students were the first members of their families to attend college. From their families' perspective, the preservation of their faith seemed at least as important as their intellectual training (O'Dea, 1958:29-83; Ellis, 1970b).

---

[3] Seat of the most recent disciplines, hence most enthusiastic supporters of the new research emphasis (Parsons & Platt, 1973:112).

By the end of World War II, the typical RC college still did not operate by the standards of the research university. Its faculty was selected as much for orthodoxy as for academic expertise (Curran, 1980). Its administrators usually belonged to the ranks of the religious order which had founded the school (Foster, 1967; Gellhorn & Greenawalt, 1970). Extensive in loco parentis regulations were common (Kearns, 1967; McNamara, 1969; Sullivan, 1970). In short, RC schools had retained their emphasis on traditional RC understandings of higher education.

Shortly after World War II, however, a number of societal pressures forced RC higher education's acquiescence in the direction of the research model. One such factor was a burgeoning college attendance rate, fueled by government subsidies like the G.I. Bill. Between the end of World War II and the Korean War, the number of students who had received federal support to attend college was three and one-half million (Babbidge & Rozenzweig, 1962: 24). Another boost to college attendance was the fact that the U.S. had one of the strongest national economies in the immediate post-war years (Janowitz, 1977:48-57).

One inducement to change which specifically applied to RC colleges was the rising socioeconomic status of U.S. Catholics. This meant that larger numbers of its college-age population wanted to earn the B.A. mandatory for middle and upper level white-collar jobs (Ellis, 1970a:203-204;

Greeley, 1977:50-68). Greeley (1977) has demonstrated that this upswing in college attendance surpassed even the fast rising national rates, so that by the early 1960s, Catholics attended college at or above the U.S. mean (Greeley, 1977:50-68). They have since equalled and surpassed the average U.S. family income as well (Greeley, 1977:57).

Serious implications for RC higher education followed from these developments within the U.S. Catholic population. They had to perform in ways beyond their admittedly modest immigrant period function, which Riesman has described as providing "decompression chambers for those edging their way out of the ghetto (quoted in Hassenger, 1977:4). Another extremely influential factor which affected the RC campus of the 1950s was the legal issue of government funding for RC colleges and universities. At Fordham, for example, funds were withheld pending examination of the "sectarian" nature of the school (Gellhorn & Greenawalt, 1970).

By the mid-1960s, active discussions on the goals of RC higher education had begun. One of the most influential of these, the 1967 Land O'Lakes (Wisconsin) Conference, drafted a position paper outlining a distinctive role for the RC university in the U.S. This role emphasized an academic appreciation for theology as a discipline alongside the other departments. But it rendered the campus itself outside the jurisdiction of the RC Church (McCluskey,

1970:1-28). In other words, the other departments would be allowed to develop as at non-sectarian schools.

Interestingly, the Land O'Lakes Statement appeared simultaneously with the federal and state court decision that for an RC college or university to receive public money it had to demonstrate that it operated according to the rules applying to government-sponsored agencies and organizations (Gellhorn & Greenawalt, 1970). Some important implications for RC higher education followed from this ruling. Such schools would have to: (1) offer a standard curriculum of majors and electives; (2) construct uniform faculty hiring and promotion procedures which conformed with government anti-discrimination policy; (3) laicize its board of directors (Gellhorn & Greenawalt, 1970).

Insofar as the treatment of students was concerned, the legal ramifications facing RC schools revolved principally about two major court decisions (Dixon vs. Alabama, 1961; Due vs. Florida A&M, 1963) which effectively dismantled the legality of in loco parentis interpretations of student disciplinary and dismissal procedures (Ratterman, 1968:52-88). Legally speaking, colleges and universities were told to adopt a set of policies like that of conservation groups and other trustees of interests considered part of the public domain (Parsons & Platt, 1973:8). In the areas of knowledge and education, RC and other schools retained autonomous authority. Elsewhere, they had to treat

their students as citizens of the U.S., rather than as contractual wards placed by parents under their custody (Ratterman, 1968:66-67).

Meanwhile on the international front, Vatican II also triggered intellectual developments within Roman Catholicism which mitigated the insular stance of the U.S. Catholic approach to education. Council documents like "The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World" and "The Declaration on Religious Freedom" called into question the emphasis on socializing for RC orthodoxy which had been one hallmark of the RC campus (McCluskey, 1970:1-28).

Beset by the many demographic, educational, legal and theological pressures for dismantling their denominational college approach, RC schools by the mid-1960s had very few options.[4] The historical precedents were plain. They could retain the denominational college structure at all costs, including the quite plausible possibility of bankruptcy; or they could embrace the research university structure. It was this second course which was followed by the larger RC universities like Notre Dame, Fordham, St. Louis University, Holy Cross, and Loyola of Chicago

---

[4]In fact, with the 1967 Maryland Court of Appeals decision that government aid could be withheld from colleges merely on the grounds of "church-relatedness," many faced a decision on which their financial solvency virtually depended (cf. McCluskey, 1970:204-205).

(Riesman, 1967; Barnett & Menges, 1981:6). These schools laicized their governance structures and changed their legal status to "independent."

The fact that the larger RC colleges and universities opted for the research university model is not surprising. They were, after all, the ones most likely to have the financial resources to acquire the materials and personnel necessary for serious research. Yet there is more to a higher education institution than its balance sheets. All schools are, as Veysey (1970:332-337) has pointed out regarding the research university model itself, products of historical accidents and contingencies which continue to affect their dynamics. Putting on the structural form of the research university does not necessarily assure a school's essential conformity (at least not immediately).

II. Methodology

Catholic higher education's "total" educational philosophy, its emphasis on socialization to RC orthdoxy, and its parochial outlook on selection of faculty and administrators reflected early U.S. Catholicism's immigrant status in a hostile social environment. Emulating the research university model for these schools meant introducing such bureaucratic processes as standardized hiring and promotion. Secularized student regulations and review pro-

cedures further accelerated this process, replacing in loco parentis guidelines which had fostered a paternalistic community ambience.

In light of these changes, it is reasonable to anticipate that the RC college's adoption of the research university model bore serious implications for its subsequent identity. Considering also the longstanding historical posture of RC collegiate administrators against the research university model, it is likely that the present RC university large enough to emulate it has changed significantly. If so, such schools may well have traveled a path already tread by the Protestant denominational schools a half-century earlier.

As reasonable as such speculation might be, it is not easy to devise a methodology to test it. One difficulty is the nature of RC higher education itself. Since most schools were founded and have been maintained as autonomous entities, there is a notable lack of coordination in the administration of RC colleges and universities (Hassenger, 1967:295-336; Ford & Roy, 1968; Ellis, 1970: 208-209). Testing any hypothesis relevant to RC higher education as a whole must be accomplished by a method of sampling accounting for a cross-section of the more than 150 individual schools. This task would be considerable both in terms of funding and the required staff. Hence, it has yet to be accomplished (Gleason, 1967:10).

An alternative approach is used here. One such school--Loyola University of Chicago--has been chosen because it has many characteristics representative of RC colleges and universities. It is analyzed in the manner of a case study. The results of this investigation, although not generalizable to the entire spectrum of U.S. Catholic campuses, will be applicable to those schools which approximate the case school. This approach has been used by many other researchers (e.g., Weber, 1958; Durkheim, 1977; Whyte, 1973; Suttles, 1974; Kanter, 1977) when attempting to bridge gaps in the literature dealing with particular social phenomena.

The close similarities between the institutional history of LU and that of RC higher education in general offer strong support for selecting it as the object of this analysis. Founded in 1870 as part of the Jesuit-administered Holy Family parish in Chicago, LU was first known as St. Ignatius College (Hartnett & Menges, 1981:1). Its aim was to provide an exclusively liberal arts education. As of the 1902-1903 academic years, the school's curricular structure was a direct reflection of the Ratio Studiorum. Coursework was subdivided into "academic" and "collegiate," the former being a rough translation of secondary education (although in a three year period). The latter amounted to an undergraduate college, encompassing four years (Hartnett & Menges, 1981:1).

There is some dispute as to the number of students enrolled at St. Ignatius College in 1902-1903, but it was probably between the 381 mentioned by Hartnett and Menges (1981:1) and LU's Office of Registration and Records' figure of 500 (LU Office of Registration and Records, 1982: 5). The "collegiate" students were arranged in four years designated (listing consecutively) "Humanities," "Poetry," "Rhetoric," and "Philosophy" (Hartnett & Menges, 1981:1). The program emphasized the Latin and Greek classics, with mathematics, history, philosophy, and religion also included (Hartnett & Menges, 1981:1).

St. Ignatius College did not become "Loyola University" until 1909, when it took over the Lincoln College of Law (Hartnett & Menges, 1981:2). Shortly thereafter, it added the Illinois Medical College (1909), Bennett Medical College (1910), and the Chicago College of Medicine and Surgery (1917). In the early 1920s, LU acquired three more educational facilities: a School of Commerce (later Business) began in 1922, followed closely by the Chicago College of Dental Surgery (1923), and finally in 1925, a separate Graduate School (Barnett & Menges, 1981:2). In keeping with the general RC pattern of slow acceptance of the research university model, it is worth noting that only after separate professional schools of law, medicine, business, and dentistry had been established did LU develop a graduate program in the Arts and Sciences. A last profes-

sional school originated in 1935, when a number of separate Chicago hospital schools of nursing combined to form the Loyola University School of Nursing (Hartnett & Menges, 1981:3). As of the 1980-81 term, 15,782 students attended LU (LU Office of Registration and Records, 1982:16), making it one of the largest RC universities in the world. It encompassed seven professional schools and awarded the Ph.D. in seventeen departments (Hartnett & Menges, 1981:5).

In view of the many parallels between LU and the general RC pattern described above, the case method approach seems warranted. I will use contemporary survey, archival and interview data obtained at LU, and fit them within the developmental context provided by the general RC and LU histories. Generally speaking, the results will be most applicable to the Jesuit-founded larger urban universities.

The survey data to be examined come from two sources. The primary one is the Loyola University of Chicago Religious Values Assessment, sponsored by the university, and administered in the fall of 1980. The Values Assessment consisted of a random sample study of administrators, faculty, staff, and students with an N of 1446. Of the students sampled, 550 were undergraduates. The major findings of this study are included in "The Interplay of Intellectual and Religious Values at Loyola University of Chicago" (Gannon & McNamara, 1982).

The second source of survey data is Robert McNamara's 1961 replication of parts of the 1952 Cornell Values Study. His sample was 1,100 male college seniors at Forham, Notre Dame, Columbia, and Cornell (McNamara, 1963). Of particular interest to this study is McNamara's subset of RC students on RC campuses. The N of this subset in McNamara's study was 424.

Finally, although survey research will provide a substantial portion of the data, it is important to augment it with archival and interview materials. This broad spectrum of input will enable a proper institutional analysis of LU. As Mayhew (1980) has pointed out, survey instruments are too often conceived in line with individualistic assumptions which disallow analysis of social structural dynamics. Yet some techniques for using survey research (e.g., factor analysis and multi-dimensional scaling) can highlight intra-group similarities and differences which facilitate structural analysis, if complemented by data gathered on more macrosocial levels. For my purposes, the optimal research strategy is to avoid exclusive reliance on either individualistic or structural levels of measurement (Gannon & Friedheim, 1982), in keeping with the method of Durkheim's research on education.

Logic of the Analysis

Durkheim's analysis of the development of the French

educational system utilized data on both the internal dynamics and external influences affecting that system. The primary sources of data in the former category were curricula, methods of teaching, and educational philosophies. The principal research technique involved in his analysis consisted of accessing and synthesizing anecdotal and institutional documents, as well as the few systematic treatments (such as the Jesuit Ratio Studiorum) available (Durkheim, 1977:137-160, 277-325). As Durkheim (1977:242-244) comments:

> The boarding system within the college functioned as a distinct institution whose head, although he was subordinated to the authority of the rector, still enjoyed a large measure of independence. He not only supervised the material organization of life, but also directed all the work done outside classes. The boarders were divided into two categories. The first, known as chanbristes, were lodged in private rooms. They were allowed private tutors and servants attached to their person, and these resided with them. But they were the exception. The other boarders were lodged in communal bedrooms; and there were as many of these as there were classes. . . .
>
> As for those who were not boarders, they came for the most part from outside the vicinity. . . . When they were not rich enough to be placed in the care of a private tutor for both their work and their conduct, they were placed in either private halls of residence or boarding houses outside the college, or with private families. . . .
>
> Now that we are familiar with the external framework of academic life let us look more closely at what this comprised; that is to say, at what the teaching consisted in and how it was understood.
>
> . . . A Christian teacher, says Father Jouvency, must teach two things: piety and literature. If we disregard piety, which strictly speaking cannot be taught and which in any case is not specific to any

> particular intellectual discipline, the sole remaining subject-matter of education, properly speaking, is literature. . . .
>
> But which languages, which literature, were taught? Exclusively those of Greece and Rome. As for French, which at the time when the Jesuits attained their greatest popularity, in the seventeenth century, was itself becoming a literary language, it was entirely excluded. . . . There was no teaching of French grammar. It was even forbidden to pupils to speak French amongst themselves not only in class but also in their living quarters. . . .

It is evident here that Durkheim's method paralleled what Geertz has referred to as "thick description" (1973:3-12)--i.e., the inclusion of qualitative evidence which enlivens the phenomenon under investigation. This approach gave the data a tangibility not since rivaled by any of the contemporary approaches to the sociology of education.

> In order to train pupils in extensive formal work which was, however, pretty lacking in substance, it was not enough to surround them, to envelop them at close quarters with solicitude and vigilance; it was not enough to be constantly concerned to contain and to sustain them: it was also necessary to stimulate them. The goad which the Jesuits employed consisted exclusively in competition . . . entire class was organized to promote this end. The pupils were divided into two camps, the Romans on the one hand and the Carthaginians on the other, who lived, so to speak, on the brink of war, each striving to outstrip the other. Each camp had its own dignitaries. At the head of the camp there was an <u>imperator</u> also known as dictator or consul, then came a <u>praetor</u>, a tribune and some senators. These honours, which were naturally coveted and contested, were distributed as the outcome of a competition which was held monthly. From another point of view, each camp was divided into groups consisting of ten pupils (<u>decuries</u>) each, commanded by a captain (called the <u>decurion</u>) who was selected from amongst the worthies we have just mentioned. . . (Durkheim, 1977:260).

The same approach is also evident in Durkheim's attenuation of the larger influences affecting the educational systems in different periods. His two major data sources for this aspect of the analysis are the RC religious beliefs which dominated medieval society (Durkheim, 1977:17-37) and the religio-political movements which rejected and partially replaced them during the Renaissance (Durkheim, 1977:177-226). For Durkheim, classroom methods and curricula were inextricably linked to larger social trends which directly affected them, but did not entirely subsume them.

> . . . Though occasionally somewhat crude and mechanistic, L'evolution pedagogigue en France provides an unequalled example of the way in which it is possible, and indeed necessary, to integrate microcosmic and macrocosmic levels of sociological analysis. No sociologist of education has yet surpassed--in depth or in breadth--this investigation of the relationship between social structure and the process of educational transmission, written more than seventy years ago. This is a sobering commentary on the subsequent history of educational research; more than anything else, perhaps, it suggests that such inquiries, which Durkheim undertook as part and parcel of the sociological enterprise, are now widely considered scientifically illegitimate in the highly specialized and professionalized community of sociological researchers (Karabel & Halsey, 1977:74).

Emulating Durkheim's method, this study includes data on both the internal dynamics of LU and U.S./RC societal patterns. On the microsocial level, both archival and survey research results are used to measure the degree to which LU conforms to either the denominational college or research university models of higher education. The archival sources

of data on LU include: (1) institutional history; (2) curricular patterns; (3) student regulations; (4) official statements of corporate purpose and philosophy; (5) governance patterns. Analysis of LU survey data will focus on the attitudes, beliefs, and goals of its administrators, full-time faculty, and undergraduate students.

Analysis of influences external to LU is based on the historical summaries already provided, plus the archival materials. Relevant archival data include: (1) College of Arts and Sciences graduation and departmental majors' requirements; (2) LU faculty characteristics; (3) student enrollment trends. Archival data collected concerning the faculty focus on the origins of their doctoral degrees and the ratio of Jesuits included. Archival data on students consists primarily of College of Arts and Sciences (College) regulations.

The logic of analysis follows the method of constructing and testing ideal typologies. As Weber (1974c) observed, the concepts to be operationalized in sociological research are difficult to measure because of the many levels of action (beyond the logical) they must account for. Usually the sociologist must formulate "ideal types," or logically constructed analogues, which can be empirically tested (Weber, 1974c:20). Despite the fact that no claim of their absolute duplication in social reality can

be made for these constructs, they nonetheless enable the testing of hypotheses.

In this study, there are two principal ideal types which are operationalized and tested. The first is the RC denominational college. As defined here, the RC denominational college, relying on a model of education transplanted from Europe, stressed religious socialization and a perspective on the structure of knowledge derived principally from the Jesuit system erected during the Renaissance. Its curricula consisted of a classics-dominated pattern of courses designed to broadly educate the student in the fundamentals of Western culture. The RC demonimational college's official statement of purpose reflected the dual priority of RC socialization and traditional education. It was officially described as both RC and liberal arts oriented. The college's administration clearly reflected the continuing presence of its founding religious order, and a significant percentage of the college's administrators and faculty were members of that order. Its faculty were expected to be Catholics, and this criterion was given more weight than their scholarly expertise. Finally, the RC denominational college's student regulations reflected the operating principle of in loco parentis. Simply stated, this meant that while attending the college, students (almost all of which were RC) were expected to conform to rules geared to reinforce their

RC identity. In consequence, the RC denominational college provided immigrant Catholicism with an elite group of firmly committed RC leaders.

The ideal type of the U.S. research university is very different from the denominational college. Its curriculum reflects departmental, rather than institutional perceptions of the organization of knowledge (Flexner, 1970; Boyer & Levine, 1981:17-22). Concretely, this means that the bulk of coursework must be devoted to satisfaction of a student's "major" requirements, while the rest consists of electives. The research university's statement of purpose is non-sectarian in content and is governed by an autonomous board of trustees (Veysey, 1970:263-341). In keeping with the rationalizing tendencies accompanying the development of the research university, administrators are selected according to bureaucratic criteria (Weber, 1974b), irrespective of any sectarian characteristic (Veysey, 1970: 302-317; Parsons & Platt, 1973:103-162). Student guidelines and procedures are meticulously codified according to the understanding that post-secondary students are not wards, but contractors with the university[1] (Ratterman, 1968:66-67). Lastly, the enrollment patterns of the research university reflect the high priority it gives to the Graduate School (Parsons & Platt, 1973:103-162).

---

[1]In short, the research university does not consider itself liable for the moral and personal development of students (Ratterman, 1968:60-67).

Consideration of Historical Periods

This is a study of the processes of institutional change in the midst of larger societal ones. It is necessary, therefore, to build into the methodology a framework for comparing data from both the contemporary LU campus and its predecessor. Although RC colleges and universities had been changing some of their traditional patterns of education ever since the turn of the century,[6] the conjunction of internal and external influences toward solidification of the denominational college model did not really peak until the early 1960s. At that time, the culmination of factors resulted in widespread alteration of their former denominational characteristics.

Since this study examines the repercussions of hypothesized change, it has been necessary to gather data reflective of LU both before and after the period in question. If such a change is indicated, the exact point at which the transformation occurred cannot be determined a priori.[7] Rather, all pertinent data and trends from the

---

[6]RC schools were actually turning out a relatively impressive number of Ph.D. degrees as early as the 1950s. Robert McNamara has documented that in the 1950s their rate of doctorate output increase over their 1940s production surpassed that of the 10 top universities in the country (McNamara, 1967). But it is important to remember the differences of scale involved. The top 21 RC schools' doctorates conferred in the 1950s (2,359) amounted to only 18% of the output of the top 10 universities (13,294) (McNamara, 1967).

[7]Following Weber's thinking on ideal typologies,

late 1940s to 1981 need to be analyzed in order to determine the points of disjunction and convergence. The survey data, on the other hand, are restricted to the two specific years in which the instruments were administered (1960-61 and 1980-81). It is assumed that LU's institutional dynamics were altered somewhere between these two dates.

---

it is probably unrealistic to expect that one can arrive at a definite point at which all measures reflect events predicted by the models (cf. Weber, 1974c:20-21).

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGE MEASURES AT LOYOLA (1947-1981)

The first hypothesis tested is that Loyola University of Chicago (LU), like most RC colleges and universities, has ceased operating as a denominational college. The method of analysis proceeds from the discussion in Chapter I. Microsocial and macrosocial measures testing the denominational college typology are examined, in order to assess the validity of the hypothesis. If accepted, it will be necessary to establish a rough time frame for the demise of the denominational college mode of operation. This "watershed" is important for subsequent analysis.

I. Degree Requirements and Curricular Patterns

Overview of Departments Considered

Because the educational philosophy of traditional RC higher education was so heavily dependent on the Ratio Studiorum (Gleason, 1967:34-35), its curriculum leaned heavily on the Enlightenment's elevation of the Latin and Greek classics. According to Durkheim (1977:215-251), an essential element added by the Jesuits was the Scholastic

interpretation of classical philosophy. The resultant mix of courses built a cohesive intellectual perspective on religio-philosophical foundations. Since each course was understood as valuable in conjunction with the others rather than on its own merit, the Ratio curricular philosophy was inherently holistic, viewing the various departments as participating in an integrated task of supplying the intellectual skills and knowledge required of an educated layman.

> The College of Arts and Sciences is the heart of the Jesuit plan of education because in it the distinctive purposes of the University are most fully realized and the distinctive means of forming the Christian humanist are more fully available.
>
> The liberal arts, when taught with Christian inspiration, are adapted to forming many sides of human nature into a complete man. The achievement of this aim requires a curriculum with strong characteristics of its own. It must be a curriculum that stresses basic and Christian subjects, that presents a well-distributed program of studies to stimulate the many powers of the human person, that promotes orderly mental growth by a graded sequence of courses built on the fundamental general education, and that crowns the college work with the wisdom of philosophy and a concentration in some special field of human knowledge.
>
> The staff of Loyola University are much helped by the principles of the Ratio Studiorum. This Jesuit manual on the art of teaching and conducting schools has been guiding Jesuit educators for nearly three hundred and fifty years. Its college plan is full of the Christian renaissance. It prescribes studies in the great classical writers, in basic mathematics and sciences, in systematic scholastic philosophy, in religion, and in communication of truth. The Ratio's curriculum was highly organized, with almost no electives, since it regarded certain studies as constant needs of human beings redeemed by Christ (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:6-7).

The structure of the Ratio is indeed quite evident in the 1947-48 LU College Catalog. Out of the 128 credit hours required for graduation, only twenty-eight (22%) were not taken by every student[1] (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:51-55). All students were required to take one three-hour course each in metaphysics, natural theology, principles of ethics, and social ethics, plus a two-hour religion course each semester. A heavy component of at least five required philosophy courses reflected LU's esteem for the medieval "queen of the sciences." LU's phrasing of its 1947 educational goals is quite succinct in its explanation for the highly structured curriculum.

> . . . it [LU] seeks to integrate both general education, cultural improvement, and professional excellence with the Catholic philosophy of life. Every unit of the University accordingly regards moral and religious training, thorough instruction in principles of religion and virtue, and the forming of clear and correct consciences in its students as essential educational tasks. . . (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48: 5-6).

LU in 1947 displayed little of the research university's departmental emphasis. The Religion department especially functioned as a component of the total curriculum of the College, rather than as an autonomous entity. It listed only fifteen different courses--a remarkably small number, considering that all students had to take eight of

---

[1]With the exception of those specializing in the natural sciences. An entirely different set of courses were predetermined for such students (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:51-55).

its courses. The department's role within the College curriculum was the provision of what had been deemed a necessary theoretical grounding in RC belief and religious/social practice.

Compared to the Religion department, the structure of the English and History departments reflected more intellectual than socialization concerns. The former offered thirty-three courses, and the latter twenty-seven. Each department could teach more diverse kinds of subjects than were available in Religion, possibly because it had been assigned a less central role in the Continental version of the Ratio system.[2] Hence, while the Religion faculty was restricted to teaching such explicitly denomination-oriented offerings as "Survey of the Catholic Religion," "Christian Origins (Apologetics)," and "Catholic Morals I" and II, English and History faculty taught many courses unrelated to strictly RC concerns. Courses of the non-denominational variety in the latter departments included "The History of English Literature, 450-1700" (and "1700-1946"), "Principles of Literary Criticism," and "The United States to

---

[2]Durkheim thoroughly documented the early Jesuit system's neglect of contemporary language and literature in favor of Latin and Greek (Durkheim, 1977:244-253). He wrote that most Jesuits of eighteenth-century France were practically illiterate in French. The situation did not differ in the case of history. The Jesuit system virtually ignored it, treating classical personalities as ahistorical personifications of virtues or vices (cf. Durkheim, 1977: 250-253).

1688" (and "since 1688").[3] (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:70-73).

By 1947 the English and History deaprtments had clearly begun to acquire some of the characteristics of the research university. Besides having considerably more curricular flexibility than a strictly denominational department like Religion during the same period, English and History were both designated "major" fields for students working in their last two years of the College. This meant that these departments could establish their own requirements for students wishing to learn more about them. Both departments in 1947 stipulated that majors take a total of eighteen hours of coursework (six courses) beyond the two courses in each discipline required of every student (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:66-73). The Religion department, in contrast, had no majors.

A broader picture of the 1947 College philosophy emerges from discussion of two more fields which will prove important later in the analysis. The Department of Sociology, like Religion, offered few courses (13). Since it had a smaller role within the mandatory coursework than Religion (2 required classes, both cross-listed with Religion), its eleven remaining courses covered topics relevant to the growing discipline of sociology. Course titles of this

---

[3]The complete 1947 offerings of each department discussed here are included in the appendices.

description included "Social Problems," "Community Organization," and "Criminology" (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:87-88).

The structure of the 1947 Sociology department provides another helpful counterpoint to the differences between the Religion and English/History departments of the period. Whereas English and history are longstanding areas of knowledge within the Humanities, sociology is a social science which did not appear in U.S. college curricula until near the turn of the century.

Moreover, the 1947 status of the different departments is an accurate reflection of their accommodation within the Ratio. In the U.S., English was studied in the Jesuit system much as it had been in the period described by Durkheim, except for one important difference. While written expression maintained its high priority, the earlier continental predilection for classical language had diminished. English's new recognition within the Ratio provided a mid-twentieth-century English department in a Jesuit college with a viable role as both conservator of Western literary culture (in keeping with the liberal arts empahsis of the school) and participant in an emerging field of learned inquiry. By adopting the twin goals of helping "the student to develop his skill and grace in communication" and sharpening "his faculty of sound criticism" (Arts and Sciences Catalog, 1955-56:58), the LU English

department of the 1940s and '50s adroitly bridged the emphasis of both the U.S. Jesuit educational tradition and the department interest in developing a special body of knowledge.[4]

Similar goal-bridging is evident in the case of the History objectives statement of the period. In attempting to deal with the many difficulties of the immigrant RC experience, it is not surprising that the U.S. Jesuits seem to have made use of a Ratio provision that local circumstances could justify changing emphases (Farrell, 1938: 367). The 1940s-1950s History department objectives reflect the concern for both Western and U.S. Catholicism's History, as well as subtle indications of the need for development of rigorous methods of research.

> History, as the record of man especially in Christian times, is a core subject with respect to the humanistic and RC educational aims of the University. In liberal arts education History's prime purpose is orientation and awakening appreciation of the values of human achievements. . . . Trained to a knowledge and desire of the truth, fortified by the examples of pioneer struggles toward goals which we have reached, matured in judgement by the wisdom of the past, the student may move more surely and swiftly toward the final purpose of his life (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1955-56:63).

As compared to English and History, Sociology in 1947 reflected an interesting combination of emphases on

---

[4]Because of the uneven publication and availability of LU Arts & Sciences catalogs, it is necessary to access data for years as proximate to each other as possible. The 1947-48 catalog had no departmental objectives section. The first available catalog with departmental objectives appeared in 1955.

disciplinary and College concerns. Originally part of the LU School of Social Work, it became a hybrid between a research university department and a conservator of denominationally relevant information on RC social life.[5] Despite the two College classes cross-listed with the Religion Department ("Christian Social Action" and "Papal Social Encyclicals"), the bulk of the Sociology Department's offerings and the objectives statement aligned with the principles of the growing field of sociology.

> This department seeks to introduce the student to the science of sociology as one of the social sciences; to give the student a deeper understanding of the nature of social relationships, social institutions, society, and culture and of the influence of these upon individual behavior; to help the student become more objective in his judgements about contemporary social problems; to encourage a keener interest in and a more serious responsibility towards the community in which he lives; and to prepare students for gaduate work in sociology, sócial administration, and social work (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1955:56-93).

Compared to the other departments mentioned, the Psychology curriculum of 1947 was strikingly non-denominational. No obviously RC-oriented courses were mentioned out of a total of twenty-two offerings (Arts & Sciences Catalog,

---

[5]Initially named the School of Sociology, the School of Social Work opened its doors in 1914. It was the first such school in the U.S. (Hartnett & Menges, 1981:2). Founded by Frederick Siedenberg, S.J., its purpose was the training of young men and women to assist in alleviating social evils and dislocations (School of Social Work Catalog, 1961-62:10-11). The first LU program officially open to women, the School's innovative scheduling (late afternoon, evening, and Saturday mornings) exemplified its non-traditional approach within the Jesuit educational system (Hartnett & Menges, 1981:2).

1947-48:84-86). The only course approaching a denominational emphasis was "Rational Psychology," which gave evidence of the department's roots inside the philosophy department. This course served the purpose of providing the scholastic approach to science promoted by the RC church[6] (Wauck, 1979:2). Subjects covered by the 1947 Psychology Department included "Experimental Psychology" I and II, "Abnormal Psychology," and "Psychology of Reading Difficulties." This collection of discipline-oriented topics reflected the departmental self-description. The Department's twin objectives were to:

> 1. develop an understanding of the structure and organization of mental life, of the true nature of man, and of the factors which contribute to the betterment of human relations and human adjustments. 2. serve as the groundwork for advanced studies in psychology and in related fields (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1955-56:88).

Departmental Changes in Denominational Curricula

The preceding analysis has focused on a general level, with references to specific departments as examples. The next section of this discussion treats of the curricular trends within the English, History, Psychology,

---

[6]According to this formulation, expounded by Leo XIII in the encyclical "Aeterni Patris," RC educators were to pursue the "study and teaching of the philosophical synthesis of St. Thomas Aquinas as suitable basis for a rational explanation of the ultimate questions of science and life" (Quoted in Wauck, 1979:2). The formulation effectively cast the sciences as "handmaidens to Theology" (Wauck, 1979:2).

Sociology and Theology Departments that moved away from offerings reflecting a denominational college emphasis. The English and History Departments are included here because historically they have contained the largest contingents of faculty in the College, and were long considered a central part of the Humanities disciplines associated with Jesuit liberal arts education. Sociology is a social science (i.e., closely allied with the professionalization of university teaching), but within LU's history has also been associated with RC social activism. The Psychology Department's inclusion provides a helpful adjunct to curricular patterns within Sociology, since it is a social science which has always had a more pronounced research bent. The pivotal role of Theology within the College curriculum of the earlier period makes its significance within subsequent curricular patterns obvious.

Three of these five departments offered courses in the 1947-48 catalog which mirrored the school's overarching College philosophy.[7] The ways these departments dealt with their denominational courses over time manifest their efforts to gain autonomy within the College. The patterns within English and Sociology appear in Table 1. The History Department's handling of such curricula is the subject

---

[7]Besides the courses' external denominational characteristics, they also appeared in the list of classes fulfilling the Religion department's mandatory electives requirement for upperclassmen (cf. Appendix V).

TABLE 1.--EROSION OF DENOMINATIONAL CURRICULA (1)

Department	Course Number and Title by Year of Change					
	'47-48	'55-56	'65-66	'67-70	'71-78	'79-81
English	#375*** Newman	nc*	nl**	nl	nl	nl
					Number reassigned to old #290: American Literature (1914-present)	nc
	#385*** Modern RC Writers	Renamed "The Catholic Renascence"	nl	nl	nl	nl
					Number reassigned to old #292: American Literature (1914-present)	nc
Sociology	#207*** Christian Social Action	nl	nl	nl	nl	nl
	#326*** Marriage and the Family	Renumbered (#328); renamed "Sociology of the Family	nc	Renumbered (#338)	Renumbered (#340)	Renumbered (332); (#330); renamed "The Family"

#349*** Papal Social Encyclicals	Renumbered (#348)	nc	nl	nl	nl
				Number reassigned to new course, "Medical Sociology"	Renamed "The Sociology of Health Care"

Key:

* = "no change"

** = (not listed"

*** = cross-listed with religion/theology dept.

of Table 2. Because the pattern of the Religion (Theology) Department is unique, it is not presented in tabular format.

The two English courses reflecting denominational over departmental priorities were "Newman" and "Modern Roman Catholic Writers." The Newman course focused on perhaps the greatest modern apologist for RC higher education. Although a great literary figure of the nineteenth century, Newman is virtually never the subject of an entire course in non-RC schools. Similarly, the course in RC writers manifests a clear denominational concern with introducing students to the RC literary culture. Comparable courses in Jewish or Protestant writers, for instance, were conspicuously absent (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947:66-60) --not surprising of course, given the low number of non-RC students enrolled at LU during these years.

The deletion of each of the denominational English courses was accomplished by the 1965-66 term. Although each survived the 1950s relatively intact (#385 was renamed in 1955), neither continued past the early 1960s. Nor have they appeared since. By the early 1970s they had been replaced by a two-course sequence in American literature.

Concurrent with the deletion of the department's two identifiably denominational offerings, English also revised its goal statement in 1965. The new version, while retaining a liberal arts emphasis, more clearly emphasized

the research university department's concern for establishing a body of commonly accepted knowledge and method of data collection.

> The general purpose of this department is to develop skill and grace in English expression, the love of literature, and the facility of sound criticism; and to foster, through literature, the quest for and the enlightenment of the mind and will (Arts & Sciences catalog, 1965:123).

The 1965-66 English Department statement of goals had changed little by 1981, although the goal of fostering "the quest for truth and the enlightenment of mind and will" mentioned in the earlier period had been dropped. An extensive explanation of the Department's role as facilitator of literary expression/appreciation and expositor of developing trends within society and literature were included.

> The general purpose of the department is to develop skill and grace in English expression, the love of literature, and the faculty of sound criticism.
>
> The department and its constituent programs retain traditional approaches and objectives (interest in a strong writing program; the technical study of poetry, drama, and fiction in the core curriculum program; a solid and structured coverage of literature written in English in the major program). At the same time we are responding to the needs of a changing society (with focus on the writer's individuality in the writing program; by approaching literature in terms of its ethnic or thematic base in the core curriculum program; with new emphasis on modern literature in the major program) (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:114).

The Sociology Department provides an instructive contrast to the way English transformed its denominational college coursework. The course most reminiscent of the de-

partment's roots in the School of Sociology, "Christian Social Action," was simply dropped by the 1955-56 term, never to reappear. The other two courses depicted in Table 1 followed more circuitous paths to extinction. "Marriage and the Family" was renumbered and retitled by the 1955-56 term. Its new title "Sociology of the Family," reflects a change in emphasis from educating about the functional importance of the nuclear family to the social dynamics affecting it. The difference in approach may appear subtle but is significant. Once educating about the family is approached with social scientific objectivity, denominational and other a priori assumptions about what constitutes the "good" family are much harder to defend. With the new title, the 1955 Sociology Department was more in a position to examine the sweeping changes in U.S. society affecting the structure of the family.

A similar change occurred with the "Papal Social Encyclicals" course. Although assigned another number in the 1955-56 terms, this course remained essentially unchanged until the 1967-70 Catalog. Then it simply disappeared.

The divestation of Sociology's last denominational course seems to have been presaged as early as 1947 by the Department's goal statement. On first consideration, it is puzzling that it took so long to accomplish it. But this apparent anomaly is largely a function of the erratic availability of LU catalogs. One of the reasons the 1955-56

Departmental goal statement is so expressly research-oriented is that at that time the Sociology M.A. program was introduced into the Graduate School[8] (Fredericks et al., 1983:51). Probably for this reason the 1955-56 term figures so prominently in the fate of Sociology's denominational curricula. As part of the process of entry into the Graduate School, Sociology felt obliged to identify itself with research in the advancement of disciplinary knowledge. Still, the papal encyclicals course was required of all RC students by the College as late as 1969. The course remained as long as the requirement did (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1965-66:121-125; 1967-69:153-156).

LU Sociology's stated research emphasis had not been appreciably altered by 1981. At that time, its primary objective remained education in sociological methods and theory. A concern with establishing a new non-denominational role for itself within the liberal arts tradition of the school was also manifested.

> . . . Introducing students to sociology as a social science, the department seeks to develop a critical understanding of the ways people relate to each other through the organization of society and how social structure and institutions influence our lives. . . .
>
> Sociology thus provides essential information for anyone wishing to take serious responsibility for

---

[8]Sociology's exclusion from the Graduate School until this late date, and other aspects of its development at LU are the topic of extended discussion in Chapter III.

> the world we are building. Loyola's undergraduate sociology program, therefore, is geared to meet the needs of several different kinds of students: those wishing to prepare for graduate study in sociology or a related discipline; students interested in careers in law, the health professions, business, government, teaching, or social service; and students who simply want new insights into their role as informed, responsible citizens (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:199).

Before discussing Table 2, it is helpful to note a common thread in both English's and Sociology's elimination of denominational curricula. With the exception of the "Marriage and Family" course (which had already been substantially revised in the mid 1950s), both departments listed no such courses by 1967-69. The vacancies left were filled by 1973 with additional substantive courses that reflected disciplinary concerns.

As Table 2 demonstrates, the response of the LU History Department to its denominational curriculum has been more ambivalent. Its lone denominational course in 1947, "Protestant Revolt and Roman Catholic Reform," has never completely disappeared from the catalog. The course has, however, undergone a kind of reorientation similar to Sociology's course on marriage and the family. In the 1967-69 Catalog, the course was given a much more neutral title (simply "The Reformation"). This allowed a topic important to disciplinary interests to be covered without the obvious apologetic overtones implied by coupling it with the RC Counter-Reformation. The rationale for such a change had been stated in the 1961-62 departmental objectives.

TABLE 2.--EROSION OF DENOMINATIONAL CURRICULA (11)

Department	Course Number and Title by Year of Change				
	'47-66	'67-72	'73-76	'77-78	'79-81
History	#331* Protestant Revolt and RC Reform	Renamed "The Reformation"	Renumbered (#212)	nc	Renumbered (#313)*
				Course added: #314 "The Changing Church 1500-1700	Renamed "Europe in Transition to Modern Times, 1450-1650"
			#331 renamed "The Russian Revolution and the Soviet Union"	nc	nc
			Course added: #388* "American Catholicism: Its Classes and Cultures 1840-1970"	nc	Renumbered (#389)* and renamed "Social History of American Religion"

NOTE:

* means cross-listed with religion/theology department.

Although not eradicating the legitimacy of its traditional role within the College (i.e., familiarizing students with the achievements of the West through the lens of Christianity), the 1961 statement argued strongly for history's role as a scientific discipline.

> History is a core subject with respect to the Catholic and humanistic educational aims of the University. In the liberal arts curriculum, its purpose is to discipline the mind through training in the special methodology of historical analysis and synthesis. In addition, it gives the student important insight into the culture in which he lives through the perspective of its historical development and encourages him to develop and refine the values which give him balance and judgement for Catholic living (Arts & sciences Catalog, 1961-62: 82).

The 1961 statement's emphasis on research methods continued in the 1969-70 departmental statement.

> History complements other liberal studies. It develops special insights into the culture in which the student has to live and helps him to view it through the perspective of time and change. It helps to discipline his mind through the methodology of historical analysis and synthesis. It stimulates him to develop judgement for a Christian life (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1969-70: 132-138).

The 1969 statement reversed the department's earlier order of presentation of its dual goals (i.e., furtherance of RC College philosophy and disciplinary research). The new statement did not contain the word "Catholic" at all, substituting for it the more general "Christian."

But unlike the other two department's irreversible elimination of denominational curricula, the 1973-74 History Department offered a course bearing many of the

characteristics of earlier College-oriented ones. Entitled "American Catholicism: Its Classes and Cultures 1840-1970," this class combined an emphasis on Catholicism with historical research on the RC subpopulation. The course's creation suggests that the History Department was continuing an interest in bridging the denominational and research emphases. In addition, the Department in 1977-78 added another course covering that segment of the 1947 Reformation course which had been deleted with its change of title. "The Changing Church 1500-1700" focused on the RC response to the Reformation; a topic which unmistakeably reflected LU's denominational ties to the target of most Reformation symbolism. The course's wording openly displayed its founding premise that a historical movement followed the Reformation.

Despite such attempts at rapprochement, the History Department at the end of the period of this study seems to have leapt off the curricular bridge between College programming and disciplinary research on the side of research. In the 1979-81 Catalog, both the "Changing Church" and "American Catholicism" courses underwent substantial revision which seem to have resulted in formally removing any explicit denominational emphasis within either topic. "The Changing Church" became "Europe in Transition in Modern Times, 1450-1650." "American Catholicism" became "Social

History of American Religions" (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:128-138).

Paralleling these curricular changes, the History objectives statement was again rewritten, reemphasizing disciplinary research and a general appreciation for "cultures, ideas, values, and value systems."

> The History Department aims in its curriculum to develop an understanding of all aspects of the past. It includes consideration of cultures, ideas, values and value systems. It fosters an appreciation of historical writing as a form of literature, and teaches the methods of historical analysis. History, as a discipline, develops special insights into the culture in which students live; it encourages students to view their culture through the perspective of time and change (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:129).

The 1979 formulation is apparently a first attempt at reorienting the department to the College without denominational overtones (neither "Catholic" nor "Christian" appeared).

Because Theology (or Religion, as it was called in 1947) was originally so intimately associated with the College curriculum and "Catholic philosophy of life," its development represents the attempt by the least autonomous field within the Ratio to establish disciplinary independence and credibility. The fifteen courses offered by the 1947 department conformed to denominational, rather than disciplinary, needs. Six out of the remaining eleven titles focused explicitly on Catholicism. These included: (1) "The Sacraments"; (2) "Catholic Morals" I and II; (3)

"Creation and Redemption," described as the study of "Catholic dogma"; (4) "Catholic Life and Worship," which concentrated on the mass. The prerequisite for a number of courses was either "Survey of the Catholic Religion" or graduation from an RC secondary school (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:86-87). Four of the remaining nine courses (aimed at non-RC students who also had to fulfill Religion requirements) were simply labelled "Bible Study I" through IV[9] (#'s 101-104) (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:86-87).

By the 1967-69 academic year (a point at which significant curricular change occurred in all the departments described), the Theology Department had eliminated its most obvious denominational elements. Its name had been changed to "Theology" as of 1961 (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1961-62: 114-115), and most of the 1947 offerings explicitly aimed at Catholicism had been reorganized in less RC-specific terminology. The sacraments course had become "Theology of the Sacraments," and the RC morals classes repackaged into one course entitled "Moral Problems" (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1967-69:160-162). The 1947 dogmatics course "Creation and Redemption" was divided into two new ones called "Theology of God and the World" and "Theology of the Incarnation and Redemption" (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1967-69:

---

[9]Cf. the complete listing of 1947-48 Religion offerings in Appendix V.

160-62). Both courses considered topics which had formerly been treated within the well-defined purview of pre-Vatican II RC Theology. The 1967-79 Theology Department's emerging curricular emphasis on theological issues rather than denominational belief further manifested itself in the new title given to the 1947-48 course on RC worship, "Liturgy and the Eucharist." This and another class, "Ecumenism in the Twentieth Century" were obviously devised with Vatican II in mind (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1967-69:160-62). Nevertheless, the change in departmental philosophy had not completely surfaced even by the end of the decade. The 1967-69 class on ecumenism appeared exclusively at the LU Rome Center campus. The same year's departmental objectives exhibited ambivalence about the new direction being taken.

> The faculty of the Department of Theology endeavors to present the life, personality, and teaching of Jesus Christ as the organic principle of unity for Catholic thought, worship, culture, and holiness. Aided by a high level of theological instruction, the students can gain a mature understanding of their faith, some ability to relate to the needs of complex modern life and society, and an inspired zeal to follow Christ in bringing the gifts of truths of faith to humanity (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1967-69:160).

As of 1981, the LU Theology offerings clearly reflected disciplinary over denominational emphases, but not to the same degree as the other departments. While the 1967 moral problems and sacraments course remained un-

changed, the two classes created out of the 1947 "Creation and Redemption" course had undergone further rewording. "God and the World of Man" and "Theological Perspectives on Man" experienced further modifications in the direction of theological topics originally treated as components of RC orthodoxy (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:216-221). In the same vein, the 1967 "Liturgy and Eucharist" class was described in 1979 as "Christian Worship." The successors of the early Bible courses for non-RC students had evolved into a contingent of offerings of general and world religion. These included: (1) "American Religious History"; (2) "Contemporary Protestantism", (3) "Basic Ideas and Practices of Judaism"; (4) "Eastern Religions" (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:216-221).

Still, the Department's stated purpose remained much more tied to Catholicism than the other departments. Its primary emphasis continued to be educating about "Jesus Christ as the organic principle of unity for Catholic thought, worship, culture, and holiness." Although this educational task was to be aided by a "high level of theological instruction," no mention of preparation for graduate work was made (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-82:216-221). The 1967 objectives reappeared, with the solitary difference of a parting mention of non-RC curricula.

> . . . The Department of Theology also offers courses in the tenets of other Christian religions, the

Jewish religion, Eastern religions, and courses in comparative religion (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81: 215).

The polar opposite case to Theology's incomplete divestment of denominational curricula and objectives is the departmental development of Psychology. By 1947 Psychology already exhibited no overtly denominational coursework.[10] Its goal statement at that time was amenable to the unified educational philosophy of the College mainly because it mentioned the importance of understanding the "nature of man," but it more clearly articulated its research emphasis (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1955-56:58). As of 1965, the Department externally appeared much like the other departments (with the exception of Theology) as a result of their increased emphasis on research. The Department numbered eleven full-time faculty (as compared to 31 English, 22 History, and 7 Sociology), and still retained the 1947 goal statement (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1965-66: 118). Immediately thereafter, Psychology experienced an incredibly rapid growth. The 1967-69 Catalog chronicles a full-time faculty over twice as large (25 compared to 11) as its predecessor (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1967-69:150). While acknowledging that growth occurred among most departments during this period, Psychology's phenomenal increase

---

[10]"Rational Psychology" is not included here because it would have been much less recognizeable as RC-related except by a select number of Catholics.

dwarfs the others. The English faculty, for instance, grew in the same period from thirty-one to thirty-five, and History from twenty-two to thirty (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1965-66:84-122; 1967-69:108-156). It is beyond the scope of this chapter to discuss the reasons behind Psychology's tremendous growth except to note its obvious connection to the departments longstanding research emphasis.[11]

Besides the rapid and dramatic growth of faculty, the 1967-69 Psychology Department also revised its objectives. Interestingly, at the time when most of the other departments considered were intent on solidifying their efforts to establish research as a priority, Psychology took another tack. It clearly reestablished the Department's dual emphases on disciplinary research and providing insights concerning the "liberal education of Loyola students" and "perennial philosophy of man."

> . . . The courses in Psychology are designed:
> 1. to contribute meaningfully to the liberal education of Loyola students;
> 2. to foster basic research in the areas of theoretical and applied psychology;
> 3. to serve as ground work for advanced studies in psychology and related fields; and
> 4. to maintain the principles of a true and perennial philosophy of man as a guide to interpretation of the findings of psychology in all areas (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1967-69:150-152).

As of the 1979-81 Catalog, LU Psychology had not appreciably

---

[11] I discuss this topic at some length in Chapter III.

altered its clearly stated dual emphases and now included thirty-one full-time faculty (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:187).

Growth of Departmental Requirements for Majors

I will close this discussion of the erosion of denominational curricula by briefly analyzing changes in the extent and format of departmental major requirements between 1947 and 1981. In 1947-48 all of the departments (besides Religion) required that majors take twenty-four hours (8 courses) within the department. Almost all remaining coursework required for the bachelor's degree was stipulated by the College. Practically speaking, College and departmental requirements are a zero-sum game. A gain in coursework under the jurisdiction of the departments diminishes the amount of courses through which the College can communicate its own educational philosophy. The first set of departments allowed to demand more hours of their majors was the humanities (see Table 3 below).

The fact that the average number of required hours in a student's major department rose almost fifty percent between 1947 and 1981 (from 24 to 34.5)[12] manifests the tension between the departments and the College during the period. The dynamics of the struggle for departmental

[12]This figure does not include Theology, since it had no major in 1947.

TABLE 3.--GROWTH OF REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPARTMENTAL MAJORS

Dept.	'47-48	'55-56	'67-69	'69-70	'71-72	'73-81
English	24	30	30	36	36	36
History	24	30	30	30	36	36
Psychology	24	24	30	30	30	30
Sociology	24	24	24	30	30	36
Theology	na	24	24	30	30	30

NOTE: Based on 1947-48 through 1979-81 Arts & Sciences Catalogs

autonomy are further illuminated by the changes required by the College within some of the departments.

The Sociology courses required by the College in 1947 ("Marriage and the Family" and "Papal Social Encyclicals," both cross-listed with Religion) reflect a considerably different perspective on the role of sociology within the curriculum than that of "Introduction to Sociology," similarly required in 1967 (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:86-88; 1967-69:171-174). The difference is between that of the College-subsidized study of social problems as interpreted by an overarching "Catholic philosophy of life" and an introduction to a separate area of knowledge as part of a student's "general education." A similar pattern of replacement operated in Psychology, where the 1947-48 "Rational Psychology" course had given way in 1967 to "General Psychology" (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:84; 1967-69:150).

Such substitutions of formal introductory courses for formerly College-oriented ones within Arts and Sciences requirements facilitated departmental juggling of major requirements. It also obviated the need for raising the total number of hours taken by majors, since they had a head start in disciplinary understandings. Hence while only raising its total major requirements three hours since 1947, the Psychology department by 1967 demanded thirty percent more disciplinary-specific coursework than it had

at that time (from 21 to 31 hours) (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:84-86; 1967-69:150-152). In light of the erosion of the traditional function of College-required coursework in such departments as Psychology and Sociology, it is not surprising that by 1979 no such requirement existed in either department (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:187-199). In contrast, both English and History majors in 1981 had to take more total department hours than those in Psychology, but included in that sum was six hours (#'s 101 and 102) still largely reflective of the College's interest in a broadening educational experience[13] (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:114-119, 128-137).

There seems, then, to have been two departmental routes to more autonomy within the College. One was the addition of more total hours, keeping in place the original courses mandated by the College. Both English and History followed this pattern. The other was the substitution of discipline-specific coursework for ones originally College-oriented. Although not always raising the total number of hours demanded of majors, this strategy enabled a department to produce more specialized majors. Both Psychology

---

[13] In the case of English, the 1979-81 courses were "Writing" I and II; in History, "The Evolution of Western Ideas and Institutions to the Seventeenth Century" and "The Evolution of Western Ideas and Institutions Since the Seventeenth Century." Both were descendents of the Ratio's emphasis on literary expression and Western Culture.

and Sociology used this approach. Interestingly, the latter successfully used both strategies at different times. By 1981, its majors were required to take thirty-six department hours (equal to the humanities departments). In addition, its College-required courses had been changed from a denominational topic to "Introduction to Sociology" (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1967-69:153-156).

II. Changes in LU Objectives

This section is an analysis of two different sets of goal statements at LU. The first, "University Objectives," is a statement historically located at the front of the LU catalogs. Its purpose is to articulate the corporate mission of the entirety of LU schools and colleges. The second set of formulations present the aims of the College, on which this study focuses. It has traditionally been placed just before catalog outlines of curricula.

The first set examined is LU university objectives.

University Objectives

The 1947 statement of university objectives was frankly denominational. The purpose of LU's education was conceived as the integration of (sub)"cultural improvement" and professional skills with the "Catholic philosophy of life." Religious training played a pivotal part (cf. excerpted passage on p. 33 above). An included passage from Pius XI on education calling for the development of a

"supernatural man" formed the centerpiece of the statement.

> The true Christian produced by Christian education is the supernatural man[14] who thinks, judges, and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason illumined by the supernatural light of Christ's example and teaching (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48: 5-6).

The entire statement made two references to "Catholic" and/or "Christian." It mentioned "Jesuit" once. Because the presence of such overtly religious terms alters significantly over the period considered, it is worthwhile to outline the implications of the 1947 formulation. First, the LU of 1947 was distinctively RC. The University stated this openly, and cited recent papal teaching on education to back it up. Second, the drafters of the statement seem to have been less concerned with demonstrating LU's "Jesuitness" to its RC target population than with asserting its Catholicity.[15]

The 1947 formulation had a long life. It remained unchanged until the 1971-72 Catalog, when in place of the quotation from Pius XI the following appeared.

> . . . The policy of this University, then, has at heart the intellectual, the professional, the social, and the

---

[14]Another trait of the denominaitonal-era descriptions is their pronounced chauvinism. As demonstrated in later catalogs, more inclusive language has emerged with less denominationally-oriented goal statements.

[15]As is discussed shortly, the school's organizational structure reflected the influence of its founders so strongly that it may have appeared redundant to stress it in the statement.

> religious welfare of all its students. Like St. Ignatius Loyola, whose name the University is honored to bear, Loyola has dedicated its educational activities "to the greater glory of God" (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1971-72:3).

The complete statement included the word "Catholic" twice and "Jesuit" once, and made no reference to "Christian." The changes in the 1971 statement are perhaps best interpreted in light of the curricular changes outlined in section II above. Following extensive alteration of the educational content of degrees administered by the College (and presumably within other LU components as well), it is not surprising that a rewritten set of university objectives appeared. What is surprising is that new objectives did not emerge sooner. However, formal self-description usually lags behind structural change because organizations often wait until new patterns stabilize before establishing a new rationale.[16] If we accept this interpretation of the covariance between organizational change and corporate self-descriptions, then the explanation for the direction taken by the 1971 changes in LU's university ogjectives is patently clear. Symbolic of these changes was replacement of the Pius XI quotation with a passage emphasizing LU's Jesuit traditions ("Like St. Ignatius Loyola, whose name the University is honored to bear . . .") thus giving more

---

[16]It is also worth mentioning that college catalogs contain a built-in lag, since they do not appear until at least a year after they are written.

emphasis to the school's "Jesuitness" than to its Catholicity.

The new emphasis solidified in the 1973-74 version. A foreward written by the president, Raymond Baumhart, S.J., supplanted the university objectives statement. It clearly emphasized LU's Jesuitness above any other institutional characteristic.

> . . . The educational mission of Loyola University, [sic] includes the gathering and dissemination of knowledge, a goal common to all universities. This tradition, as embodied at Loyola, emphasizes the development of the traditional student, including social, moral, and spiritual growth within the Judeo-Christian framework.
>
> The goal of Jesuit higher education is men and women who are intellectually mature, whose lives express the values which they embrace, who spend themselves in service to their fellow man, and who view their good works as a contribution to the glory of God. As a Catholic university, Loyola University's objective is to be a Christian presence in institutional form in the academic world and to confront the major problems of our day (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1973-74:3).

All told, the foreword mentioned "Jesuit" four times; more than twice any other religious word. Both "Catholic" and "Christian" appeared twice. Two new adjectives not related to religion also surfaced in 1973: The fact that LU was "independent" appeared twice; its "urban" location once.

This new Jesuit-yet-independent corporate rationale reinforced the significant 1971 shift in the marketing of LU. For many reasons, the school's former official identification with Catholicism needed to be modified. The university's response to the need for a change in rationale

took place in two steps. The first (1971-72) was largely negative. The most overt symbol of LU's association with the RC church disappeared, replaced by a simple affirmation of the school's undeniable ties to Ignatius Loyola. The second is chronicled in the 1973 Catalog, when not only Ignatius, but the order he founded were named in the mission statement. This emphasis on the school's Jesuitness dovetailed nicely with the newly established independent status of the school.[17] LU remained tangibly linked to its denominational roots, while avoiding the disadvantages of being completely identified with them.

LU's Jesuit-yet-independent corporate identity accommodated the altered U.S. (and RC) environment of the 1970s. The majority of RCs had now attained higher socio-economic positions than those the denominational RC college served. There was less need among them for an RC college/university which would assure students' Catholicity than for a respectable private university which gave access to professional occupations. At the level of the College, independent status lent post hoc legitimacy to curricular trends during the 1960s away from socialization.[18] By

---

[17] LU was officially incorporated as an independent university in 1970. The school no longer officially belonged to the Jesuit order, but it continued to hold a sort of caretaker status (see the more detailed discussion of this topic which appears below).

[18] An important bellwether of the practical dynamics of switching from denominational to independent Jesuit

simultaneously removing legal jurisdiction for LU from the Jesuit order, the Jesuit-yet-independent status potentially allowed the school to have it both ways. It could proudly proclaim its Jesuitness, yet enjoy the financial benefits of eligibility for government funding.

The 1973 corporate rationale has remained in place since its articulation in the early 1970s. As of 1981, it retained its position of prominence at the beginning of the Catalog (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:4).

College of Arts and Sciences Objectives

The strong influence of the Ratio on the College has already been noted. Because of that influence, the College's interpretation of its own curricular dynamics in 1947 exhibited an apologetic tone. Acknowledging that the classics held a diminished position in curricula at that time, the Arts and Sciences objectives nonetheless aimed at the continued development of "true and perfect Christians."

> . . . Both the expanse of modern learning and the uneven collegiate preparation of youth in an age of mass education have led the modern Jesuit college to allow a greater variety of studies and professions, at the price of less stress on classic literatures and philosophy. But the number of constant or prescribed courses still remains large, relative to other university

---

status is the role of theology in the curriculum. As a department, it must stand on its own as a source and expositor of disciplinary research. Recent canon law changes threaten to undermine the viability of this arrangement by requiring ecclesiastical approval of Theology faculty (LU faculty council minutes, 1983:3).

> programs, and extends to major fields such as languages, history and other social studies, philosophy, religion, science, and expression. The required and related courses in the college, the religious activities, the approved extracurricular organizations among students, and the rules for students are means carefully directed to the formation of the true and perfect Christian (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:16-17).

Paraphrasing the 1947 College self-description, it was a Ratio-inspired program regrettably forced by the exigencies of the times to restrict its reliance on the classics and their scholastic interpretation. Yet it still demanded that its students take predominantly "constant" subjects (like religion and rational psychology), and retained its strong emphasis on extracurricular forms of socialization. Required religious activities headed this component of the College program.[19]

The 1947-48 College statement remained until 1971, when a new emphasis on general education appeared. The 1971 statement took the form of a detailed explanation of the required College requirements. It asserted that the coursework intentionally provided all students with exposure to subjects they may not have taken otherwise. Thus, science majors had to take History and English literature courses, and humanities majors natural science, psychology and social science (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1971-72:62).

> In this way, every student, in his pursuit of truth, becomes acquainted with fields of knowledge about which

---

[19]Discussion of required religious observance comprises Section IV, which immediately follows.

> he might otherwise remain in almost total ignorance. All curricula emphasize this process of "general education" in the first two years (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1971-72:24).

It is probably not coincidental that the 1971-72 restatement of the College objectives accompanied the secularized university objectives of that year. Indeed it would have been quite difficult to defend the College's earlier mix of socialization and education when the university had eradicated its most overt RC references. The picture of an LU Arts and Sciences degree painted in 1971 portrayed a liberal arts education, as opposed to an RC Ratio Studiorum-inspired one.

Much as the 1973-74 university goal statement strengthened the trend away from RC identifications, that year's College statement reinforced the emphasis on liberal arts. In fact the entire College curriculum underwent revision in a well-worded rationale based on the aims of liberal arts education.

> A liberal arts curriculum should try to develop the following in its students: Analytic thinking, objectivity, integrative thinking, a sense of history, an understanding of man's complex relationships to his fellows and the physical universe, together with his attempts to understand his origin and destiny. The core curriculum is a first step in this process. . . (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1973-74:44).

The aims of the College now encompassed only the intellectual aspects of what had formerly characterized LU's undergraduate program. These included: (1) analytic thinking; (2) objectivity; (3) integrative thinking; (4) a

sense of history; (5) "a sense of man's complex relationship to his fellows and the physical universe." Other than an oblique (and non-denominational) reference to understanding one's "origin and destiny," specifically denominational emphases which had been the centerpiece of the 1947 statement were conspicuously absent.

The particulars of the College curriculum amounted to a thoughtful reorientation of what had become an anachronistic set of department-oriented offerings. Rather than stipulate particular courses, the 1973 "core curriculum" (Core) recognized distributions of related fields of knowledge. Generally, students had to take two or three classes in each distribution (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1973-74:44-46).

The key element of the statement explicitly described appropriate core coursework in each area. In natural science, for instance, a core course should introduce and familiarize students with the scientific method (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1973-74:44-46). Such a course in the social sciences explicated the difference between natural and social science. Simple inroductory courses did not fit the description.

> Introductory courses, insofar as they provide the student with a first experience of a separate discipline, are usually less than ideal for this purpose (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1973-74:45).

Significantly, the description of Theology classes designed

for College degree requirements remained abstract.

> It is up to the Theology department and to the freshman academic counseling program to evaluate each student's background and devise a program for him that will permit him to reach an appropriate level of theological understanding that will enable him to follow up his own theological interests intelligently (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1973-74:45).

The 1973 Core and its rationale presented the College with a clearly stated agenda for its new non-denominational philosophy of education. The organization of coursework has subsequently remained intact, with the exception of a 1979 addition in the area of mathematics/ natural science. These fields were divided, and each assigned specific curriculum hours (1 course in mathematics, 2 courses in natural science) (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:46). In addition, a new rationale for the Core appeared which strongly emphasized the College's Jesuitness. The statement described Jesuit education as stressing that a human being is:

> . . . 1. a responsible member of society; 2. an individual with an inquiring mind; 3. able to express himself; 4. "a thinker about humanity's place in the broad universe of being"; 5. a "believer in God and God's intervention into history" (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:45).

The 1979 Core statement mentioned a number of goals cited in 1973 by Pedro Arrupe, S.J., the Jesuit superior general. Among these were the formation of: (1) "persons-for-others"; (2) persons fashioned in a new humanism characterized by "responsiblity to our brothers and to history";

(3) "persons aware of history"; (4) "persons of reflection and critical judgement"; (5) persons formed "with a passion for Justice" (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:45). The statement stipulated that the course numbers 100 to 130 and 270 to 295 in all departments should be reserved for Core coursework (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:44-45).

All told, similar patterns of change run through the thirty-nine years in both university and College statements of formal objectives. For my purposes, however, the patterns within the College are more important. During most of the period (24 years), the College's objectives remained much as they had been in 1947. With the Ratio as guide, undergraduate programs intentionally fostered an educational synthesis based primarily on scholastic philosophy. Although the Jesuits may have grudgingly shelved their stress on the classics, they had not abandoned their emphasis on RC socialization. Elements of this aspect of the College philosophy permeated the curriculum, as well as the extracurricular experience of students.

After both internal and external pressures to eliminate the strictly denominational aspects of its program reached their peak in the mid-1960s, College self-descriptions changed considerably. They began to emphasize the program's liberal arts tradition. As of 1973, LU's liberal arts description underwent further modification, portraying it as explicitly Jesuit yet with only vague RC ties.

Although the validity of this stress on the close continuity between the new Jesuit liberal arts and earlier Ratio-inspired programs is questionable (as described above, considerable discrepancies are evident), it did facilitate the appearance of continuity. This desired outcome was partially the result of the symmetry of the Jesuit General's vision with recent documents of the larger RC church.[20] Still, LU's Jesuit-yet-independent form of liberal arts contained few of the curricular elements formerly identified with Jesuit education, and none of the extracurricular.

III. Changes in Student Regulations

The purpose of this section is to examine whether or not LU's College rules governing students underwent the hypothesized shift away from an "in loco parentis" interpretation of its operation. There is little room for doubt that such an understanding grounded the 1947 religious programming. The College took responsibilitu for both instructional and behavioral reinforcement of student's RC backgrounds.

---

[20] Arrupe's aims for Jesuit higher education have been echoed in a large assortment of non-Jesuit literature. A small sampling of such literature included "Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church" (United States Catholic Conference, 1980), the 1980 general report of the International Federation of Catholic Universities (I.F.C.U. General Report, 1980), and the entire issue on Peace and Justice Education in "Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education" (Vol. 1:2, 1981).

> In addition to the thorough religious instruction by regular classes in religion, Loyola University adopts many other means of promoting a sincere Catholic way of living in its students (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:28).

Few aspects of how to maintain their Catholicism were left to students' imaginations. Formal disciplinary procedures followed non-compliance in two denominational activities. First, students had to attend a weekly mass designated for their class or section. No excuses for non-attendance were accepted. The seriousness with which the rule was interpreted manifests itself in this proviso from the 1961-62 Catalog.

> Since the Student Mass is equally a part of the student's academic schedule, no Catholic student will be excused from the Student Mass for any reason, regardless of outside work, distance from school, class schedule, etc. (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1961-62:17).

Secondly, all RC students had to attend a mandatory three-day annual retreat. Non-RC students simultaneously attended a series of conferences on "moral questions" during this period of time (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:28).

Other telltale indicators of the <u>in loco parentis</u> RC socialization of students also existed. Official RC-designated Holy Days of Obligation (i.e., mass attendance mandatory) effectively shut down the College, since they counted as free days. Moreover, the 1947 Catalog noted that each class taught in the College began with a prayer (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:28). The mass and retreat regulations remained in place until 1965-66. Then

the Catalog's wording changed significantly from "required" to "encouraged" weekly mass attendance (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1965-66:19). The retreat rule finally disappeared in 1969, after undergoing a name change in 1967. In that, the final year that the rule existed at LU, its official designation was "Christian Renewal Requirement" (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1967-69:34).

Considering the massive influence for largescale modification of the College's denominational approach, the demise of mass and retreat regulations for RC students in the 1960s was a fait accompli. As the most obvious component of LU's denominationalism, such regulations headed the list of things which must be jettisoned for the school to establish itself as a fundworthy institution. Nevertheless, serious implications accompanied their removal. Because of the enforced status of certain kinds of religious behavior as the hallmark of the College's extracurricular socialization, mass and retreat regulations took with them the entirety of LU's program in this area. In effect, the College had restricted itself to a contractual relationship with students for the very specific service of a college education.

Although it took the College's objectives statement fully four years to reflect the fact (the first revised College self-description appeared in 1971), as soon as the religious behavior requirements gave way, its dynamics were

irrevocably altered, and the management of religious activities was given over to a newly created office of "campus ministry." Thereafter, only curricular methods of instruction in Catholicism could be considered legitimate. Yet departmental initiatives toward disciplinary autonomy seriously jeopardized even that possibility.

IV. Changes in Jesuit Participation in Governance

Three forms of change in LU's governance over the period of analysis merit consideration. The first, Jesuit presence on the Board of Trustees, is an index of the School's legal ownership. Second, the differing ratios of principal administrators of the College belonging to the Jesuit order present another measure of Jesuit presence in the infrastructure of LU. Finally, the ratio of Jesuit faculty members is a measure of the curricular presence of the order. Indices of both administrative forms of institutional presence appear immediately below in Table 4. Figures on Jesuit faculty members are included in Table 5.

The principal change during the period of this study in Jesuit membership on the board of trustees appeared in the 1971 Arts and Sciences Catalog. At that time, reflecting the 1970 establishment of an LU Corporation autonomous from the Jesuit community, a layman became chairman (Hartnett & Menges, 1981:6). This meant that for the fist time in the school's history, the members of the

TABLE 4.--DECLINING JESUIT PARTICIPATION IN LU GOVERNANCE

Year	Percentage Who Were Jesuits (raw N)	
	Board of Trustees*	Principal Administrators**
1947-48	100 (5)	50 (11)
1955-56	100 (6)	50 (9)
1961-62	100 (9)	42 (11)
1965-66	100 (8)	30 (11)
1969-70	100 (9)	30 (10)
1971-72	94 (16)	14 (15)
1973-74	50 (11)	19 (6)
1979-81	33 (7)	8 (3)

*Information based on Arts & Sciences Catalogs.

**Those administrators listed under headings "Offficers of Administration" and "Officers of Personnel and Services." In subsequent years, those listed under comparable headings are included. Later headings used in addition to the 1947 ones are "General Administration" (from 1955 on) and "Administrative Staff of the College of Arts and Sciences (1973).

Board were not all Jesuits. Since then, the ratio of Jesuits on the Board has steadily dwindled. By 1981 it barely satisfied the ratio of "one-third plus one" stipulated by the articles of separate incorporation.

The recent changes in Board membership are tantamount to an official recognition on the part of LU that it has ceased to operate as a denominational college. The "one-third plus one" provision is a legal formula for LU's transformation from a denominational Jesuit-owned school to an independent "Jesuit-affiliated" one. Following the logic that official descriptions are post hoc acknowledgments of structural change, it is quite reasonable that the revision of the Board would have occurred sometime about 1970. Numerous curricular, legal and theological factors had been operating for some time to bring it about.

As Table 4 clearly demonstrates, Jesuit presence among the College's principal administrative jobs does not bifurcate into two discrete "eras," as does Board membership. There have been three distinct stages of Jesuit presence among administrators.

The first phase clearly demonstrates a longstanding major difference between the ratio of Jesuits among administrators and members of the Board. Whereas in the earliest year considered in this study only one-half of LU administrators belonged to the Jesuit order, all the Board members did. The one-half Jesuit administrative ratio at

LU--which, with only a slight decrease in 1967, maintained for 14 years after 1947--roughly compares to the forty-five percent of such jobs filled by Jesuits among all U.S. Jesuit colleges and universities as of the late 1950s (Reiss, 1969:110).

Yet as Table 4 indicates, the ratio of Jesuits in College administrative posts had dropped appreciably by the mid-1960s. The thirty percent at LU who belonged to the order in 1965 was also comparable to the national figures for Jesuit higher education at that time (23% of all Jesuit colleges and universities), but it did not lessen the magnitude of the problem of declining Jesuit controls (Reiss, 1969:110). This second stage of the dwindling numbers of Jesuits in College administration occurred during a period of rapidly increasing enrollment and physical development.[21] The period encouraged the expansion of administrative positions at a time when the order possessed insufficient numbers to reassert its control over LU. The result was a declining ratio of Jesuit administrators not due to attrition (i.e., by death, transfer, or resignation), but simply because of the introduction of more such jobs. The actual

---

[21]During the five years in which the thirty percent ratio of Jesuit to other College administrators held steady, a number of building projects occurred on the Lake Shore campus, where most College students are enrolled. These included the construction of: 1. Damen Hall, a 10-story science/classroom facility; 2. Mertz Hall, a 29-story dormitory, student center and theater; 3. an additional wing for Cudahy Library (Hartnett & Menges, 1981:appendix).

number of Jesuits in LU administration declined by only one man in the decade of the 1960s, despite the fact that by 1967 there were twelve percent fewer of them than there had been in 1961 (30% as compared to 42%).

The third stage began with a drop of approximately fifty percent between the 1967-69 and 1971-72 Catalogs (30% to 14%). Since that time, the average ratio of Jesuit to other College administrators has averaged fourteen percent, although the 1979-81 Catalog indicated the strong possibility that the ratio will drop even further. This decline has been more a function of shrinking numbers of Jesuits occupying such posts than administrative expansion. As of 1981 there were almost three-quarters fewer Jesuits in high LU College jobs than there had been in 1947. Although no current national figures on Jesuit schools are available, the LU ratio of eight percent Jesuit administrators was approximately one-half the figure predicted by Reiss (1969: 110) some ten years earlier. Clearly, by 1981 LU's top management had ceased to operate as a virtual extension of the order. Table 5 (see below) dramatically depicts the decline in Jesuit faculty at LU over the thirty-three years. But to present the decline as clearly as possible, it is necessary to comment briefly on the 1947-48 figures. The ratio of eighteen percent Jesuit faculty in that year is clearly anomalous. It is highly unlikely that LU's Jesuit faculty ratio would have been so much less than the thirty-

TABLE 5.--JESUIT FACULTY AT LU (1947-1981)

Year	Undergraduate Faculty	Percent S.J. Faculty (raw N)
1947-48	163	18 (30)
1958-59	162	30 (48)
1965-66	264	23 (62)
1967-69	248	16 (39)
1969-70	279	15 (42)
1971-72	304	18 (54)
1973-74	461	12 (54)
1977-78	449	12 (55)
1979-81	494	10.5 (52)

SOURCE: Arts & Sciences Catalogs, 1947-48 through 1979-81.

one percent average among U.S. Jesuit colleges and universities for that year (Reiss, 1969:107), since its administrative governance ratios equalled or surpassed the comparable figures. It is even more unlikely in view of the fact that as of 1958, LU's thirty percent Jesuit faculty ratio was higher than the national average figure of 27.5 percent (Reiss, 1969:107). The most logical explanation for the anomalous 1947-48 ratio is that the system of faculty listing by department used in that year failed to reflect significant numbers of Jesuit faculty (which do appear in the later Catalogs' system of alphabetical listings).[22]

Apart from the 1947 figures, Table 5 manifests a clear erosion of Jesuit presence within the undergraduate faculty. Between 1958 and 1981, the ratio of Jesuit faculty declined approximately one-third (from 30% to 10.5%). Not surprisingly, the period of greatest dropoff occurred in the 1900s, although it did not arise from losses in the numbers of Jesuits. As in the case of administrative presence, the losses were more a product of rapid overall faculty growth. Likewise, LU losses in the ratio of Jesuit faculty members generally approximated national data for Jesuit colleges and universities. In fact, by the close of

---

[22]Administrative personnel with academic degrees, for instance (who are included in subsequent listings), may not have appeared in the departmental system.

the period LU faculty contained considerably more Jesuits than the national average projected by Reiss in 1969 (10.5% vs. 5%) (Reiss, 1969:107).

V. Conclusions

As Table 6 (see Below) clearly demonstrates, the four major measures of the denominational ideal-type manifest LU's tangible shift away from it. Although the English Department began earlier to jettison RC-oriented coursework, History, Sociology, and Theology had also eliminated it by 1967. With the exception of History, which through the middle and late 1970s alternately initiated and dismantled such curricula, denominational courses have since disappeared. It is worth mentioning that by 1981, a mild resurgence of College-oriented liberal arts objectives occurred in all departments considered except for Theology, which had retained its original denominational cast.

The largest point of discontinuity in the College's self-description occurred in the 1971-72 Catalog, when a format which had survived intact since at least 1947 gave way to one stressing LU's Catholicity without directly mentioning Pius XI's or any other papal legitimation of its procedures. From then on, LU's official self-description has stressed its Jesuit, independent, and RC character (in that order). This change in emphasis amounted to a claim for LU's continuity over the period of transition. Jesuit

TABLE 6.--TRIANGULATION OF LU DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGE CHANGES

Measure	Academic Year '47-48	'65-66	'67-69	'69-70	'71-72	'73-74	'79-81
Denominational curricula	E,H,S,T	H,S,T	None	None	None	H	H
Mission statement	C,P	C,P	C,P	C,P	C	C,J,I	C,J,I
Student regulations	M,R	R	R	None	None	None	None
Board of Trustees (% S.J.)	100	100	100	100	94	50	33
Administration (S.J.)	50	30	30	30	14	19	8
Faculty (S.J.)	18	23	16	15	18	12	10.5

Mission Statement	Key Denominational Curricula	Student Regulations
C="Catholic" used twice or more	E=English	R=Required retreat
I="Independent" ditto	H=History	M=Required mass
J="Jesuit" ditto	P=Psychology	
P=Pius XI quote included	S=Sociology	
	T=Theology	

education at LU, so the argument went, persisted unchanged in its provision of a quality liberal arts education.

The change in student regulations of the College, which had constituted a major component of the liberal arts program and its denominational emphasis, occurred in two stages. First, the mandatory student mass requirement (which had persisted through the early 1960s) was eliminated in 1965-66. Then the required student retreat expired as of 1967. Neither has been revived since. Nor can they, in view of present legal strictures on educational funding of denominationally sponsored colleges.

For the first time in LU's history, a non-Jesuit name appeared in the 1971-72 Catalog listing of the Board of Trustees (as chairman). This was an important symbolic and structural development, since from then on, the ratio of Jesuit Board members steadily declined. As of 1981, only one-third of Board members belonged to the founding order.

In addition, Jesuit participation in LU's highest management posts diminished in three stages. From an initial ratio of one-half Jesuits at the start of the period under investigation, the figure slipped to thirty percent in the middle 1960s. It remained there until dropping precipitously in 1971 to fourteen percent. Meanwhile, Jesuit faculty presence steadily eroded following the late 1950s, although it was most pronounced during the 1960s.

Dating of the Changeover

It is unrealistic to attempt to specify a particular point at which all the levels of LU's educational processes ceased to function as prescribed in the denominational college model. There is neither theoretical nor empirical justification to impute an all-or-nothing character to the changeover. It is possible, however, to determine a particular span of years during which multiple factors coalesced to affect the change which both makes theoretical sense and is useful for further analysis.

As a cursory examination of Table 6 makes clear, there seems to be more than one pattern of change from denominational college. While student regulations, the ratio of Jesuit Board members, and denominational curricula declined abruptly, other components of the college experienced more complex interactions. The ratio of Jesuit administrators, for instance, seems to have declined in stages (i.e., pre-1965, 1965-1970, and afterwards). Moreover, the transition within LU's mission statements would suggest that the period of RC, then Jesuit-yet-independent, identities straddled a brief period of non-identity during the early 1970s. Yet there is a way to piece together the data displayed in Table 6 so that the various patterns form a coherent picture. Distinguishing between structural change and an organization's official acknolwedgment of it, we can assume that some elements of LU's operation would

undergo significant transformation before others. More concretely, changes in operational procedure and personnel could go on for some time before their outcome is considered stable enough to warrant a revised official self-definition.

The logic of delayed organizational acknowledgment best appears to fit the data presented in this chapter. Structural modification of LU's denominational characteristics in the form of fewer Jesuit administrators, erosion of student religious regulations, and removal of RC-specific courses had become pronounced by the middle 1960s. Not until these patterns had proceeded to the point of irreversibility were the official description and legal status of the school brought into line with the changes. The crucial period of change, then, was 1965-72.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH UNIVERSITY MEASURES AT LOYOLA (1947-1981)

If LU has ceased to function as a denominational college, has it subsequently become a research university? This question relates to the second general hypothesis of this study, and it is the focus of this chapter. As in Chapter II, the analysis proceeds by assessing measures operationalized according to the ideal typologies described in Chapter I. I intend, first, to compare the typical research university's emphasis on departmental majors, nonsectarian self-descriptions, and research emphasis with what has happened at LU since the early 1960s, and then to assess the extent to which LU has in fact developed into a research university.

I. Incomplete Development of the Graduate School

One of the major consequences of the development of the research university has been the emergence of numerous post-graduate programs. As was true of many institutions shortly after the turn of the century, LU developed medical, law, dental, and other professional schools in a very short period of time. As Veysey (1965:337-338) and Ben-David

(1972:16-23, 87-109) have commented, the ease with which the U.S. university (in comparison with universities in Europe) accommodated professional schools by simply adding post-graduate programs to four-year colleges in order to form universities was not only atypical, but also resulted in a blend of theoretical and practical knowledge which has considerably altered how the professions with established university programs understand themselves. From the perspective of the aspiring professions whose training programs became standard parts of the U.S. university (e.g., law, medicine, administration), professional schools meant increased legitimacy and better control over the numbers and types of recruits (Collins, 1979:118-130).[1] But the universities themselves also benefited in at least two ways.

The first was financial. According to Collins (1922:121), prior to adoption of the research model, many colleges were suffering acute money problems. There were too many of them trying to attract too few students. Presented with a viable rationale for attracting would-be professionals who would augment the enrollment of the college,

---

[1]Members of the medical professions, for example, now train within a university medical school; otherwise they are not accepted by the profession or members of society. But because engineering in the U.S. has not developed a single training procedure, no such consensus developed. Engineers subsequently do not control membership to the same degree as M.D's, nor do they enjoy the same monopolistic salary and status benefits (cf. Larson 1977: 19-39; Collins, 1979:22-48.

the schools that could do so enthusiastically embraced this approach and better financial times. Second, the location of professional education within the universtiy has provided the possibility of cross-fertilization of research (Parsons & Platt, 1972:232-246).

Yet according to Parsons and Platt (1972:103-162), the benefits of the U.S. creation of the research university-professional school have not overshadowed an even more significant achievement--the innovation of graduate schools of arts and sciences. They consider the graduate school the core of the university because it performs the vital social function of developing new knowledge. This knowledge resource both informs the teaching of the faculty and becomes accessible to the professional schools and the public (Parsons & Platt, 1973:103-162).[2] In a society built on the principles of scientific verification and rational decision-making, this dual function makes the graduate school the central hub of the university. As already noted, LU maintained the denominational college model much longer than non-RC higher educational centers. One reason for LU's reluctance to alter its traditional structure can be

---

[1]This assertion, as Parsons and Platt have admitted, exhibits some of the most glaring weaknesses of ideal typologies (cf. Parsons & Platt, 1973:156-160). Whether or not the various educational units within the university communicate is debatable. Veysey (1965:337) has claimed that they do not by virtue of a tacit agreement not to invade each other's territory.

found in student enrollment figures over the period under investigation. As of 1947, only 22.5 percent of LU's total students attended postgraduate classes (see Table 7 below). The rest were enrolled in either full- or part-time undergraduate programs. Since that time, the LU ratio of postgraduate students has gradually increased. Its highest point was in 1973, when thirty three percent of all its students attended such classes.

The emphasis on undergraduate education marked the denominational college, which operated without the scientific research rationale. The steady shift in LU's "client" population from approximately one-fifth postgraduate students in 1947 to one-third in 1973 manifests its emerging involvement in postgraduate education. It also suggests the possibility of a more subtle development mentioned by Jencks and Riesman: the introduction of a significant emphasis within the undergraduate programs on pre-profession/pre-graduate level work.

> The function of this change was the birth of what Frank Bowles has called the "university college." In our usage this is a college whose primary purpose is to prepare students for graduate work of some kind--primarily in the arts and sciences but also in professional subjects ranging from law and medicine to business and social work. . . (Jencks & Riesman, 1968:24).

To what extent LU undergraduate education has come to stress postgraduate work is an empirical question that will be addressed shortly in the section on allocation of resources. In order to clarify the pattern of increased

TABLE 7.--GROWTH OF LU GRADUATE DIVISIONS (I): STUDENTS ENROLLED AS OF FALL SEMESTER

year	full-time undergraduate*		postgraduate**		others***		total
	%	N	%	N	%	N	
1947-48	56	3940	22.5	1581	21	1477	1998
1955-56	32	2678	23	1940	44	4618	8294
1965-66	40	5393	22	3003	38	5095	13491
1967-68	37	5265	24	3430	38	5413	14108
1969-70	37	6010	30	4837	33.5	5456	16303
1973-74	38	5845	33	5083	28	4274	15202
1980-81	39	6223	30	4752	30.5	4807	15782

*Includes students in all undergraduate divisions assuming full-time enrollment (i.e., Arts & Sciences, Nursing, Business, Niles College after 1967).

**Includes both the graduate school and various professional schools. See note to Table 8 for complete listing of the professional schools.

***An assortment of part-time and ancillary programs. Included the Dental Hygiene, Dental Assistants, Correspondence Study, Undergraduate Education, Rome Center and Jesuit Theology program. The lion's share of students in this category, however, have been enrolled in the University College.

NOTE: All figures are from the Historical Enrollment Survey of LU (office of Registration & Records, 1982).

postgraduate enrollments at LU, however, it is necessary to further examine the proportion of Graduate School to professional school enrollments within the period. Table 8 addresses this issue (see below)

Table 8 highlights the fact that proportionate gains in postgraduate enrollments at LU have not been equally shared between the Graduate School and the various professional schools. As of 1947, the Graduate School recorded almost one-third fewer students than the professional schools (421 to 1,160). As of 1981, its ratio of postgraduate students had declined to approximately one-fifth (788 to 3,964). A noteworthy exception to this pattern occurred between 1955 and 1967, when the Graduate School increased while the professional school enrollment declined.

Because of LU's longstanding stress on the College of Arts and Sciences and Parsons and Platt's contention that graduate education is the heart of the research university, it is necessary to further examine the growth of LU's Graduate School.

Following Chapter II's discussion of the significance of the 1960s at LU, the twelve year period of the Graduate School's ascendance relative to the rest of the university enrollments is not surprising. The slow dismantling of denominational curricula at the end of the decade complemented and reinforced the emerging vitality of

TABLE 8.--GROWTH OF LU POSTGRADUATE DIVISIONS: TOTAL STUDENTS ENROLLED IN FALL SEMESTER

Year	Graduate School		Professional Schools*		Total**
	%	N	%	N	
1947-48	6	421	16.5	1,160	6,998
1955-56	9	782	14	1,158	8,294
1965-66	11.5	1,555	11	1,448	13,491
1967-68	11	1,613	13	1,817	14,108
1969-70	6	935	24	3,902	16,303
1973-74	6	984	27	4,099	15,202
1980-81	5	788	25	3,964	15,782

*Includes Business, Dental, Education, Law, Medicine, Nursing, Social Work, along with the Institute of Pastoral Studies and Industrial relations.

SOURCE: Historical Enrollment Survey (Office of Registration & Records, 1982).

Summary figures are for all divisions of the university. They are included to show the relative distributions of graduate and professional school enrollment compared to the entire university.

the Graduate School. The puzzling part of the pattern in LU postgraduate enrollments (if the hypothesis that LU has become a research university is to be accepted) is the unmistakeable decline in Graduate School enrollments from the 1970s onward. According to the hypothesis, LU should have continued to accelerate its pursuit of basic research within this unit as its denominational college characteristics receded. Instead, LU experienced a temporary real growth in the Graduate School followed by recent significant gains in the professional schools. At the close of the period, while the ratio of professional school enrollments at LU had significantly increased over 1947 levels (25% vs. 6.5%),[3] the ratio of Graduate School students had actually decreased as compared to 1947[4] (5% vs. 6%).

I should mention that both Graduate and professional school enrollments have declined since 1973. Demographic and economic factors have converged to make the job market for both academic and non-academic professionals much less attractive than during the 1960s. Yet at LU even the general decline in postgraduate enrollment has more severely

---

[3]Figures are from Table 8.

[4]While this pattern is not conclusive without national statistics covering the same period, it does indicate that LU's Graduate School has not gained ground relative to the rest of University enrollments. Presumably, while societal employment patterns have also reduced research university graduate enrollments, they currently represent a larger percentage of total students than 5%.

affected the Graduate School. Between 1973 and 1981 the enrollment in LU's Graduate School declined twenty percent (from 984 to 788). During the same period the combined enrollment loss at all LU's professional schools was a little over three percent (from 4,099 to 3,964).

Because this study focuses on the significance of the Graduate School, enrollment figures on the combined professional schools at LU mask considerable shifting within the various schools. Yet for my purposes the central finding is that the growth of LU's postgraduate divisions has been skewed toward professional education.

II. Graduate School Trends and LU Support Systems

I now want to consider certain background characteristics of the spotty development of LU's Graduate School which places enrollment statistics in perspective. My discussion takes the form of cataloging the scarcity of support resources at LU allotted for a research-grounded Graduate School. Two types of resources are considered. The first is organizational, and focuses primarily on budget concerns. The second is motivations. I will also examine educational aspirations of LU's client student population, and the ramifications of these motivations in light of Graduate School enrollment trends.

Organizational Support Systems

One is hard pressed to find an organizational support structure at LU for its Graduate School during most of the period of this study. The 1975 North Central Association evaluation report to the university took great pains to describe these shortages, one of the most glaring of which was the relatively small stipends LU then allocated for graduate students (North Central Report, 1975:12). In addition, the report noted the higher than average faculty teaching loads for comparably sized universities, and the usually minimal secretarial staffs (North Central Report, 1975:13). Because the use of teaching assistants was largely left to individual departments, assistants in those departments with heavy graduate teaching responsibilities often acted as half-time instructors, thereby lessening the possibility of their assisting in research activities (North Central Report, 1975:12). Thus, North Central's overall assessment of LU's Graduate School was quite negative, describing the extant support structures as "minimal" (North Central Report, 1975:24).

In view of the low priority LU has given to the Graduate School relative to research universities, it makes sense to examine more closely the shape and function of institutional support for graduate schools at universities which have emphasized the research university model. As many have noted (Jencks & Riesman, 1968:40-41; Parsons &

Platt, 1973:103-162; Boyle, 1983), one of the first and most direct support structures developed was the institution of teaching aides and/or reduced teaching loads.

> Nevertheless, the character of most faculties has changed, not only over the past hundred years but even over the past thirty. Until World War II even senior scholars at leading universities did a good deal of what they defined as scut work: teaching small groups of lower-level students, reading papers and examinations, and the like. Their labors were supplanted by aging but unscholarly instructors and assistant professors, who were not given tenure, status, or high salaries but were kept around precisely because there were lots of routine teaching jobs to be done and they were willing to do them. Today, however, few well-known scholars teach more than six hours a week, and in leading universities many bargain for less. . . (Jencks & Riesman, 1968:40).[5]

Subsequent innovations included enlarged secretarial staffs and greater office space, which supported the same principle as the first; the less time faculty spend in "scut work," the more they can pursue research.

Certainly the development of such research university "perks" serve latent as well as manifest functions. For instance, such "perks" solidified the emerging profession of university professor in the process of solidifying universities' commitment to the new model (Larson, 1977:

---

[5]The latter portion of this passage sharply reflects the period in which it was written. It provides a contemporary account of the widespread growth of the priority of research during the same period in thich LU's Graduate School experienced real growth. Even since the serious constriction of higher education, however, the basic structure of reduced teaching loads has remained in research universities, albeit in a diminished state.

152). Yet apart from furthering academics' professionalization, reduced teaching loads and larger secretarial budgets also had very research-specific benefits. They helped both faculty and institution to focus on the importance of research. The message of its priority was communicated quite clearly in the guidelines for tenure and promotion which took shape at research universities (Parsons & Platt, 1973:123).

The fact that LU has been slow to acknowledge the need for building a budgetary support structure for its Graduate School highlights another area of weakness mentioned by the North Central Report. LU faculty in general considered the criteria for tenure vague, and faculty sabbaticals to be inadequately funded.

> . . . Many say that they are not sufficiently informed concerning the standards which they must meet in order to achieve promotion and tenure and concerning the policies and procedures by which these standards are enforced. A majority of the faculty respondents believe that university commitment of resources for "sabbatical" leave and other research support is inadequate (p. 37), and yet a surprisingly small number apply for the leaves that are available. . . (North Central Report, 1975:17).

The combination of inadequate support and uncertainty as to the priority of research in tenure and promotion decisions seems to have operated as a self-fulfilling prophecy. It is reasonable to assume that it adversely affected the re-

search performance of LU faculty[6] for much of the period under consideration.

Student Motivations

As "clients" paying tuition to receive their education at LU, the motives of students are an important factor in assessing whether LU has become a research university. In keeping with the open systems theoretical framework of this study, students' motivations are assigned neither a causal nor a dependent status with respect to LU's operation. Rather, they are considered an important variable which significantly interacts with the rest of the system (Katz & Kahn, 1970).

LU undergraduates in 1981 were markedly more career-oriented than their counterparts in other colleges and universities. American Council on Education (ACE) figures for entering LU freshmen in that year highlighted their emphasis on professional careers as a reason for coming to LU. Over one-half of all LU first-year students, for instance, stated that they intended to become members of only four professions: Dentistry, Law, Medicine, and Nursing (Gronbjerg et al., 1981). This proportion is more than double the number of freshmen answering similarly at all U.S. private universities (57% vs. 27%), and is quadruple

---

[6]Data on faculty research performance is hard to gather. One measure of it is discussed in the section on departmental rankings.

the percentage of those entering public universities (57% vs. 14%) (Gronbjerg et al., 1981). Moreover, the divergence between the educational aspirations of LU freshmen and freshmen entering other universities has grown by sixteen percent between 1972 and 1981; during the same period the difference between LU students and those at public universities grew by twelve percent (Gronbjerg et al., 1981).

The aspirations of 1981 freshmen mirrored all LU undergraduates' perceptions of the advantages of attending the school (see Table 9 below). Undergraduates' answers exhibit strong agreement that attending LU bears tangible results in the form of a good "academic" education. Approximately two-thirds considered each of the following benefits of attending LU "very important": (1) its "better academic programs" (69%); (2) the "better chance of being accepted into a good professional or graduate school" it provided (63%); (3) LU's better teachers" (62%). The practical nature of LU's academic excellence for undergraduates was unmistakeable. One-third or less gave the item "more is demanded of students" or "the emphasis on liberal education" the same degree of importance. In short, undergraduate priorities as to the benefits of attending are clear. It is a respectable credentialization center.

The pragmatic pursuit of a college degree for its job benefits is not restricted to LU. According to Collins (1979:71), higher education is largely the familiarization

TABLE 9.--1981 LU UNDERGRADUATES ON ACADEMIC ADVANTAGES OF ATTENDING LOYOLA*

Item	Percent answering "very important"
Better academic programs	69
Better chance of being accepted into a good graduate/professional school	63
Better teachers	62
Teachers give more time to students	56
More is demanded of students	33
More emphasis on liberal education	29

N = 560

*The survey question read "As you see it, what, if any, are the advantages of attending Loyola?" Answers were made according to a four category Likert scale reading "very important," "somewhat important," "not too important," "not important."

SOURCE: Gannon and McNamara, 1982:16.

with "cultural capital" which has become the currency of occupational access quite apart from its intellectual benefits (Collins, 1979:71). Yet the fact that LU undergraduates during the latter part of the period under investigation have been even more credential-conscious than others invites comment. Their lower socioeconomic background is probably the major reason for the difference.

The disadvantaged socioeconomic status of U.S. Catholics throughout most of American history is a matter of record (cf. p. 13). Interestingly, members of much the same lower and middle-class strata still attend LU. As of 1981, almost three times as many LU freshmen students' fathers worked in blue-collar jobs as at all private universities (27% vs. 10%). Almost twice as many LU fathers worked in such jobs as compared to freshmen at all public universities (27% vs. 15%) (Gronbjerg et al., 1981: presentation handout used at Baumgarth Symposium session). Their position on a lower rung of the socioeconomic ladder means that LU students have further to climb to attain the professional occupations they seek than students at other comparably sized universities. It is not surprising that they are more career conscious even as early as the time of college enrollment.[7] If Greeley is correct in stating that RC educational attainment had surpassed everyone but

---

[7]ACE questionnaires are distributed and completed as a part of the enrollment procedure.

Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Jews in educational attainment by the mid-1960s (Greeley, 1977:41), then the considerably lower socioeconomic backgrounds of LU students is not a simple function of religion. It suggests, rather, that LU's "market" is not those Catholics who have already "arrived," but those who are still in the process of doing so.

The effect of its clientele on LU's post-denominational movement toward a research university cannot be overlooked. LU students have been less interested in Arts and Sciences graduate work than in more immediately rewarding professions than their parents have worked in (cf. Gronbjerg et al., 1981: presentation handout).

III. Recent Faculty Trends

Another set of statistics relevant to the question of LU's becoming a research university is the educational background of its faculty. Parsons and Platt (1973:140-141) consider training in critical thinking and mastery of a particular subfield of knowledge a primary function of a good graduate program. In addition, both Collins (1979:22-48) and Parsons and Platt (1973:141-142) consider socialization an important part of graduate education. Hence one useful measure of a research university's emphasis is the proportion of its faculty who have received doctorates from

elite universities.[8] Such faculty members would be expected to impart their expertise and enthusiasm for research to their colleagues. Another measure is the proportion of faculty who have Ph.D.'s. Since the inception of the research university, schools emphasizing research have considered an earned doctorate virtually mandatory (Veysey, 1965:176). Hence, a very high ratio of earned doctorates is a prerequisite of a research university.[9]

Because of the denominational tradition of LU, a third index of its hypothesized development into a research university is the proportion of its faculty members with doctorates from RC graduate schools. Compared to the earlier period (when RC orthodoxy was considered as important a qualification for RC college faculty), the proportion of faculty doctorates from such schools would be expected to decline following the demise of the denominational model.

In order to accept the premise that LU's faculty has become increasingly reflective of the research university, it must be domonstrated that stable trends in the

---

[8]Although the precise definition of an elite graduate university remains vague (Cartter, 1966), it has generally remained a stable index of those schools producing the largest number of Ph.D.'s (Jencks & Riesman, 1968:13). Here, only the 8 largest U.S. Ph.D.-granting schools are considered "elite" (cf. McNamara, 1967).

[9]Even as a minimal measure, however, its significance is slight. The shortage of college teaching jobs in recent years has made the doctorate virtually mandatory at almost every college.

direction of research university teaching and research have recently emerged at LU. These trends are: (1) virtual universality of an earned doctorate among faculty members; (2) decline in the proportion of faculty from RC graduate schools; (3) increase in the percentage of faculty from elite graduate schools.

As Table 10 demonstrates (see below), the proportion of LU faculty without doctorates has dramatically declined since 1947.

The seventy-seven percent average of faculty members since 1972 who have had doctorates represents a fifty-eight percent increase over the 1947 ratio (77% vs. 45%). Still, the significance of this increase is hard to assess --since presumably even most colleges are staffed by faculty with earned doctorates. The postsecondary teaching market has been so tight for at least ten years that a Ph.D. is virtually mandatory.

Although data on the earlier years of the period are unavailable, a similar sharp decline in the ratio of RC Ph.D.'s during the 1960s is evident. In 1967, the earliest year for which such data are available, over one-third (39%) of LU's faculty was a product of RC graduate schools. By 1981, that percentage had dropped to twenty-four percent.

Finally, the ratio of LU faculty members who matriculated at the best-known universities exhibits the least discernible change throughout the period. This ratio's

TABLE 10.--CHARACTERISTICS OF LU UNDERGRADUATE FACULTY (1947-1981)

Year	Percentage Ph.D.'s	Percentage Ph.D.'s from RC schools	Percentage Ph.D.'s from elite schools*
	raw N	raw N	raw N
1947-48	45 (73)	na	na
1958-59	36 (58)	na	na
1965-66	67 (178)	na	na
1967-69	65 (161)	39 (63)	23 (43)
1969-70	68 (191)	30 (57)	25 (47)
1971-72	77 (233)	25 (59	25 (59)
1973-74	75 (345)	23 (79)	24 (82)
1977-78	79 (355)	24 (86)	23 (82)
1979-81	77 (379)	24 (90)	22 (79)

*Elite schools are defined as the top 8 doctorate-producing schools. They are Columbia University, the University of Wisconsin, Harvard University, the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois, the University of California (Berkeley), Cornell University, New York University (cf. McNamara, 1967). Although restrictive, this definition enables the measurement of faculty from the most prestigious training programs.

SOURCE: Arts & Sciences Catalogs, 1947-48 through 1979-81.

apparent continuity is probably at least partially due to the lack of availability of data, since the twenty-four percent figure for 1967 (the first year for which data are available) is certainly well above what would have been true during the height of LU's denominational college operation. The most parsimonious interpretation of Table 10 figures on elite doctorates must take account of the watershed character of the 1960s. Certainly more elite-trained Ph.D.'s joined the faculty during that period. Yet the degree of difference in this measure over time has been considerably smaller than for the other two (an average of 24% elite-trained Ph.D.'s since 1967, peaking at 25% between 1967 and 1972). The pattern of equal representation of RC and elite Ph.D.'s has been maintained since 1970.

IV. National Rankings of LU Departments

In view of the importance Parsons and Platt (1973) have assigned the graduate school within the university, one important measure of the intensity of LU's implementation of the research university model is the prestige accorded to its Graduate School programs. Since the denominational RC college was not much interested in the production of scientific knowledge, those LU Graduate School programs which were in existence prior to the 1960s would probably have acquired little disciplinary respect. If LU has become a research university, however, its Graduate

School programs should now warrant considerable approbation.

This section considers four of the five LU departments discussed in Chapter I. Because Theology has no doctoral program, it is not included. Data are from preliminary reports of a major study of U.S. doctoral programs completed in 1982 entitled "An Assessment of Research-Dcotorate Progams in the United States" (cf. Chronicle of Higher Education, 1982).

Overall LU Rankings

Across the four LU departments shown in Table 11 (see below), sub-par ratings were the rule.

The average LU score for quality of departmental faculty, effectiveness in producing research scholars, and the eminence of faculty were all well below the average score of 50 (all between 41-42), indicating that LU still has not attained parity with other universities. The area in which all LU departments did best, "improvement over the last five years," was the only one in which the overall LU score reached the average (49.5).

Table 11 graphically depicts the continuing ramifications of LU's denominational college roots; but it also points to a recent development in its accommodation to the research university. Following the 1975 North Central Report's indictment of its inadequate support for the Graduate School, LU initiated a serious program to foster uni-

TABLE 11--1982 LU DEPARTMENTAL RANKINGS*

Dept.	Faculty	Graduates	Recent improve-ment	Faculty research	Mean score
English	38**	40	44	41	41
History	38	37	51	38	41
Psychology	47	48	53	47	49
Sociology	41	38	50	41	42.5
Column mean score	41	41	49.5	42	na

*Column headings are abbreviated. The actual headings were "quality of faculty," "effectiveness in educating research scholars," "improvement over 5 years," "evaluators' familiarity with faculty research."

**Ratings are standardized so that a score of "50" represents the average rating for all departments.

SOURCE: Chronicle of Higher Education (November 10, 1982:5-6 and January 19, 1983:12-14).

versity research. First, an Office of Research Services was developed to play the role of information clearinghouse for faculty interested in research. This office also sponsored numerous grant-writing seminars free of charge (Loyola Research Review, 1980). Second, extensive expansion of LU's computer facilities occurred and, unlike in most universities, there was unlimited computer time allotted for faculty members. Third, a Research Policy Committee has been established to facilitate administrative planning which takes research into consideration.

The initial benefits of recent efforts to support LU-based research are evident in the departmental rankings on improvement over five years. Of the four departments, only English (44) did not score at or above average in this category. One further mark of the positive effects of LU's recent stress on research is an increase in outside funding during the late 1970s. LU reported a raw increase of ninety-three percent more funding for science and engineering research in 1979 than in 1974 (Loyola Research Review, 1981). In addition, several research chairs were recently established (in Theology, Psychology, and Philosophy) in Arts and Sciences departments.

Humanities Departments

The average score across all evaluative categories for both English and History was forty-one. Not surpris-

ingly, the departments' evaluation in specific areas generally differed little. English was judged slightly better in its production of research scholars (40 vs. 37) and faculty research (41 vs. 38). Yet in the category which may have the greatest long-term effects, improvement over five years, History scored fourteen percent higher than English (51 vs. 44). Considering the curricular and departmental objectives' patterns in both departments (cf. Chapter II), their 1982 national rankings may well bear witness to the benefits of History's continuous accommodation to research and "Jesuit-yet-independent" emphases. Apparently it has recently hit upon a formula which bears promise of satisfying both concerns to considerably greater extent than its counterpart.

English' low improvement score suggests that it has had less success in reconciling its strongly denominational past with the requirements of the research university. It more sharply reflects the shortcomings of LU humanities disciplines noted by the North Central evaluators in 1975 (North Central Report, 1975:7).

> The Jesuit and Roman Catholic origins and traditions of Loyola have defined the present character of the Humanities at the university, particularly in the core curriculum of the College of Arts and Sciences with its emphasis on philosophy, theology, history, and literature. . . .
>
> As on many other campuses, there is a general uneasiness among the Humanities faculty stemming from the awareness that liberal education is no longer at the center of university life. . . . There appears to

be some reluctance on the part of the faculty to acknowledge this situation and to make departmental courses and programs more directly responsive to real student needs. The overambitious catalog listings of some departments testify to this lack of educational focus.

Social Sciences

As compared to the humanities departments, both social science disciplines fared better in the national rankings. Across all categories, the Psychology Department scored forty-nine, and Sociology 42.5. Psychology and Sociology ranked higher for at least two reasons. First, the history of these departments at LU was less dependent on the denominational model (cf. Chapter II), and so they could more easily adapt themselves to the research model when it became clearly indicated. The second reason follows from this advantage. Both social science departments could guide their development according to emerging disciplinary directions less encumbered by College-specific tradition. Hence both Psychology and Sociology in the 1979-80 Graduate School catalog offered programs tailored to non-academic careers.[10] Psychology offered

[10]One of the difficulties of the timing of LU's efforts to become a research university is macrosocial constriction of the market for post-secondary teaching. The argument advanced here is that this downturn has differentially affected LU departments' capacity to train graduate students. Those tied to the U.S. research university's historical stress on professorial careers have fared worse than those free to experiment with alternative emphases. The significance of experimentation has been exacerbated at LU by the above-average credentialism of its recent students.

clinical, experimental, and professional training emphases, while Sociology was tailored to academic teaching/research and non-academic research (LU Graduate School Catalog, 1979-80:107-121). By contrast, because of the humanities departments' association with the Ratio Studiorum, their evolution into research departments was unidimensional; they had more difficulty distinguishing between disciplinary research and college teaching, because they felt constrained to toe the "scientific objectivity" line.[11]

Considering these two departments separately, their different abilities to adapt to the changes in disciplinary career patterns is reflected in their ratings. English, still most closely tied to the ideology of research "for its own sake," by 1981 had no graduate program for those planning non-academic careers despite the fact that prospects for such employment were better (LU Graduate Catalog, 1979-80:46-51). It fared badly and was judged a bad risk for improvement. History, on the other hand, had experimented by adapting to the new contours of the College to the extent that it offered a non-research M.A. (LU Graduate Catalog, 1979-80:65-73), and showed signs of departmental improvement for its efforts.

---

[11]Note that I am making no claim for the uniqueness of this situation at LU. Rather, the configuration of LU's institutional history has exacerbated the characteristic reliance of U.S. humanities disciplines on teaching. This has resulted in an additional impediment to LU humanities departments' flexibility in the post-denominational period.

Compared to either humanities department, both social science departments experimented to a greater extent with recent disciplinary developments in the non-academic sector. Benefitting from its early disassociation with College socialization and long-standing disciplinary career paths outside academe, LU Psychology ranked above average in five-year improvement (53), and slightly below otherwise (between 47 and 48). Since it had been more closely tied to LU's denominational period, and because of U.S. Sociology's closer historical association with academic careers,[12] Sociology's ratings are only slightly higher than those of the humanities departments. While Sociology's recent stress on both academic and non-academic careers enabled it to do well (50) in the improvement category, it did considerably worse in the others (between 38-41). Indeed, the similarity of Sociology's scores to English in all but the improvement categories lends support to the notion that the difference between the two is largely a function of departmental capacity for adaptation to economic constrictions on conventional graduate training.

---

[12] A disparate but growing literature on the need for redefining U.S. Sociology to include non-academic jobs has recently emerged. A theoretical debate on the legitimacy and optimal configuration of such a redefinition remains unresolved (Janowitz, 1979; Manderscheid, 1976; Tuchfeld, 1976). This does not lessen the likelihood that a semi-profession of "policy analysis" or "planning" is developing with or without the discipline's sanction (Macrae, 1974; Wrong, 1976).

Case Analysis of Psychology and Sociology

Given these differences in ratings, it will be useful to examine the processes which have enabled the Psychology Department to more convincingly establish a research emphasis. My main point of comparison here will be with Sociology. Psychology's origin and development is compared to that of the Sociology Department. In addition to the two being social sciences, a number of more significant parallels exist. The founder of both departments at LU was a Jesuit. Moreover, each founder was an important national figure, establishing the RC professional association in his discipline. To a considerable extent, close examination of the similarities and differences between the two departments is a study in the unique variables involved in an RC university department's struggle to achieve disciplinary autonomy. The intent of this section is to highlight those variables by illustrating their long-term effects on the departments involved.

The analysis proceeds from a fundamental anomaly evident from departmental descriptions thus far. Why is it that the Psychology Department has always focused more on research and theory as defined by its discipline than Sociology, if the two had such similar origins? Based on the conclusions of this analysis, I will suggest some more general principles which may well apply to other LU departments.

Origins and Development of the Sociology Department

Following its inception within the School of Social Work (founded in 1914), LU's Sociology Department was long overshadowed by the School's practical emphasis on clinical applications. Illustrative of Sociology's low profile at LU, it did not become a separate department until 1936. At that time Ralph Gallagher, S.J., who had earlier founded the School of Social Work at the University of Detroit, was appointed chairman of the newly established Department of Sociology (Fredericks et al., 1983:51).

As suggested both in his early research and administration of the department, Gallagher's conception of sociology stressed its practical applications. His graduate work had included both social work and sociology (Fredericks et al., 1983:50). His specialization in juvenile delinquency and the prison system adroitly synthesized both fields into a combination which served him well as a spokesman for social reform known throughout Illinois. Gallagher both founded and served on numerous commissions, including the Governor's Committee on Narcotics and Sex Offenders and the Chicago Crime Prevention Bureau (Fredericks et al., 1983:3). When he died in 1965, the Chicago Sun-Times ran an editorial of his contributions to the community (quoted in Fredericks et al., 1983:58).

> . . . He founded many organizations for the betterment of society, including the Institute of Social and In-

> dustrial Relations at Loyola, the Federation for Crime Prevention and Delinquency Control, and the American Catholic Sociology Society.
>
> He spoke his mind as he saw fit. He once said, "The only reason I am ouspoken is because I believe in justice."
>
> Chicago lost a great and good citizen when Father Gallagher died Wednesday at 69. The better Chicago he helped to build is a monument to his work here.

The synthesis of social work and sociology that comprised Gallagher's notion of sociology proved of great service. It did not, however, correspond to disciplinary trends toward theory-based research within U.S. Sociology. Not interested in the "value-free" approach, Gallagher was prone to mix spirited exhortation with sociological concepts, as demonstrated in the following passage from his dissertation (quoted in Fredericks et al., 1983:2):

> . . . the shame of our civilization, especially in the United States, is the slum. Let us not mince words . . . by (using) such euphemisms as . . . "underprivileged" or "intersititial" or "changing" . . . districts. They are but slums! Children in the United States are guaranteed by right of birth "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." If we can describe as "life" the contest for existence that pervades these areas, then the guarantee of such is no boon. If the power to eke out . . . an existence within the confines of a rat-ridden tenement can be called "liberty," then shame on the name! If poverty and hunger and disease and the lack of any other place to play than a dirty crowded street or sordid alley are part of that bewitching pursuit of "happiness," then satisfaction in the attainment of such is the lot of the gaunt, ragged . . . thousands of our children who fight for existence in our city slums.

Gallagher's leadership of the department reflected his partisan veiwpoint. For many years, the Sociology Department's

only graduate program was housed within the Institute of Social and Industrial Relations (founded in 1941, also by Gallagher), where it amounted to one area of specialization in a Master of Social Administration degree. Illustrative of the applied bent of the program, other areas of specialization were industrial relations, personnel administration, and public administration (School of Social Work Catalog, 1950-52:10). Sociology did not offer its own Ph.D. program until 1959, four years after it accepted its first M.A. students under the auspices of the Graduate School (Fredericks et al., 1983:52).

Certainly the rationale of pursuing scientific research for its own sake was not the predominant emphasis of Gallagher's term as chairman of the Department (from 1936-1965).[13] Rather, his administration exemplified early twentieth-century "Catholic" sociology's translation of scholastic philosophy into sociological terminology. According to that framework, society was defined as a rationally organized group in the pursuit of the common end of

---

[13]Illustrative of his perspective on research, Gallagher explained in a 1954 Institute faculty meeting that more funding was necessary. Since (he held) graduate programs' reputations were usually based on faculty research publications, it was essential for them to write some articles (Institute of Social and Industrial Relations faculty meeting minutes, 1954). To that point, the notes indicate that little or no research had originated at the Institute. The direct linkage in Gallagher's mind between the sudden attractiveness of research and the necessity for increased funding is unmistakeable.

present and eternal well-being (O'Brien, 1939:vii). The task of those skilled in sociology was the articulation and furtherance of the social encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI (O'Brien, 1939:xi-xiii).

Gallagher's approach to sociology coincided with the conception of Catholic Sociology in which he was trained. As demonstrated in O'Brien's RC secondary school text (1939:169-243), the primary interest of this denominational approach was the contruction of a viable alternative to both liberal democratic and marxist conceptions of social organization. The right to a living wage and unionization were two major tenets; but its central thesis was the priority of the family as "society's conrnerstone" (O'Brien, 1939:114-121).

The origin of all three LU denominational sociology courses lies within Catholic Sociology's principles. "Marriage and the Family" argued for the "proper" family structure, while "Papal Social Encyclicals" surveyed the documents which both inspired and formed the theoretical superstructure of Catholic Sociology. "Catholic Social Action" provided an overview of the system which served the added function of exhorting College students to work toward the new social order--to be "Crusaders for Christ" (O'Brien, 1939:319-320):

> The social hall of St. Peter's parish was ablaze with lights. Men stood in small groups, smoking and talking, both within and without the handsome building.

> The balmy September evening had enticed the large number who had responded to the Pastor's inviation. . . .
>
> A chorus of "Good evening, Father" greeted young Father Kelly's arrival. "Father Tom," as the older men called him, was a general favorite because of his gay and easy manners which blended becomingly with his deeply spiritual character. . . .
>
> "Let's get started, Gentlemen," he called above the hub-bub in the hall. . . .
>
> The priest smiled.
>
> . . . "We are all aware, in at least a general way, of the purpose of this gathering tonight. We hope to organize a parochial unit of the diocesan Catholic Action organization. . . ."

The Sociology Department's close ties with Catholic Sociology were a double-edged sword for the Department. It dovetailed with the Ratio-oriented denominational period of LU history, and thus became a basic component of the College curriculum. Yet its very affinity to the College rationale stunted the Department's distinctive theoretical and research potential; its subject area and style of presentation were considered a cross between social work and scholastic philosophy/theology. Fr. Gallagher's Sociology Department provided no theoretical framework for emulation of mainstream U.S. Sociology's growing emphasis on empirical examination of theoretical concepts and trends.

Origins and Development of the Psychology Department

In stark contrast with the pattern of development of the Sociology Department, Psychology from the beginning

stressed research. Its first graduate program, an M.A. established in 1930, was awarding degrees before Sociology had become a department. Although one ostensibly important task set before the Psychology Department upon its inception in 1929 was the "study and teaching of the philosophical synthesis of St. Thomas Aquinas as suitable basis for a rational explanation of the ultimate questions of science and life" (Wauck, 1979:2), its greater interest in producing disciplinary research was evident from the beginning. Its founder, Charles Ignatius Doyle, S.J., also began the Loyola Center for Child Guidance and Psychological Service (in 1941), which under his successor, Vincent Herr, S.J., in 1945 became a first-rate clinical facility (Snider, 1953). The department had established a Ph.D. program by 1946.

By the early 1960s, Psychology had functioned for quite awhile as a research department, easily attaining American Psychological Association accreditation. Under its first non-Jesuit chairman, Ronald Walker, a school for emotionally disturbed children was opened by the Department with money from the state of Illinois (Wauck, 1979:10). In addition a student counseling service, autonomous Child Guidance Center, and M.A. program in counseling for professional religious all were initiated, and the part-time Ph.D. program was discontinued (Wauck, 1979:10).

In contrast to the tangibleness of a denominational

disciplinary approach associated with Catholic Sociology, no such subfield seems to have emerged in psychology. Hence, despite the fact that Fr. Doyle founded the Chicago Society of Catholic Psychologists (later the American Catholic Psychological Association), the Association did not seriously affect the Department's relatively quick adoption of the research university mode of operation. It apparently was not clear what a "Catholic" psychologist would do differently than a non-Catholic one. In fact, Catholic Psychology seems to have meant little more than being a psychologist who was also Catholic.

This is certainly Wauck's (1979) interpretation of the history of the Association. He noted that as of the late 1950s, a significant twenty-seven percent of those teaching in RC psychology departments were non-Catholics (1979:8-9). Moreover, there was little difference in theoretical approach between the RC and non-RC departments (Wauck, 1979:9). Interestingly, this ambiguous situation left the RC laymen-psychologists the most dissatisfied of the three groups (RC priests, RC laymen, non-RC); they were expected to be pursuing research and teaching such as their non-RC peers, yet live up to the unclear additional expectations placed on the Catholic Psychologist (Wauck, 1979: 9). In view of its tenuous foundations, the Association suffered an understandably quick demise as soon as it became clear that Vatican II had questioned the legitimacy of

denominationalism for its own sake. Wauck supports this conclusion, although he strongly disagrees with the common interpretation of events during that period.

> A further compounding of these influences came, oddly enough, from a misunderstanding of the Second Vatican Council's statements on aggiornamento and ecumenism. Ecumenism never meant that we were to minimize our distinctiveness or merge into one blurred image. I think it meant that despite our differences we were to actually seek points of agreement and areas in which we could cooperate with people of other faiths and religious views. . . .
>
> . . . But growing internal dissension and mistrust following Vatican II, and the winds of a perverted ecumenism, led to the formation of that somewhat anomalous amalgam called "PIRI" (Psychologists Interested in Religious Issues), or Division Thirty-Seven of the APA (Wauck, 1979:9-10).

Wauck overlooks the fact that no tangible differences in the teaching and doing of research in psychology at LU or most other RC colleges existed. As a result, dissolution of the professional organization for RC psychologists was inevitable once theological motivations were removed. Unlike the American Catholic Sociological Society, which transformed itself into the Association for the Sociology of Religion, the American Catholic Psychological Association was subsumed as a subsection of the American Psychological Association.

Societal Factors Influencing Departmental Dissimilarities

The preceding analysis makes it clear that the Sociology Department developed originally as a denominational

department with a distinctive denominational base,[14] and inclination toward concrete applications. It is equally apparent that the Psychology Department never attempted to maintain a distinctive denominational orientation. Were, then, the different departmental paths a function of LU-specific processes, or reflections of macrosocial influences within the American RC subculture?

In the case of Psychology, the answer is evident. Psychology was uniquely disposed among LU departments to follow disciplinary trends toward research, although it was not atypical of other RC psychology departments. The factors which influenced its non-denominational cast were also operating at other RC schools. Likewise, there is no reason to suspect that the Sociology Department's divergence from the sociological mainstream was unique; pending further comparative data, I will assume that it was not. If the departments' differing predilections for a denominational approach to their discipline were not isolated to LU, to what might they be attributed?

Probably the most lilely place to look for such

---

[14] Interesting research on the denominationally distinctive approaches within sociology could well result from this discussion. For example, Perkins (1980) has convincingly argued that conservative Protestant denominations' perspective on sociology is much different than that of Catholic Sociology. The differences may well have engendered distinguishable "Protestant" psychology and/or sociology departments at those schools retaining a strong Protestant denominational tie.

influences in the sub-cultural experience of U.S. Catholicism prior to World War II. From the Civil War to the early part of this century, the RC working population held primarily menial and blue-collar jobs. Its members were largely immigrants who suffered widespread prejudice and discrimination extending even into the public educational system's classrooms (Ellis, 1970:84-123); Greeley, 1977:32-47). The Church was obliged to construct what amounted to its own parallel educational and community structures (Ellis, 1970:84-123). This sensitized it to the concerns of lower strata Americans of the period--labor injustices, social dislocations aggravated by social change, and the erosion of the infrastructure of the family.

> It might, indeed, be maintained that the Catholic Church was, during this period, one of the most effective of all agencies for democracy and Americanization. Representing as it did a vast cross section of the American people, it could ignore class, section, and race; peculiarly the church of the newcomer, of those who all too often were regarded as aliens, it could give them not only spiritual refuge but social security (quoted in Ellis, 1970:105).

It is quite understandable that the U.S. Church's emphasis on community-building imprinted itself upon the fledgling sociology departments which began to appear in RC colleges after 1920. Catholic Sociology's insistence on the primacy of the Christian family reflects an abiding focus of the Church's social thought. Equally relevant is the care which Catholic Sociology took to tiptoe between

the Scylla of liberal capitalism.

> The most pressing of our present problems in the field of industry is the centralization of wealth and power in a small portion of the human race. For it is not only wealth, but power that is concentrated in the hands of a few. This is economic dictatorship, similar in its nature and practices to the political dictatorship we spoke of in the chapter on Totalitarian States. . . .
>
> What brought about the concentration which gave economic dictatorship its birth in the world? The answer to that is limitless competition which allowed the use of any practices to make money, [sic] that one could get by with. One could use any means of making money provided they were effectual and safe. In an earlier chapter we spoke of Liberalism. You will recall that discussion under the title "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity."
>
> Individualism is the present name for the theory of Liberalism. It cried "Liberty! Give us liberty to do as we please!" The liberty which business demanded and took to itself was free competition, unchecked speculation. Injustice resulted. The poor and weak were trodded down in the strife. Only the strong survived. Concerning this free competition, Pope Pius writes: "This accumulation of power, the characteristic note of the modern economic order, is a natural result of limitless free competition which permits the survival of those only who are strongest, which often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience (O"Brien, 1939:254-255).
>
> Let us define Communism and discuss briefly each one of its most destructive teachings. Communism is a form of civil government. It is revolutionary. It is a view of life based on hatred and change, on violence and overthrow. It arouses hatred between different classes and groups of men. It incites laborers to revolt and bring about a world revolution. . . .
>
> Communism is not only revolutionary, it is also anti-God. It denies God and attempts to stifle religion. Communists tell the people, "There is no God. Religion is silly. There is no life after this one. There will be no future reward for being good. No one

> will punish you for being evil. You don't need to go to Church" (O'brien, 1939:213-214).

As demonstrated both in Fr. Gallagher's approach to sociology and the curricula offered by the department prior to its acceptance into the Graduate School, the Catholic Sociologist sought to reconstruct industrial society in a peculiarly American way--via non-radical unionization, the separating of church and state, proper education and "the return to Christian living" (O"Brien, 1939:311). This agenda is reflected in the stated purposes of the American Catholic Sociological Society (quoted in McNamara, 1969b):

> . . . to stimulate concerted study and research among Catholics working in the field of sociology, to create a sense of solidarity among Catholic Sociologists, to present the sociological implications of Catholic thought and to encourage its members to recognize their professional responsibilities as sociologists.

In effect, Catholic Sociology was a fusion of sociological concepts and metaphysics with considerable internal coherence. Its conceptual orderliness made it a viable alternative to the mainstream sociology which became dominant with the growth of the research university.[15] It also slowed RC sociology departments' adaptation to the research university model.[16]

---

[15]No claim is made here that Catholic Sociology was unique in its mixture of religions and intellectual elements . . . merely that other strains of early U.S. Sociology did not have the same staying power.

[16]Apart from the example of the LU department, the history of the national organization also supports this claim. Although the members of the American Catholic

No such alliance between disciplinary theory and Church ideology occurred in the case of a would-be Catholic Psychology. The most important reason for the absence of a cohesive rationale for such a sub-discipline is evident in the O'Brien passages. Catholic social thought viewed analysis based on the individual level with great suspicion, associating it with the social dislocations accompanying the rise of nationalism and capitalism. More particularly, the individual's importance and rights had been the battle cry of the anti-clerical French Revolution (O'Brien, 1939: 254-255)--as well as the Reformation itself. Hence, if not to the point of openly discouraging interest in the science of individual behavior, it seems safe to conclude that the RC denominational college had no ready basis by which its psychology department could be judged; in U.S. post-secondary education its presence was virtually mandatory, but it enjoyed no specifically RC apologia.

The absence of a distinctively denominational approach to psychology in U.S. Catholicism largely accounts for the ease with which the LU Psychology Department de-

---

Sociological Society had by the 1960s ceased functioning in the denominational way described in the association's charter, it had not been renamed even as of 1969 (McNamara, 1969b). At that point, it was in the process of organizational change which would reflect its actual change to a group concerned with the sociology of religion. The name of its publication shifted from Association for Catholic Sociology Review to Sociological Analysis: A Journal in the Sociology of Religion in 1964.

veloped its own research university-type emphasis. Furnished with only a tenuous theoretical linkage between itself and the tradition of scholastic metaphysics, its proponents were comparatively free to quietly pursue disciplinary trends, while establishing highly visible community resource agencies doubling as research facilities.

V. Conclusions

A number of important findings have emerged from the preceding discussion. First, as compared to other postgraduate programs at LU, the Graduate School has not attained the high status accorded it at major research universities. In fact, except for a brief period in the 1960s, its enrollment has lost ground to the professional schools. While not solely the fault of LU (larger economic trends have also adversely affected national graduate enrollment), insufficient effort and resources have been allocated to counteract these macro-trends. LU students' growing credentialism has further exacerbated the problem. The non-emergence of the Graduate School is nuanced by statistics on the changing characteristics of the LU Arts and Sciences faculty. Although LU faculty have been increasingly expected to hold Ph.D.'s, amd there are fewer of its members trained at RC universities, the hypothesized dramatic increase in the ratio of faculty trained at the most prestigious universities has not materialized. After a brief up-

swing in the 1960s, it stabilized at about one-fourth of the total faculty. Finally, recent national departmental rankings have given LU Arts and Science graduate programs a mediocre rating. The departments scored at or below average in almost every category.

In view of these findings, the hypothesis that LU has become a research university after dismantling its denominational college mode of operation must be rejected. As demonstrated in close examination of the Psychology and Sociology Departments, the historical roots of the school are not so easily jettisoned. They have continued to influence departmental operation in tangible, if not overt, ways. Indeed, the data suggest that LU's partial noncompliance with the research university model might best be interpreted as an attempt on its part to construct a kind of hybrid identity not identical with either the denominational college or research university model. Such an interpretation would account for the truncated development of research at LU, while explaining the recent improvements in its support structures.[17] I want to conclude this chapter by briefly outlining evidence that supports LU's option for constructing a "third way" between the denominational RC college and the research university.

---

[17]Not an easy trick, since the one apparently contradicts the other.

LU as Jesuit-yet-Independent University

Although trends at LU indicate that a general convergence with the research university model has not immediately resulted, in some select areas significant inroads have recently been made. Acknowledging the great diligence with which institutional descriptions have sought to establish a non-denominational Jesuit identity for the school (cf. Chapter II's discussion on pp. 62-73) as well as the significant denominational influences on LU departments, it is reasonable to speculate that LU's denominational origins may yet be responsible for its organizational dynamics. If so, then the recent upswing in support for research should also reflect the school's attempt to establish sufficient research characteristics to comply with U.S. university standards, yet remain consistent with LU's official description as Jesuit-yet-independent.

Certainly the phenomenal growth of campus ministry at LU only strengthens the position that denominational ties have been assiduously maintained since the 1960s. Between 1970 and 1982, campus ministry has grown into the most heavily subsidized non-educational unit of the university.[18] It now includes a staff of twenty-five full-time and twenty-two part-time workers (We, 1982). More importantly, since

---

[18]Prior to 1970, "campus ministry" was organized under a completely different system. It was known as the "Religious Life Program" (Von Kaenel, 1970).

1971, the director of campus ministry (a Jesuit) has had the title of Vice-President of the university, emphasizing the symbolic importance of this component (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1970-81:34). In view of the sudden erosion of its curricular regulation of students' religious behavior, it is apparent from these administrative and budgetary developments that LU has not altogether removed its denominational linkages, but merely transferred them to the extracurricular sphere.

> . . . Students, faculty, administration and staff are urged to live the twofold Christian precept of "love of God and neighbor" in their personal lives and as members of the Loyola University community.
>
> To emphasize and facilitate the spiritual and human development of students, faculty and staff, Loyola has established the office of Vice President of Campus Ministry. It is the responsibility of this Officer of the University, working with his staff, as well as through students and faculty, to promote the spiritual renewal of the whole university community (Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1979-81:34).

The effect of LU's strong support for campus ministry has been the construction of a non-denominational religious program which provides an element of consistency between LU's denominational and post-denominational dynamics, yet avoids former legal difficulties.[19] Hence an extracurricular parallel to the stated Jesuit-yet-independent character of the university has been erected which exhibits both as-

---

[19]Besides RC programs, Jewish and Protestant ones are carefully noted in campus ministry pamphlets and descriptions.

pects of the definition; it is not exclusively RC, yet maintains Jesuit leadership.

In addition to campus ministry, LU has sought to demonstrate its Jesuit-yet-independent character in two other ways. The first is the ongoing lecture and discussion series called the Loyola-Baumgarth Symposia on Values and Ethics. This series, which originated in the mid-1970s, is designed to focus attention on the issue of how a contemporary RC university might foster an interest in ethical concerns. The symposia consist of the reading and discussion of a yearly series of papers.

A second area in which LU has solidified its Jesuit-yet-independent identity is in its educational processes. In 1982 LU was awarded a grant of $400,000 from the Andrew Mellon Foundation to improve its Core curriculum. Included in the proposal was the selection of a full-time Director of the College Core, twenty professors to become Core faculty, and the introduction of inderdisciplinary courses which might better incorporate the educational synthesis described in the Core Curriculum Statement(LU Research Review, 1982). If this project is to imbue the Core with a new vitality, it will have to establish a non-denominational counterpart to the Ratio-inspired one that undergirded LU's denominational period.

When combined with LU's late-1970s interest in upgrading its research support infrastructure, the Mellon

project represents the educational pole of LU's post-denominational attempt to construct an institutional identity that is neither a return to the past nor a simple emulation of the research university model. As the period under consideration ended, LU had begun to manifest the rough outlines of the school's interpretation of a "Jesuit-yet-independent" university. At LU, this had come to mean a university which combines elements of both the denominational college and research university. In continuing to stress the importance of religious and ethical sensitivity in a non-denominational way, LU has linked itself to its denominational past while maintaining the necessary distance. It has also just begun to balance this emphasis with tangible acknowledgment of the priority of doing research. This aligns it with the procedures of the research university.

CHAPTER IV

ATTITUDINAL DIFFERENCES AMONG STUDENTS FACULTY, AND ADMINISTRATORS

I have argued in previous chapters that by the middle 1960s, many RC universities recognized that they could not long continue as they were--they had to confront challenges posed by the research university model. The analysis thus far has concentrated on historical and archival evidence. The survey data presented in this chapter provide further sources of information. The discussion begins by establishing that schools like LU have recently served a much different student population than they did in the early 1960s. Second, the considerable divergences of opinion among the contemporary students, faculty and administrators are analyzed. The purpose of this chapter, then, is to test the attitudinal corollaries of hypotheses generated in earlier chapters. The use of multiple regression further refines the argument.

I. Educational and Religious Attitudes of Undergraduates

If the historical documentation provided by Chapters II and III is accurate, then the students now being served by LU should be very different from their counter-

parts attending the pre-Vatican II RC college. Unfortunately, no data comparable to the 1981 Religious Values Assessment exist from before LU's pre-changeover period. There are such data, however, on RC college students who were seniors during the 1961 academic year (cf. McNamara, 1963). In order to see whether recent LU students have in fact been religiously different from those attending RC universities in the early 1960s, I will juxtapose 1981 undergraduates' responses with those of McNamara's respondents on the same questions asked twenty years earlier. The rest of the chapter builds on this examination.

Comparison of 1961 and 1981 RC Students

Greeley et al. (1976; 1977) have documented the recent dramatic changes in sexual attitudes and practices among U.S. Catholics. They contends that Vatican II's reassertion of the Church's traditional ban on contraception fomented mass questioning of its authority and tradition. For my purposes, the most concise way to demonstrate the radically different societal contexts in which the 1961 and 1981 RC university operated is to examine RC college students' sexual attitudes during the two periods (see Table12 below).

An average of fifty-three percentage points sepa-

TABLE 12.--1961 SENIORS ON SELECTED SEXUAL BEHAVIORS (by campus type and denomination

	Percentage saying behavior is wrong*		
	RC college	non-RC college	Catholics at non-sectarian college
Heavy necking	73	14	34
Sex with fiance	86	22	49
Sex with prostitute	92	46	71
Homosexual sex	93	52	71
N=	424	683	71

*"Wrong" is a constructed category, formed by collapsing "terribly wrong," "seriously wrong," and "somewhat wrong.

NOTE: Table 12 is adapted from NcNamara (1963)

rated 1961 RC from research university[1] college senior's attitudes on the items included. RC seniors considered all the activities wrong, while the other two groups either overwhelmingly condoned them or were undecided. Interestingly, the dramatic differences between the RC and research university students could not be attributed entirely to denominational effects, since when Catholics were in the minority (i.e., at the research univsersities), their scores fell roughly halfway between the two profiles. Although not conclusive (self-selection probably also played a part), these findings support the argument advanced in Chapter II that RC socialization was a major component of the pre-Vatican II RC college. Although their attitudes were still notably different from other students there, the way RC seniors who attended research universities thought about sexuality was less like the general RC subpopulation than those attending RC colleges.

As demonstrated in Table 13 below, the situation had drastically changed at LU by 1981. Virtually the same ratio of 1981 RC undergraduates considered premarital sex with one's finace wrong which held the oppposite opinion in 1961 (10% wrong in '81; 14% not wrong in '61). This represents a shift of seventy-six percentage points over a

---

[1]The non-RC campuses included were Columbia and Cornell, both of which are elite research universities. The other two were Notre Dame and Fordham.

TABLE 13.--1961 AND 1981 STUDENTS ON SEXUAL BEHAVIORS

Item	Percentage reporting behavior wrong*		
	'61 RC college	'61 Catholics at sectarian college	'81 RC students**
Sex with fiance	86	49	10
Sex with prostitute	92	71	65
Homosexual sex	93	71	47
Contraceptive birth control in marriage	85	not included	6
N=	424	71	396

*cf. Table 12

**Both sets of 1961 figures were based on seniors only; 1981 figures were based on all RC undergraduates. The LU RC students represented 71% of all LU undergraduates.

period of nineteen years. Moreover, only six percent of 1981 LU RC students considered birth control within marriage wrong; this is approximately eighty percent lower than had been the case twenty years previous. The forty-five percent of RC undergraduates at LU in 1981 who considered homosexual sex wrong also represents a steep decline from the ninety-three percent who agreed in the earlier period. The sixty-five percent ratio saying sex with a prostitute was wrong in 1981 was only marginally less than in 1961.

Short of conducting an extensive examination of the religious attitudes and beliefs of 1981 LU undergraduates, the data presented in Tables 12 and 13 support the conclusion that the RC undergraduates attending LU in recent years had a radically different approach to their religion than their 1961 counterparts. This finding is in line with Chapter I's discussion of recent changes within the U.S. RC community. It may well bear important consequences related to their motives for, and assessments of, attending LU.

Educational Goals of 1981 Undergraduates

As mentioned earlier, LU undergraduates in 1981 were extremely credential-conscious. Table 14 (see below) strongly suggests, however, that they were considerably less cognizant of LU's religion-related benefits. Less than fifteen percent said they considered the advantages of

TABLE 14.--1981 STUDENTS ON LU'S RELIGIOUS ADVANTAGES

Item	percentage very important	percentage unimportant*
Opportunity to take a variety of theology courses	9	68
Catholic university	14	56
Exposure to religious atmosphere	13	49
More stress on values	28	27

N=542

*Unimportant is a combination of "not important" and "not too important" responses.

taking a variety of theology courses, attending a Catholic university, or being exposed to a religious atmosphere very important. Over one-half (56% and 68%), in fact, considered the first two items unimportant. Only "more stress on values" garnered a sizeable percentage of almost one-third (28%) of all students answering "very important"; yet virtually the same ratio (27%) considered it unimportant.

Since among all undergraduates the religious advantage items were given short shrift, we might expect little difference between the way RC and non-RC students evaluated them. Nevertheless, Table 15 (see below) manifests some interesting divergences between RC and non-RC students on the issue of LU's religion-related benefits.

Across three of the four items included in Table 15 --i.e., theology courses, religious atmosphere, and stress on values--a miniscule average of 6.7 percentage points separated the RC undergraduates from the non-RC ones marking "very important." A much larger margin of eighteen percentage points, however, separated the ratios considering very important the fact that LU is an RC university. The latter item seems to have meant a great deal to about one-fifth of the RC students, and virtually nothing to the others. Further evidence of a tangible difference between RC and non-RC students appears in the data on those considering the items unimportant. While only about twelve

TABLE 15.--STUDENTS ON LU'S RELIGIOUS ADVANTAGES BY RELIGION

	percentage very important			percentage unimportant*		
	RC	Not RC	total	RC	Not RC	total
Opportunity to take a variety of theology courses**	10	6	9	64	76	68
Catholic university	19	1	14	44	86	56
Exposure to a religious atmosphere	15	7	13	42	65	49
More stress on values	30	22	28	22	38	27

N=542

NOTE: Religion was coded into Catholics and non-Catholics.

*See note to Table 14.

**Kendall's Tau C significance between groups on each item[2] exceeds .01.

[2]In order to obtain intra-group N's large enough to enable analysis of differences between them, some groups were oversampled. Although only 10% of undergraduates were sampled, 50% of the faculty, and virtually all of the administrators, were. The resultant N more nearly approximates the universe of LU students, faculty, and administrators than it does a random sample. Hence, the use of statistics is technically inappropriate, because there is no larger universe with which these data can be compared. Nevertheless, statistics are used in this chapter to suggest relationships which may bear further scrutiny.

percentage points separated the groups answering that the variety of theology courses and stress on values were unimportant (12% and 11% respectively), much large margins separated RC and non-RC responses to the other two items. Twice as large a difference (23 percentage points) obtained between the ratio of RC to non-RC students marking that LU's exposure to a religious atmosphere was unimportant; over three times as large a difference (42 percentage points) separated them on the issue of LU's Catholicity.

Hence, while the undergraduate population as a whole did not highly regard those aspects of LU most reminiscent of its denominational past, considerable differences did exist between the Catholics and non-Catholics. Non-RC undergraduates were clearly disinterested in religiously-related goals, focusing entirely on the school's academic advantages. RC undergraduates concentrated equally on credentialization,[3] but their attitudes toward LU's religious benefits were more complex. Few paid great heed to its "Catholic" and religious dimension, yet many were unwilling to write them off altogether. A sizeable percentage (ranging from 25% to 48%) considered each item "somewhat important," making the conclusion that LU had ceased to operate on any but the academic level premature. Rather, it mattered among RC students to a lesser extent (probably),

---

[3]No differences occurred among the academic items listed in Table 6 between RC and non-RC students.

and in a more complex fashion, than before.[4]

Having demonstrated a residual, if radically altered, set of religious "payoffs" for RC students is quite different from isolating its constitutive elements. As mentioned earlier (cf. Chapter III, pp. 132-135), recent attempts to erect a viable Jesuit-yet-independent (JYI) identity for LU indicate that it is a response to the changing legal and socioeconomic environments in which the school finds itself. Without being too "Catholic," the JYI identity continues attracting RC students--but not so obtrusively.

Undergraduates on Core Curriculum Goals

The 1981 questionnaire section which best reflected respondents' attitudes toward LU's JYI identity was the question asking what importance they would give to each of the six goals mentioned in the Core Curriculum statement. The undergraduates' responses appear below in Table 16.

When compared to Table 15, RC and non-RC students had remarkably similar attitudes toward the Core Curriculum. In both the "very important" and combined "unimportant" categories, small differences separated the two religious

---

[4] In other words, extra-denominational factors are now playing a larger part. Gannon and McNamara (1982:32-35) have demonstrated, for example, that one's overall orientation to the meaning of religious tradition and belief also heavily influences one's attitudes toward LU. McNamara (1983) has elaborated on the effect of orientation to religion on other values.

TABLE 16.--STUDENTS ON CORE CURRICULUM GOALS BY RELIGION*

Item	percentage very important			percentage unimportant**		
	RC	non-RC	total	RC	non-RC	total
Importance R's give to becoming a person:						
Aware of today's society and actively concerned for the future of the human race	79	77	78	1	3	2
Of reflection and critical judgment	64	63	64	6	5	6
For others	63	54	60	4	7	5
Formed with a passion for justice	53	57	54	6	9	7
Responsible to his/her brothers/sisters and to history	46	40	44	12	22	15
Aware of his/her religious vocation**	36	27	33	16	38	22
	N=396 (71%)	162				

*Both religion and "unimportant" coded as in Table 15. Items were taken from p. 45 in the Arts & Sciences Catalog.

**Kendall's Tau C significant beyond .01 level; table is rearranged for ease of presentation.

groupings. The one exception to this pattern was the item on the importance of a student's being"aware of his/her religious vocation." RC students considered this item very important more often than the others (36% vs. 27%); also less than one-half of them marked it unimportant (16% vs. 38%). The differences between the Catholics and non-Catholics on this item were significant beyond the .01 level.

Interestingly, student responses on the goals of the Core differed markedly from their opinions of LU's religion-related advantages. With the exception of the religious vocation item (which apparently tapped a specifically RC orientation to career-planning), an average of sixty percent of all undergraduates considered the Core curriculum goals "very important."

We can conclude from this discussion of Tables 15 and 16 that, although LU still provides some specifically "Catholic" benefits for students, they are not closely related to the official JYI identity recently established. The educational goals derived from this identity have indeed provided a non-denominational appeal for undergraduates. But with the exception of the religious vocation item (which even the RC students did not enthusiastically endorse), the stated goals of the Core have not retained an association with religion at all. Rather, the Core ideals provide a broad appeal which is non-denominational.

Before considering the differences among students, faculty, and administrators on these items, one further point requires examination. The stark difference between student priorities on the Core goals and some of the LU advantages items seems logically inconsistent. For instance, while overwhelming percentages (79% and 64% respectively) of the undergraduates thought that being a "person aware of today's society and actively concerned for the future of the human race" were very important, less than one-third likewise considered LU's emphasis on liberal education (29%) or stress on values[5] (28%). The LU Religious Values Study's thorough evaluation of the incongruence between students' (and others') opinions on the benefits of attending the school and the official purposes of the Core mentions three possible interpretations (Gannon & McNamara, 1982:21). The Core goals may be so abstract as to preclude either disagreement with them or applying them to concrete situations. Hence, one can be "all in favor" of the former while virtually ignoring the school's liberal arts/values dimensions. Or perhaps American Catholicism has provided its members (hence most of the respondents) with few conceptual bridges which combine intellectual and

---

[5]This incongruence is important because it casts into doubt the authenticity of the carefully constructed argument from the Jesuit liberal arts tradition which undergirds the Core Curriculum philosophy.

religious values.[6] Finally, it may be that in the experience of attending LU, no such linkages exist. In other words, what goes on in the process of an LU education bears no resemblance to the goal statements of the Core curriculum.

Differences Among Status Groups on Educational Goals

According to Linton's definition (1936), undergraduate students, faculty, and administrators comprise a system of organizational statuses[7] with different responsibilities and privileges. In this section, I will examine differences between the answers of members of each group on the LU advantage and Core Curriculum goal items. Building on the above discussion of students' responses, I will fit intergroup differences into the historical context provided by Chapters I through III.

We have already established that the undergraduates most highly regard the credentialistic benefits of LU. When compared to the responses of the faculty and adminis-

---

[6]This line of thought follows O'Dea's (1958:26-50) argument that respect for intellectual values were once all but extinguished in American Catholicism, except as they applied to the clergy.

[7]Because of the difficulties in separating cohort and age effects in a one-time sample (cf. Rodgers, 1982), I will use status to designate purely organizational relationships. Although age and cohort are both intercorrelated with organizational position, I will not consider them separately except where clearly indicated.

trators, their credentialism becomes even plainer (see Table 17). While the students were utterly convinced of the benefits of the first four items listed in Table 17 (better academic programs, chance of acceptance into post-graduate work, teachers, and time given to students), neither the faculty nor administrators were quite so sure that these are the strengths of an LU education. A large chasm separated the percentage of students marking "very important" from those in the other groups doing the same on these items. For example, twenty-eight percentage points separated the ratio of students from faculty/administrators marking that LU provides better academic programs (69% vs. 41%). If we take the mid-point between the faculty and administraotrs' answers[8] on the next two items, thirty-five points differentiated how the undergraduates and faculty/administrators rate LU's ability to provide a better chance of acceptance into a good graduate or professional school; sixteen points in the case of LU's better teachers.

The fact that the Arts and Sciences faculty and administrators were in such close agreement on the above items suggests that their own training and experience have made them more dubious of LU's academic superiority over

---

[8]With the exception of "teachers give more time to students," the faculty and administrators' responses were close enough to consider them together. Where this usage appears in the discussion, a difference of no more than 6% separates the two sets of responses.

TABLE 17.--STATUS GROUPS ON ADVANTAGES OF ATTENDING LU

Item	Percentage rating "very important"		
	Students	Faculty	Administrators*
1. better academic programs**	69	41	41
2. better chance of being accepted into a good graduate or professional school	63	25	31
3. better teachers	62	44	48
4. teachers give more time to students	56	42	59
5. more is demanded of students	33	27	31
6. the emphasis on liberal education	29	52	46
7. more stress on values	28	44	56
8. it is a Catholic university	14	31	39
9. exposure to a religious atmosphere	13	34	46
10. the opportunity to take a variety of theology courses***	9	9	22
	n= 560	150	91

*Consists of principal administrators (as defined by Personnel records) and department chairpersons.

**The differences among groups on all items was significant beyond the .01 level.

***Item 10 was rated radically lower than the other religious items by all groups, probably because of the department's inability to extricate itself from LU's denominational past (see Chapter II). The item is not included in discussion of the table.

other Chicago-area colleges and universities. They were even less convinced of LU's ability to give an "inside track" to a good postgraduate program, as compared to other (presumably private) schools. Only twenty-five percent of the faculty marked "very important" on this item, while thirty-one percent of the administrators did. It is reasonable to assume that the student's much higher rating of LU's academic merits reflect their lack of comparative information and experience with which to evaluate LU.

In contrast, the faculty/administrators' responses indicate familiarity with rankings within colleges and universities. Their experience with what Larson (1977:205) has called "horizontal upward displacement" as it operates in academic careers[9] prevented them from extolling LU's academic benefits to the same extent as the students. According to this system (reflected in the departmental rankings discussed in Chapter III), LU is only mediocre. Instead, they emphasized the school's liberal arts and religious tradition (i.e., items 6 through 9 in Table 17). On the liberal arts item, for instance, twenty percent more of the faculty/administrators marked "very important" than did the undergraduates (49% vs. 29%). Likewise, while only fourteen percent of the undergraduates considered the fact

---

[9]That is, the previously typical career path from graduate school to equal or somewhat lower-status university, then on to higher-status schools in subsequent positions.

that LU is an RC university very important, thirty-five percent of the faculty/adminsitrators thought so.

The greatest disagreement on the religion issues was between the administrators and students. Some twenty-eight percentage points separated their ratios answering that LU's stress on values is very important (28% vs. 50%); thirty-three points separated them on LU's provision of a religious atmosphere (13% vs. 46%). A smaller gap of twenty-five percent between the two groups occurred when respondents were asked about LU's being an RC university (14% vs. 39%). But in contrast to the academic items, faculty and administrators' responses also diverged from each other on the religious benefit items. Faculty answers generally fell halfway between the administrators' and students' ones.

Further evidence of the stratified response pattern on the religious benefit items is supplied in the varying ratios which considered them unimportant. (See Table 18 below.) The degree of unimportance of three of the four religion-related items was widely contested among the groups. As with the "very important" answers on this section of the questionnaire, disparities of between twenty-five and thirty-seven percent separated the administrators from the undergraduates. The extent of many students' dismissal of these items is quite evident in Table 18. Virtually one-half or more considered such benefits unimportant.

TABLE 18.--STATUS GROUPS ON UNIMPORTANT REASONS FOR ATTENDING LOYOLA

Item	percentage rating "not too important" or "not important"		
	Students	Faculty	Administrators
The opportunity to take a variety of theology courses	68	59	43
It is a Catholic university	56	37	19
Exposure to a religious atmosphere	49	27	15
More stress on values	27	15	10
The emphasis on liberal education	25	14	15

Much smaller percentages of both faculty and administrators did likewise.

We can probably attribute the considerable differences among students, faculty and administrators on the religious merits of attending LU to the frame of reference common to each group. Undergraduates attending LU in 1981 had both demographic and economic reasons to have credentialistic motivations. Not only was the market for new job-seekers terrible, but they were also following the footsteps of the so-called "Baby-Boom" cohorts, who had already flooded the job market for years to come with college-educated workers (Harter, 1983:586-592). These bleak prospects, combined with the lower socioeconomic backgrounds of LU students, largely accounts for heavily credentialistic orientations. The administrators, on the other hand, have probably reached heir high organizational status as a result of their support for LU's official goals. In other words, they have been selected largely because they satisfied certain criteria of trustworthiness and/or loyalty to other administrators' ideas about how the school should operate.[10] The result of this process, referred to by Kanter (1977:47-68) as "homosexual reproduction," would logically result in the administrators' responses being a

---

[10]This line of reasoning follows Pfeffer (1978:57-68), who cites the tendency of management to recruit the other members of the organization most like themselves.

quantifiable measure of the official LU organizational ideology on the above items.

According to this schema, faculty find themselves quite literally in the middle. Like the administrators, they are too familiar with the status rankings within higher education to pay great heed to LU's academic benefits over other schools. Yet they are not as convinced of its religious merits as are the administrators. From their point of view, LU's greatest potential lies in its liberal arts benefits.

Differences Among Groups on Core Curriculum Goals

The varying responses of the three status groups on the Core goal items (see Table 19 below) combines the patterns found among the academic and religious benefits of LU.

As discussed, students generally considered the Core goals important. So did both the faculty and administrators, by even larger ratios. Generally speaking, as with the academic/credentialistic benefits of LU, the faculty and administrators' sentiments on the Core goal were approximatley equal. With the exception of being a person "of reflection and critical judgement," an average of only four percentage points separated the ratios marking high importance. The considerably higher faculty ratio on the former item (93% vs. 81%) is consistent with that group's greater interest in LU's liberal arts benefits.

TABLE 19.--STATUS GROUPS ON GOALS OF CORE CURRICULUM

What importance do you give to becoming a person:	Percentage saying "high importance"		
	Students	Faculty	Administrators
Aware of today's society and actively concerned for the future of the human race	79	92	88
Of reflection and critical judgment	64	93	81
For others	62	71	73
Formed with a passion for justice	54	67	66
Responsible to his/her brothers/sisters and to history	44	67	62
Aware of his/her religious vocation	26	37	45
	n= 560	150	91

Further insights into the faculty and administrators' responses on the Core items is contained in Table 20 (see below).

Among both sets of responses, the total figures conceal denominational differences on one-half the items. Within the faculty, being a person for others, responsible to history, and aware of one's religious vocation all were judged very important significantly more often by the Catholics. Among administrators, the same denominational differences also obtained on two of the items (person for others and vocation), but not on the third. Instead, the RC administrators marked being aware of society and the future of the human race very important significantly more often than did non-Catholics.

Building on earlier discussion of the groups' differing responses to LU's advantages, an additional conclusion follows from Tables 19 and 20. In contrast to the advantages items, no clear stepwise pattern is evident in answers to the Core Curriculum goals. Students were only slightly less enthusiastic about them than the others. There was virtually no difference between the faculty and the administrators.

II. Status and LU's Recent Corporate Identity

We have established two dominant response patterns on the key items related to LU's educational goals. The

TABLE 20.--FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS ON CORE CURRICULUM GOALS BY RELIGION*

Item	Percentage marking very important					
	Faculty			Administrators		
	RC	non-RC	Total	RC	non-RC	Total
Importance R's give to becoming a person:						
Aware of today's society and actively concerned for the future of the human race	94	89	92	93**	73	88
Of reflection and critical judgment	91	97	94	81	82	81
For others	80**	62	72	79**	52	73
Formed with a passion for justice	69	67	69	72	50	66
Responsible to his/her brothers/sisters and to history	76**	58	68	63	59	62
Aware of his/her religious vocation	56**	14	38	54**	18	45
N=	83	63 (57%)		69	22 (76%)	

*Religion is coded as in Table 15.

**Kendall's Tau significance at or beyond .01 level.

first is increasing support, which places the faculty midway between the students' and administrators' responses. I shall call this configuration the "hierarchical pattern." The best example of this pattern is respondents' answers on the religious benefit of attending LU. Second, much smaller between-group differences occurred in other areas (notably the academic advantage items and Core goals). Although the undergraduates did consider LU's academic advantages much greater than either the faculty or administrators, the difference between the latter groups was negligible. Even less disagreement occurred over the importance of the Core goals; on many of them, over two-thirds of all three groups considered them highly important.

What determines the different response patterns among groups? in answering this question, I will return to Chapter III's discussion of LU's new "Jesuit-yet-independent" corporate identity, and then proceed to examine survey responses in order to verify or refute the hypotheses generated by the dynamics of between-group differences.

Vague Corporate Rationale

As mentioned previously (see pp. 132-135, the JYI corporate rationale which appeared in the early 1970s was designed to accomplish two somewhat contrary purposes. By linking an LU education with the long tradition of Jesuit education, the identity in prin-

ciple supplied a bridge to the past. By assiduously avoiding references to the RC Church, it anabled LU to satisfy the legal requirements for non-denominationalism. In so doing, however, the official JYI identity statements suffered simultaneously from ahistoricism and abiguity. As clearly demonstrated by Durkheim, the Ratio was not simply a liberal arts philosophy of education, but a Reformation-era educational system which quite successfully countered the age's fusion of respect for classical culture and distaste for Roman Catholicism. Indeed, one of the reasons for the great success of Jesuit education among earlier U.S. Catholics was its built-in capacity for reinforcing students' Catholicism in the course of the program. The JYI formula's careful isolation of the liberal arts dimension of Jesuit education is a disembodied construct actually appearing for the first time, although described as centuries old.

The actual content of the JYI rationale, then, has been unclear. Is LU to become a non-denominational liberal arts university (a difficult balance to strike), as described in the new mission statements, or is its new description really a paper-and-ink smokescreen to camouflage a denominational college? Since the new identity is still in its fledgling stage, there are no definitive answers to such questions. Yet as members of a large organizational system, those associated with LU appear to adopt a working

interpretation of what they think "Jesuit-yet-independent" means. Among the undergraduates, who are involved for four or five years, the necessity for a well-conceived interpretation is not great. They can endorse Core goals while downplaying their implications for educational motivation. It is different for the faculty and administrators, many of whom will spend their entire careers at LU. The indispensability of a clear notion of what is meant by the JYI corporate rationale is especially real for administrators because they are commonly chosen for their loyalty to the organization. They are expected to uphold it and its purposes as part of their jobs.

Hence, it is reasonable to look for clues to the working content of LU's new identity in those questionnaire items exhibiting status-differentiated responses. Moreover, considering LU's longstanding emphasis on Jesuit governance, the most likely place to anticipate that administrators[11] might look for aid in piecing together a working definition of the meaning of "Jesuit-yet-independent" is those Jeusits currently working at LU. As members of the order, they constitute a kind of informal reference source on "Jesuitness." They are its personification. This interpretation of LU's status follows Weber's ideal type of traditional authority, which centers on a commonly recog-

---

[11]Who represent the highest position in the status-group pecking order.

nized master or set of master codes (Weber, 1974c:227).

Legitimacy derives from two sources:

> (a) partly in terms of traditions which themselves directly determine the content of the command and are believed to be valid within certain limits that cannot be overstepped without endangering the master's traditional status; (b) partly in terms of the master's discretion in that sphere which tradition leaves open to him. . . (Weber, 1974c:227).

Although for LU's JYI identity the Ratio is invoked as the "master" guidance, its masterly role is largely symbolic. This makes the role played by the Jesuits indispensable. According to Weber, the first source of top-level personnel within a traditional authority structure is kinsmen--relatives or close personal associates of the master (Weber, 1974c:228), which at LU are the existing members of the founding order of the school and the Ratio. Others can also be recruited to serve at high levels, but only after they have first proven their personal loyalty to the "master" principle (Weber, 1974c:228).

But demonstrating their loyalty to LU's recent JYI ideology is a difficult process for would-be and current adminstrators. I hypothesize that their solution to this problem is to discern as best they can what the phrase seems to mean to those "master" Jesuits in attendance. They then prove themselves by mirroring back those qualities to a greater extent than others either attending or working at LU.

Before examining the merit of this hypothesis, a

further point is pertinent. In a traditional organizational system such as Weber described, there must be a clear preference for what Gouldner has termed "locals" (Gouldner, 1957), who are trusted and considered loyal. At LU, "locals" refers to members of the Jesuit order, longstanding faculty at LU, or others familiar to members of the Jesuit order (by way of earlier educational or seminary contact).

One way of testing whether the Jesuits working at LU in 1981 did affect status-linked response patterns is to separate them from non-Jesuit respondents. Unfortunately, no questionnaire item directly addressed whether or not respondents were Jesuits. The closest approximation follows from isolating priests working at LU during that time. The resultant N of 36 represents a ratio of 24% "Jesuits" among the combined faculty and administrators. Although this figure is higher than the 10% Jeusit faculty members and eight percent Jesuit administrators indicated by the Arts and Sciences catalog for 1979-81, it is the best measure of Jesuits which the questionnaire makes available. Using this coding, I will next examine the "Jesuit" faculty and administrators when separated from the non-Jesuits. Should a significant difference between Jesuits' and non-Jesuits' answers on key items emerge, their response can be compared to the three status groups' answers.

Jesuits and Non-Jesuits

As Table 21 demonstrates (see below), the Jesuits did answer some of the items much differently from non-Jesuits. The ratio of Jesuit respondents considering the use of contraceptives in marriage wrong (44%) was virtually the same as the non-Jesuits who considered it usually or always right (42%). Although less dramatic, major differences separated the Jesuits from others on the rest of the items as well. Over twice as many Jesuits as non-Jesuits marked sexual relations with one's fiance or between homosexuals wrong. Almost as large a margin (86% vs. 48%) separated the groups' scores on the culpability of having sexual relations with a prostitute. All the differences between Jesuits and non-Jesuits were significant (cf. note at bottom of Table 21).

When the patterns between Jesuits and non-Jesuits on the Core items are similarly depicted (cf. Table 22), more interesting differences between them become evident. In all cases, the Jesuits rated the Core goals higher than the others. In the case of the last four items, the difference between groups was significant at the .01 level. An average of twenty-seven percent more Jesuits thought being a person "for others," "with a passion for justice" and "responsible to his/her brothers/sisters" was highly important. Almost three times as many Jesuits (89% vs. 31%) considered the religious vocation item highly important.

TABLE 21.--JESUITS ON SELECTED SEXUAL ITEMS

Item	Figures shown are percentages			
	non-S.J. faculty + administrators		S.J. Faculty + administrators	
	W*	R	W	R
Contraceptives in marriage**	8	42	44	6
Sexual relations with fiance	21	31	53	6
Homosexual relations between consenting adults	31	9	69	0
Sexual relations with prostitute	48	5	86	0
N=	202		36	

*W = percentage marking terribly or seriously wrong; R = percentage marking usually or always right.

**Kendall's Tau significance of all variables exceeds .001.

TABLE 22.--JESUITS ON GOALS OF CORE CURRICULUM

Item	Percentage marking high importance: Non-S.J. faculty + administrators	S.J. Faculty + administrators
Importance given to becoming a person:		
Aware of today's society and actively concerned for the future of the human race	89	94
Of reflection and critical judgment	87	97
for others*	67	94
Formed with a passion for justice*	63	89
Responsible to his/her brothers/sisters and to history*	61	89
Aware of his/her religious vocation*	31	89
	N = 202	36

*Kendall's Tau significance exceeds .01.

Much the same pattern is evident in the responses of Jesuits as compared to non-Jesuits on the liberal arts and religious advantages of LU items (see Table 23 below). Although insignificant differences occurred between the two groups' priority for liberal education and stress on values, much larger fluctuations of between twenty-one and thirty-one percent occurred on the last three items. Over two-thirds of the Jesuits (71% and 73%) thought that LU's Catholicity and religious atmosphere were highly important benefits of attending, while less than one-half of the non-Jesuits (42% and 49%) concurred. The forty-four percent of the Jesuits indicating that a variety of theology courses was highly important amounted to over three and one-third times the ratio of non-Jesuits answering similarly.

Jesuits and Status Groups

When the data depicted in Tables 21, 22, and 23 are superimposed on the response patterns noted earlier, an interesting configuration emerges. The first such overlay concerns how the three status groups and derived "Jesuit" respondents answered on the sexual items (see Table 24 below).

The hierarchical pattern noted in earlier discussion of the sexual items is clearly extended to some of the other items when the Jesuits are included. Indeed even the

TABLE 23.--JESUITS ON SELECTED ADVANTAGES OF LU*

Item	Percentage marking "very" important: non-S.J. faculty + administrators	S.J. faculty + administrators
The emphasis on liberal education	51	65
More stress on values	56	71
It is a Catholic university**	42	73
Exposure to a religious atmosphere**	49	71
The opportunity to take a variety of theology courses**	13	44
	N = 202	

*On the academic items, there were no significant differences between Jesuits and non-Jesuits.

**Kendall's Tau significance at or beyond .01 level.

TABLE 24.--STATUS GROUPS AND JESUITS ON SEXUAL ITEMS

Item	Figures are percentages							
	students		faculty		Administrators		S.J. faculty + admin.*	
	W**	R	W	R	W	R	W	R
Contraceptives in Marriage	5	48	11	42	19	26	44	6
Sexual relations with fiance	10	46	20	30	36	21	53	6
Homosexual relations between consenting adults	45	7	31	9	47	4	69	0
Sexual relations with a prostitute	62	2	51	1	60	1	86	0
N =	560		150		91		(36)	

*A constructed category included for purposes of comparison.

**W = percentage marking terribly or seriously wrong; R = percentage marking usually or always right.

administrators' traditionalism pales in comparison to the traditionalism of the Jesuits.

Jesuit/non-Jesuit patterns on the sexual and Core items seem at first to support the Weberian principle of "kinsmanship." When the scores of the three status groups on the sexual items are compared with the Jesuits' (see Table 24), a clear continuum is evident. The Jesuits almost unanimously maintained the traditional Church position on each item. Next came the administrators, then the faculty, followed by the students.

Yet this interpretation does not fit all the items listed in Table 24. The scores of the administrators and students on the homosexual and prostitute relations items were remarkably similar, leaving the largest differences between the faculty and Jesuits. An average of thirty-six percentage points separated the two groups "wrong" ratios on the items.

In analyzing the groups' deviation from the increasing support patterns observed on the homosexual and prostitute items, it is important to remember that the students and administrators contained the largest ratio of Catholics (71% and 76% respectively) next to the Jesuits themselves. It is likely that their mutual condemnation of homosexual sex and sex with a prostitute is linked to the high ratio of Catholics in each group. For them, such activities fall outside the category of "discretionary"

sexual practices (e.g., contraception and premarital sex) on which a large number of Catholics have broken with the institutional Church (Greeley, 1977:129). The fact that the students' and administrators' answers on them are so close indicates that these respondents' Catholicism is responsible for the pattern, and not their location in the organizational system.

This observation suggests two conclusions. First, the apparently hierarchical response pattern observed on the first two items is probably more related to each group's preponderant form of Catholicism than it is to organizational status. In contrast to homosexuality and having sex with a prostitute, the students answered as "communal Catholics" (Greeley, 1977:270-274) on the two items on which Catholics often dispute Church teaching authority. The fact that the faculty and administrators' responses form a hierarchical pattern culminating in the official Church (and Jesuit) position simply reflects the fact that the Catholics in each group were more traditional than the RC students. Since there was a larger percentage of RC administrators, their total scores were higher. Second, the "hierarchical" configuration may not be related to the organizational dynamics of LU at all. Since this pattern is evident only in those items directly concerning denominational or religious concerns, perhaps it simply reflects the fact that the RC undergraduates' Catholicism is differ-

ent from older Catholics, and that there are more RC administrators than RC faculty (76% vs 57%).

The latter finding is nuanced by superimposing the Jesuits' responses on the status groups' answers to the liberal arts and religious advantage items (see Table 25 below). Once again, the stepwise increase of emphasis on each item is again quite evident on most of the items. Yet the pattern breaks down for the liberal arts items. Here, faculty came closest to the Jesuits' scores. Contrary to a status-based explanation's prediction that they would profile less like the Jesuit "kinsmen" of the Ratio than adminstrators, they outdistanced the enthusiasm of the administrators in this area (52% vs. 46%). Hence, the organizationally-based hypothesis for the hierarchical responses is not generally supported by the information contained in Table 24. Although the Jesuits do at first appear on some of the items to set the standard which others emulate (with varying degrees of enthusiasm), a simple conformity pattern is discernable only on those items directly concerned with Catholicism (i.e., either practices on which the Church has expressed a clear opinion, or on which a long history of RC education suggests the "right" position). In fact, respondents in each subgroup seem to have merely answered according to their interpretation of religion. Since Catholics represent such a large majority, communal vs. traditional Catholicism (not organizational loyalty) seems to have been

TABLE 25.--STATUS GROUPS AND JESUITS ON SELECTED ADVANTAGES OF LU*

Item	Percentage marking "very important"			
	students	faculty	administrators	S.J. faculty + administrators
The emphasis on liberal education	29	52	46	65
More stress on values	28	44	56	71
It is a Catholic university	14	31	39	73
Exposure to a religious atmosphere	13	34	46	71
The opportunity to take a variety of theology courses	9	9	22	44
N =	560	150	91	36

*There was virtually no difference between the groups (or the Jesuits and others) on the items related to academic/credentialistic motives.

the real dividing line. The apparent hierarchical configuration on such items is merely a function of the varying numbers and types of Catholics in each group.

There is, however, one aspect of the Jesuits-as-kinsmen concept which remains useful. The Jesuits at LU combine interest in LU's Catholicity with almost equivalent enthusiasm for its liberal arts dimension in a way not duplicated by any of the other groups. Assuming that the administrators do feel some need to display their loyalty other than through their predominantly RC Church membership, it is surprising that they have not picked up on the liberal arts component in the Jesuits' attitudes to a greater degree than they have. Instead, the faculty consistently showed more interest in LU's liberal arts component (cf. Tables 19 and 25). They rated both being a person of critical reflection (93% vs. 81%) and LU's emphasis on liberal education (52% vs. 46%) highly important more often than the administrators.

The substantive nature of this anomaly is further illuminated by Table 26 below. These figures are particularly revealing because the Core items most directly mirror the JYI identity. Their non-denominationally phrased fusion of religious, humanitarian, and liberal arts motivations represents the best single measure of the subgroups' enthusiasm for the new identity. Again, the Jesuits' overwhelming support for the goals supports the "kinsmen" idea

TABLE 26.--STATUS GROUPS AND JESUITS ON GOALS OF CORE CURRICULUM

Item	Percentage marking "high importance"			
	Students	Faculty	Administrators	S.J. faculty + administrators*
Importance given to becoming a person:				
Aware of today's society and actively concerned for the human race	79	92	88	94
Of reflection and critical Judgment	64	93**	81	97
For others	62	71	73	94
Formed with a passion for justice	54	67	66	89
Responsible to his/her brothers/sisters and to history	44	67	62	89
Aware of his/her religious vocation	26	37	45	89
N =	560	150	91	(36)

*A constructed category included for purposes of comparison.

**Kendall's Tau -significance at .01 level (with administrators' answers).

that they are the group best equipped to appreciate the JYI model. The great similarity between the non-student groups suggests that religion plays a much less important role in acceptance of the items than on the religious advantages and sexual items. It also highlights the import of the one item on which faculty and administrators' answers diverged --being the sort of person which liberal arts education seeks to produce.

Although the administrators were certainly not opposed to the Core items, the fact that their responses were not more like the Jesuits' may indicate some potential problems between them and the faculty. For one thing, it is obvious that a higher proportion of administrators are Catholic than students or faculty.[12] This in itself may be unsettling to the large percentage of the faculty (almost one-half) which are not Catholic. More importantly, the administrators' curiously weaker support for LU's liberal arts dimension probably magnifies in faculty members' minds their strongly traditional Catholicism. The administrators' motives may well seem less solicitous of the JYI identity than of mere denominationalism. Put differently, if the administrators seemed to equally combine traditional Catholicism with interest in humanitarianism and the liberal

---

[12]This fact probably does not escape the notice of the others, and particularly the faculty (who observe administrative appointments with great interest).

arts as the Jesuits do, their traditionalism would appear in line with the blending of past and present which LU's corporate self-description espouses. As it is, their traditionalism takes on the shape of an autonomous badge of entry into the corporate ranks.

Hence, repsondents' general endorsement of the Core goal items means both less and more than meets the eye. It means less than we might initially expect because it is obvious that while all three groups are in favor of the items, the way each interprets them is different. This ambiguity enables us, however, to glean more from the responses than would otherwise be possible. To the students, the Core ideals sound good, but they have little practical meaning since they are associated with nothing else. The faculty's support for the items is apparently focused on their potential for strengthening LU as a liberal arts college. Meanwhile, the administrators' support was not close enough to the Jesuits' to demonstrate special allegiance to these goals. Moreover, they consistently ranked the liberal arts emphasis lower than either the faculty or the Jesuits (both when asked about LU's educational advantages and the Core goals).

One final note. Although the traditional "kinsmen" of the new JYI identity, the Jesuits are not simply homogenous in their responses. As exhibited in Table 27 below, their answers on certain items were also split according to

TABLE 27.--JESUITS BY AGE ON SELECTED SEXUAL ITEMS

Item	Figures are percentages					
	Jesuits under 50		Jesuits 50 or over		Total	
	W*	R	W	R	W	R
Contraceptives in marriage**	15	15	61	--	44	6
Sexual Relations with fiance**	23	15	70	30	53	6
Homosexual relations between consenting adults**	46	--	83	--	69	--
Sexual relations with a prostitute	77	--	91	--	86	--
N =	13		23			

*W = percentage marking terribly or seriously wrong; R = percentage usually or always right.

**Kendall's Tau significance at or exceeding .01.

age groups. Those under fifty, for example , much less often considered wrong the use of contraceptives in marriage (15%), sexual relations with fiance (23%), and homosexual relations between consenting adults (46%). Apart from the sexual items, however, only a few other age-related differences among the Jesuits occurred. Whereas forty-two percent of Jesuits under fifty considered LU's religious atmosphere very important, almost two-thirds (58%) of those over fifty did.[13] While only slightly more than one-half (55%) of the younger Jesuits considered the fact that LU is an RC university very important, over two-thirds (72%) of their older confreres did. Virtually no differences occurred on the Core items. Still, the fact that some differences arose suggests that among members of LU's founding order, some attitudinal variation exists. If so, it is hardly surprising that other respondents also approached the new JYI identity much like a Rorschach Test; they saw in it the aspirations that they brought to LU.

III. Multiple Regression of Key Items

In this section, I will use more powerful statistics to test some of the inferences reached earlier. Among the propositions to be examined are: (1) respondents' rating of the importance of LU's religious benefits

[13] These figures are not shown in tabular format.

and Core Curriculum objectives was tied to Catholicity; (2) apart from religion, status-groupings played some part in attitudes toward both; (3) interest in the credentialistic benefits of attending LU was not related to Catholicity or status. Using simple and constructed variables, I will further examine these propositions in multiple regression analysis.

Variables Used

I will use constructed variables which combine respondents' scores over two or more single items as dependent variables. The variable names are LURELIGN, SJINDEPEN, and LUCREDENT. LURELIGN is respondents' average score on the four combined items associated with LU's current religious benefits (see Table 28 below).

The four items used are religious atmosphere, RC university, variety of theology courses, and stress on values. SJINDEPEN is the respondent's average score on the benefits of attending LU items logically implicated[14] by

---

[14]SJINDEPEN is used rather than a composite measure of the Core items themselves for two reasons. First, so many marked "high importance" in the items that the distribution of responses is seriously skewed. Second, it is hard to conclude anything from the responses on them, since the three groups seem to understand them differently. Instead, assuming that their main logical content is continued respect for RC tradition combined with special concern for liberal arts education (i.e., the interpretation of "Jesuit-yet-independent" common to LU Jesuits), the pertinent advantages of the educational benefit items are used.

TABLE 28.--REGRESSION VARIABLES AND CONSTITUTIVE ITEMS

Regression Variable	Content
LURELIGN	LU denominational benefits; consists of: (1) religious atmosphere; (2) RC university; (3) variety of theology courses; (4) stress on values.
SJINDEPEN	LU Core educational benefits; consists of: (1) liberal arts; (2) RC university; (3) stress on values.
LUCREDENT	LU Credentialistic benefits; consists of: (1) academic programs; (2) acceptance into graduate/professional school.
RELIGION	Catholic/not Catholic (dummy = R1) R1 = Catholic
STATUS	2-dummy variable differentiating students, faculty, and administrators (dummies = S1, S2) S1 = faculty, S2 = administrators.
RCSEX2	Selected Sexual Behaviors; consists of (1) contraceptive use in marriage; (2) premarital sex with fiance.
INTERACT	2-dummy variable representing the interaction of RELIGION with STATUS* (dummies = I1, I2), I1 = R1S1 (RC faculty/ not), I2 = R1S2 (RC administrators/not).

*Whenever more than 1 categoric variable is used in multiple regression, the possibility of a compound effect must be taken into account (Kim & Kohout, 1975). Because INTERACT proved to have a negligible influence on all 3 dependent variables, it is not discussed further.

the Core goal statements. The three benefit items which comprise this measure are liberal arts, RC university, and stress on values. This variable roughly measures openness to the educational outcomes of LU's JYI identity as experienced during the 1981 academic year. LUCREDENT is another constructed variable. It is respondent's average score on the two academic benefits of attending LU which best exemplified credentialistic motives. The two items used are academic programs and acceptance into graduate or professional school. The independent variables are RELIGION, STATUS, and RCSEX2. RELIGION is a dummy variable[15] coded Catholic/non-Catholic. STATUS is another dummy variable which, because it corresponds to three separate groups (students, faculty, and administrators), is subdivided into two codes (S1 and S2). When entered into the regression equation, the dummy codes automatically take account of the missing category because the coefficients assigned to them are figured using the uncoded category as a reference point (Kim and Kohout, 1975:374). That is, the dummy coefficients automatically represent the effect of a particular coding compared to the uncoded category.

---

[15] Dummy variables are necessary in regression when categoric data are included. Since it would be illigitimate to assign numeric value to such variables, they are transformed into a binary, or dummy, variable which can then be added to the regression equation in a yes/no format (Kim & Kohout, 1975). The number of dummies necessary to represent a nominal variable is the number of categories minus one.

Finally, RCSEX2 is a measure of RC traditionalism. It is the average score of respondents on the two sexual items which most clearly distinguished the differences between orthodox RC attitudes and those of communal Catholics. The two items included are contraceptive use and premarital sex with one's fiance.

Before discussing the results of the regression analysis, it is helpful to know how the respondents scored on the dependent variables, both as a whole and as separate subgroups. Table 29 displays this information (see below), and gives support to two sets of conclusions. First, the distributions on the dependent variables are not seriously skewed. Second, the composite variable COREGOAL, which is not used in the analysis, is heavily skewed in the direction of "high importance" (cf. Table 29). This variable, which directly measures respondents' attitudes toward the Core goals, was subsequently dropped from consideration.

One caution on the use of multiple regression with these data is necessary. There is a longstanding debate within sociology on the suitability of using non-categoric statistics with categoric data. Methodologists like Blalock (1972) have contended that such data do not satisfy the conditions necessary for regression statistics, and thus cannot be analyzed with them. Others, such as Labovitz (1972, 1975), have argued that ordinal data, when constructed according to a Likert scale, are appropriate for

TABLE 29.--LU SUBGROUPS ON DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Variable	Students		Faculty		Administrators		total	
	H*	U	H	U	H	U	H	U
LURELIGN	20	34	40	22	52	12	27	30
SJINDEPEN	28	20	51	13	60	6	35	17
LUCREDENT	78	2	42	11	42	7	68	4
Coregoal**	86	--	96	--	88	--	88	--

*H = percentage responses averaged high importance; U = percentage averaging little or no importance.

**Respondents' average score on the 6 Core Curriculum goal statements.

such procedures. I have followed Labovitz' interpretation, and will employ correlation statistics with the 1981 survey data. Also, cognizant of the danger of possible discrepancies when such statistics are employed with data broken into less than five categories (cf. Bollen & Barb, 1981), I have followed the thinking of those advocates of "strong statistics" who consider the slight distortion of information which might result to be outweighed by their potential for facilitating more powerful analysis (cf. Labovitz, 1970).

Results of Multiple Regression

The results of multiple regression analysis for each of the dependent variables is displayed in Table 30 (see below). The best predictors of how respondents ranked the traditional denominational advantages of attending LU were the two religious varaibles, R1 and RCSEX2. These two easily garnered the largest zero-order coefficients with LURELIGN (.39 and .51, both significant beyond the .000 level) as well as accounted for the greatest variance when entered into the full regression model. Not surprisingly, being a Catholic accounted for proportionally more variance in the full model (.30) as compared to the RC sexual orthodoxy variable than is suggested by its Pearson coefficient. This indicates that attitudes toward the sexual items are indeed associated with Catholicism. Knowing one's score on

TABLE 30.--REGRESSION RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN KEY VARIABLES

	LURELIGN			SJINDEPEN			LUCREDENT		
	r*	B**	F***	r	B	F	r	B	F
RELIGION (Rl)	.386	.301	132.7	.310	.253	80.5	NA****		
RCSEX2	.515	.393	213.8	.418	.301	20.3	NA		
STATUS									
(Sl)	.128	.158	19.5	.165	.199	28.2	.150	.167	18.3
(S2)	.228	.138	20.6	.207	.148	20.4	.074	.103	8.5
INTERACT									
(I1)		NA			NA			NA	
(I2)		NA			NA			NA	
R-squared*****		.371			.268			.033	
N		759			760			801	

*Zero-order correlation coefficient.

**Standardized coefficient in total equation.

***Hierarchical F statistic (i.e., resultant with each variable when added separately).

****Both Rl and RCSEX2 proved insignificant in LUCREDENT equation

*****Interaction terms were insignificant in LURELIGN and SJINDEPEN equations; they were unnecessary in the LUCREDENT equation, because RL had been excluded.

RCSEX2 further clarifies the manner of Catholicism the respondent subscribes to. Further, both STATUS codings proved to add significant predictive power to the model. As hypothesized in Section II, their significant F ratios (19.5 and 20.6) indicate that once religion and sexual orthodoxy were taken into account, organizational status played an additional role in differentiating respondents' attitudes toward LU's traditional religious payoffs.

The net predictive power of the model in explaining LURELIGN is high for social scientific research. The R-squared of .37 compares, for example, only slightly below the .43 coefficient of determination reported in Blau and Duncan's status attainment model (Blau & Duncan, 1967:174). The fact that so few variables accounted for so much variance in respondents' scores on LURELIGN is strong evidence that its constitutive items are indeed largely denominational payoffs. We can surmise that if similar questions had been asked at LU before 1965, the LURELIGN items would have been more popular, although this cannot be tested directly. We can, however, extrapolate the likely future of interest in such payoffs, if in fact it has declined considerably. Such interest can only continue to flag, as long as present trends (e.g., growing latitude of topics falling within the purview of issues considered discretionary, continuing non-espousal of denominational objectives in official goal statement's and curricula) continue.

As compared to LURELIGN, the model's ability to predict how respondents' rated the educational implications of the JYI identity (SJINDEPEN) was weaker (.27), but still considerable. Once again, R1 and RCSEX2 accounted for the lion's share of the variance (Beta = .25 and .30 in the full model), but both were less conclusive than in the case of LURELIGN. Instead, the STATUS codings played a more significant role in predicting SJINDEPEN scores. That is, apart from whether or not one was Catholic and how traditional was their Catholicism, STATUS Categories accounted for more SJINDEPEN variance than did LURELIGN.

This finding suggests that the recent JYI identity statement's contention that it is describing a different corporate entity than a denominational college has some validity; purely denominational factors did play less of a role in influencing attitudes toward the SJINDEPEN items than they did in the case of LURELIGN's mixture of conventional denominational college benefits. Yet the failure of the STATUS variable to account for more variance than it did also suggests that faculty and administrators are not sure of the contents contained in the new identity package. As noted earlier, this uncertainty has resulted in a bifurcation among the two groups. Faculty more strongly support the liberal arts dimension of "Jesuit-yet-independent's" logical components; the administrators are more favorable

to the identity's promise for retaining traditional denominational emphases.

In contrast to both of the other dependent variables, the model's ability to account for LUCREDENT scores was negligible. When added one by one, neither R1 nor RCSEX2 added sufficient ability to estimate how highly respondents rated LU's credentialistic benefits to be retained. The F statistic resulting from R1 was 1.9;[16] that resulting from the addition of RCSEX2 was 2.5. Only the STATUS codings satisfied the criterion of adding significantly more predictive power than the simple mean of LUCREDENT scores. Still, the R-square figure (.03) resultant from using the STATUS dummies exclusively indicates that little is learned about how credentialistic one's attitudes were by knowing respondents' organizational status. In other words, there were powerful factors which affected all three status groups not contained in the model (or, as it turned out, in the rest of the questionnaire items).

Extraneous Factors Affecting Credentialism

In accounting for the powerful influence of outside forces in explaining LU credentialism, it is important to remember that the case-study method underlying this analysis precludes examining inter-school status. There are no data by which to compare LU students with those attending

---

[16]Neither figure is included in Table 30.

elite universities, or even other RC ones. As Vanfossen, (1979:264-273) has outlined, a number of studies have demonstrated the presence of a stratification system among U.S. colleges and universities. It may be that credentialism at LU is a more deeply experienced orientation among all three subgroups than is true at Harvard (for example), or even Georgetown.[17] The lack of such data makes testing the effect of such rankings impossible.

But no matter how large the scope of a study, it is virtually assured that some influences will remain extraneous to the analysis. According to Parsons and Platt, western society has developed a penchant for what they term "instrumental activism" (1973:41). If so, it would not be surprising if practical motivations predominated in those either attending or working in higher education contexts. Indeed, Parsons and Platt observed that U.S. society is unique in institutionalizing a large network of such organizations specifically geared to the intellectual dimension of instrumental activism (i.e., the dissemination and production of knowledge in universities). Although not stated in the same terms, Bowles and Gintis' research (1976) on the direct relationship between education and stratification does not contradict such a hypothesis. Hence another comparative level which may well influence LUCREDENT

---

[17]Where older and more nationally connected ties facilitate easier access to mobility ladders.

scores is the fact that respondents are Americans--not to mention westerners. If compared with the attitudes of students, faculty, and administrators at a South American or Indian university, LU respondents' considerable respect for credentialistic motives might well be better accounted for.

Also, the shape which the post-World War II welfare state has taken in the U.S., as compared, for example, to Europe and Japan, may also play a part in respondents' credentialism. Compared to such planned societies as England and Japan, Americans are to a much greater extent left to their own devices in the provision of adequate income, housing, and health care. Depending on the way in which university credentials are accounted for in such places (e.g., how they figure into unemployment benefits),[18] university students and personnel there may actually be more concerned with gaining a credential than their U.S. counterparts. Again, the absence of such data make testing this observation impossible.

IV. Conclusions

In the overall analysis, the principal conclusion reached in Section I was that the student population served by LU in 1981 was demonstrably different than would have been the case twenty years earlier. The major difference

---

[18] Special thanks to Richard Block, Ph.D., of Loyola University of Chicago, for providing insight into this line of reasoning.

was not the percentage of RC students. Although the proportion of RC students in 1961 would probably have approached 100%, still more than two-thirds were Catholic in 1981. Rather, the most consequential difference was in the kind of RC students attending in 1981. During the latter period, students held overwhelmingly permissive attitudes toward certain sexual practices which earlier would have been largely condemned on an RC campus. Although their non-orthodox attitudes were limited to certain issues, RC students' overall approach to Catholicism in 1981 would probably have destroyed the viability of the denominational approach at LU regardless of other factors. This conclusion supports Chapter II's discussion of the demise of the RC college.

Second, RC students' non-traditional Catholicism seems to have had serious consequences for the former close relationship between U.S. Catholicism and the Jesuit higher educational philosophy. Although the majority of undergraduates were still Catholic, the perceived benefits of LU's traditional denominational benefits rated very low among them. They still mattered to some; but not to as many, or even to the same extent. Rather, students most highly prized the credentialistic rewards of attending LU as they saw them. Whether or not credentialism has increased since 1961 is unknown. It is more likely, however, that such students' longstanding credentialistic concerns

simply have not diminished since then. Hence, they now exhibit a primary educational motivation which once was tempered with denominational motivation.

Students' attitudes toward the stated goals of the post-1973 Core Curriculum exhibited few denominational effects. Only the goal of career planning, because its phrasing reflected the traditional RC emphasis on religious vocation, reflected denominational differences. The item was unpopular among students (as it was in general).

Building on preliminary discussion of 1981 students' attitudes toward the educational goals and processes of LU, two interesting response patterns emerged when faculty and administrators' responses were also considered. The first clearly followed a hierarchical configuration in which students' answers contrasted most sharply with administrators', and faculty attitudes fell in between. Responses about the denominational rewards of LU and the sexual behavior items best exemplified this tendency. Answers on the more academic rewards of attending, as well as in the goals of the Core, however, defied this pattern. Faculty and administrators both answered such items similarly, as contrasted with the students.[19]

The items on which respondents fell into hierarchical rankings proved closely allied to RC denominationalism.

---

[19]On the latter items, even the difference in attitudes between the students and others was not great.

Hence the preliminary hypothesis that Jesuits present a living roadmap of "Jesuit-yet-independent"-ness proved less useful than expected. Still, it did highlight the difference between faculty and administrators' responses on the liberal arts benefits of attending LU. The conclusion suggested by the rather tangled interplay of status and religion in respondents' attitudes is that LU's new corporate identity is interpreted in conformity with the totality of the religious/humanitarian/liberal arts language of its official description only by the Jesuits. Neither the students, faculty, nor administrators have combined all three elements to the same extent.

Not that its abstractness has worked against the JYI identity's popularity among respondents. Overwhelming proportions of all three groups supported them as stated in the goals of the Core Curriculum. Considerable numbers (over one-half of both the faculty and administrators) even highly valued the particular educational payoffs of attending LU (i.e., liberal arts emphasis, stress on values, RC university) implied by them.

The regression analysis largely reinforced the main contours of the crosstabular analysis. The principal determinant of how highly respondents rated LU's denominational benefits was their orientation toward Catholicism. Religion played a much smaller part in influencing how respondents rated the Core items' synthesis of liberal arts,

values, and Catholicity. Status, although significantly involved in predicting both sets of scores, influenced the latter more strongly. Yet, because of the confusion as to what the new identity means, it did not have as strong an influence as it might have. Administrators failed to give equal priority to the Core's liberal arts implications, while faculty endorsed them much more strongly than they did its denominational benefits. Finally, the available data from the Religious Values Assessment lacked the kinds of information necessary to help account for respondents' credentialism. Conventional socioeconomic information[20] (e.g., father's education, family income) lacked the necessary analytic scope to measure the types of macrosocial processes which influence this pervasive social fact.

---

[20]Traditional socioeconomic measures (e.g., father's education, father's occupation, combined income), although included in the instrument, added virtually no additional predictive power to LUCREDENT scores.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study has addressed three major questions. Has the contemporary Catholic university really ceased to function as a denominational college? If so, does it now operate as a research university? Finally, if indeed the RC university no longer fits the description of the denominational college, its alteration has been both recent and abrupt. What, if any, are the strains faced by the contemporary RC university?

Here, I will summarize the major findings relevant to these questions. I will then discuss the ramifications of those findings for both Loyola and the theory and methods of sociology.

I. Overview of Findings

The first major hypothesis, that Loyola recently underwent a substantial modification of its educational content and procedures, must be accepted on the basis of the available data. Loyola has since the mid-1960s increasingly resembled non-sectarian universities. Curricula have undergone modification to reflect disciplinary, rather than Catholic, viewpoints toward the organization of knowledge. Regulations reinforcing students' membership in the RC Church, once a hallmark of a Loyola education, have

succumbed to legal and societal trends toward non-sectarian education. Loyola's official self-descriptions changed to reflect the transformation. By the mid-1970s, the school was described as a Jesuit liberal arts university; its Catholic roots were demonstrably less prominent.

Investigation of Hypothesis One proved essential to the study because it established the basic issues to be addressed in the rest of the analysis. In addition, it furnishes a case study testing the longstanding assertion by RC educators that their colleges and universities have undergone radical change since the early 1960s. Loyola incorporates most of the characteristics of the Jesuit universities, which in turn comprise the single largest block of such schools. Still, too little comparative data on other RC colleges and universities exists to make a further case for Loyola's representativeness. More comparative information is required. Notwithstanding, this study is the first to conduct a careful empirical examination of the change in key elements of an RC university over time. On this score, it makes a positive contribution to social scientists' understanding of American Catholic social and educational history.

The second hypothesis tested, that LU has since become a research university, must be rejected. The successors to Loyola's denominational structure and processes are not currently typical of the U.S. research university.

Loyola's Graduate School, for instance, has not sustained its mid-1960s growth as compared to the rest of the university. Nor has the ratio of faculty trained at elite schools steadily risen. Instead, after a brief period of real growth from 1955 to 1968, the percentage of graduate students has held steady since 1947. During the same period, the ratio of professional students has risen by one-third, while the percentage of elite-trained faculty shows signs of decline after peaking at twenty-five percent. That Loyola has failed to become a full-fledged research university is further suggested by the credentialistic motives of its students, as well as by its departments' national rankings.

Hence, while no longer a denominational RC university, the school has not become a research university either. It seemed as of 1981 to hover somewhere between, describing itself as a Jesuit liberal arts university. For this reason, Loyola's new corporate rationale of Jesuit-yet-independent education emerged during the course of the study as the pivotal element in its contemporary structure. While satisfying the legal requirements of non-sectarianism, the new identity also echoed elements of U.S. Catholicism unmistakeable to longstanding Catholics. Its promise, in other words, is that it appeals to the school's institutional clientele without ostensibly singling them out.

Yet the Jesuit-yet-independent rationale's claim of

consistency with centuries of Jesuit educational history is not historically accurate, and its exact meaning has remained unclear. While students, faculty,and administrators all supported the rationale's official wording and goals, they disagreed on specifics. Students seemed not to associate LU's new educational mission with anything, while the faculty focused on its implications for emphasizing the liberal arts. Administrators, while not eschewing the liberal arts implications of the school's new "Jesuit-yet-independent" character, appeared to associate it most closely with traditional RC attitudes and goals.

II. Implications

Two sets of implications follow from this study. The first concerns the case school. Having demonstrated the fragility of Loyola's new corporate identity, what sources of strain might we expect it to experience? A second set of ramifications relates less to the case school than to the field of sociology. For example, the use of archival research in close conjunction with survey research is not common in the literature. Yet, as this study demonstrates, their combined use bears interesting possibilities. Second, corporate goals have not been a frequent focus of organizational literature. My evidence suggests that they warrant more attention. I will conclude by discussing the

further utility of some concepts which proved helpful in the analysis.

Sources of Strain at Loyola

If Katz' (1977) contention that U.S. educational systems have exhibited the same propensity toward bureaucracy as most other large organizational structures is correct, then the development of the research university is partially the outcome of the bureaucratic processes of differentiation and specialization. The fact that Loyola now exists somewhere between the ideal types of the denominational college and research university is no assurance that its intermediate location will be permanent. On the contrary, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) have convincingly argued that most organizations exhibit a tendency to replicate the structure of the other organizations with which they interact. According to them, three types of mechanism influence "institutional isomorphic change": (1) coercive legal and political pressures; (2) mimetic tendencies to repeat actions taken by other organizations; (3) normative pressures based on assumptions common to members of a profession (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983:150). This model seems well suited to the case of Loyola. The jettisoning of denominational college regulations and self-descriptions in the face of funding requirements is a clear example of coercive pressure. Likewise, the faculty's preference for the

liberal arts ramifications of the new JYI identity is probably related to those ramifications' clear compatibility with the ideals of university professors, as opposed to the more religiously-tinged connotations of the other Core goal items.

If U.S. higher education is in fact subject to the "iron cage of bureaucratization" originally described by Weber (1958:181-183), then it is unlikely that LU's recent steps to emulate the research university will be its last. Indeed, at least three of DiMaggio and Powell's predictors of likely settings for isomorphism are present at Loyola (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983:154-156).

> Hypothesis A-4: The more ambiguous the goals of an organization, the greater the extent to which the organization will model itself after organizations that it perceives to be successful.
>
> Hypothesis A-5: The greater the reliance on academic credentials in choosing managerial and staff personnel, the greater the extent to which an organization will become like other organizations in its field.
>
> Hypothesis B-3: The fewer the number of visible alternative organizational models in a field, the faster the rate of isomorphism in that field.

In view of the obscurity of the JYI identity, DiMaggio and Powell's first relevant predisposition for isomorphism is clearly in evidence at LU. The question of which organizational model might be perceived as successful for Loyola may depend on who is concerned.[1] Its tenuous

---

[1]Among faculty, appropriate "success" might mean a new synthesis of liberal arts and research education. Ad-

post-denominational corporate purpose makes it highly susceptible to the same societal pressures which engendered the research university. Indeed, in view of the paucity of available alternatives to the research university in U.S. higher education (DiMaggio & Powell's hypothesis B-3), the likelihood of Loyola's continued drift toward the research model is enhanced.

The tenuousness of Loyola's present structure is demonstrated in the difference of opinion between the faculty and administrators on the content and methods of educating in a "Jesuit-yet-independent" setting. To administrators, the language of the Core curriculum conjures associations of traditional RC interests in humanitarianism and the liberal arts. Put differently, their interpretation of the liberal arts dimension of the Core curriculum is a Catholic liberal arts (i.e., the original Ratio Studiorum). Among the faculty, only about one-half of which are Catholics, such a connection should not be assumed. A more pronounced liberal arts emphasis per se is clearly mandated by the Core.

Although subtle, the difference between these interpretations is significant. In the face of increasingly practical RC students seeking to win jobs by means of a

---

ministrators, however, seem more comfortable with fondly recalling the denominational college days, content to superimpose a veneer of its lingering RC educational overtones over a fundamentally research university curriculum.

college education, the packaging of Loyola's liberal arts education might well decide its future institutional identity. For example, is it more important that the school attract RC students, or that it attract students interested in gaining a broad education? The former stance is congruent with LU's past, the latter attractive to the faculty. But it is also incongruent with both the past and present configuration of Loyola students. Is some felicitous combination which appeals to either, or both, types of student possible? Perhaps, but not without better articulated goals and educational policies.

Markides and Cohn recently argued that external threats to groups are successfully resolved only when subgroups feel that their interests are mutually served by the strategy adopted (Markides & Cohn, 1982). Otherwise, internal dissent prohibits successful resolution. Similarly, Wells and Piccou (1982) credit faculty distrust and counter-mobilization with a major role in the defeat of educational reform at a small Southern college during roughly the same period as Loyola's changeover. As of yet, no such counter-mobilization is evident at LU. Yet the fact that incoming faculty now conform to research-university criteria of competence means that the present comparatively low ratio of Catholics among them is unlikely to grow much. Hence, denominational overtones (real and imagined) in administrators' language and behavior will

continue to drive a possible wedge between themselves and the faculty. One solution to this potential conflict would be for Loyola to hire more non-Catholics at high-level positions. Then language and behavior which unwittingly sends denomination-specific "messages" might be discussed and altered accordingly by the administrators themselves. Otherwise, serious discussion between faculty and administrators as to the nature of Loyola's Jesuit-yet-independent character might achieve the same result.

Viewed in this light, the murkiness of the JYI identity is double-edged. On one hand, its meaning is unclear precisely because no alternative to the elective-dominated education provided by the research university has emerged. If Loyola could fashion a viable liberal arts/research university synthesis, it would have developed a distinct package with great promise for attracting students and educational attention. This follows Wells and Picou's conclusions (1982:30).

> Ostensibly, if the Becoming Place[2] and colleges like the Becoming Place are to survive, they must develop desirable "characteristics which separate them from the crowd" (Turbeville, 1979:30). . . . Unfortunately, successful innovation appears to be an elusive phenomenon due to the myriad internal contradictions spawned amongst those who eventually must be the receptors and agents of change.

Yet the JYI identity's amorphousness also leaves Loyola more susceptible to the isomorphic pressures cited

---

[2]That is, the pseudonym of their case college.

by DiMaggio and Powell (1982). Despite the fact that it may in the long run hurt its chances for survival,[3] Loyola may increasingly emulate the research university. Indeed, if its faculty feel threatened enough, such an agenda could easily become their goal.

Large-Framed Analysis

Perhaps the most important methodological contribution this study makes to the field of sociology concerns the macrosocietal scope of the analysis. The massive historical and other forms of information characteristic of Durkheim and Weber's research has become a rarity in contemporary sociology. This is due in large part to the unfortunate rift between those who use "soft" (i.e., qualitative) and "hard" (i.e., survey, census, etc.) data in research. This study's combination of archival and survey data attempts to bridge this gap. Using a few master concepts derived from the history of U.S. and RC higher education, such ubiquitous campus "artifacts" as college catalogs and newsletters became valuable sources of information which supplied a processual dimension often missing in survey-based research. Gannon (1981) has observed that in

---

[3]I am assuming the LU stands a better chance of attracting students if it successfully molds a new synthesis than if it becomes indistinguishable from a mediocre research university. In that case, its only attractiveness would be lower cost--a risky basis on which to build an independent university's financial structure.

the case of the sociology of religion, for example, survey research and other forms of quantitative data have so dominated recent literature that other types of research skills have become all but a lost art. The domination of "hard" data has not been limited to the sociology of religion. If, however, the largescale organization has become as pivotal to late industrialism as Bell (1976) and others (Galbraith, 1967; Drucker, 1969) have claimed, then the rapid dislocations being experienced by many of them are social facts which must be considered in the initial, macrosocietal approach to data collection before other methods become useful.[4] One byproduct of this study is confirmation of the insight that rapid social change necessitates more, not fewer, examples of large-framed research.

Attention to Corporate Goals

A second productive insight which this study can provide to sociology is the importance of organizational goals in complex organizational theory. Numerous researchers have noted the conceptual difficulties in studying goals. Not only are they easily confused with an individual's motives (Simon, 1964), but quite often they are ambiguous or contradictory in themselves (Pfeffer, 1978:196;

---

[4]Dramatic change has occurred in sectors other than higher education. For example, the financial fragility of staple industries like auto and steel-making, as well as breakups of still successful giants like AT&T, are a matter of public record.

DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). The unfortunate result is very little research which seriously considers the impact of an organization's goals on its internal processes and effectiveness. An exception to this trend is Sill's (1969) treatment of the succession of goals in a number of voluntary organizations[5] which emerged as adaptations to social pressures. As yet no one has attempted a badly needed study of particular universities' adaptations to social change. In the case of Loyola, for instance, a direct link between structural change and revised corporate goals is evident. Equally evident is the important role played by the school's founding order in the construction of the JYI identity. Yet without further comparative examples from other RC schools, there is no reference point by which to measure how much different Loyola's resultant goal statements are from those of other schools. Indeed, without comparison to other Jesuit colleges and universities, there is no assurance even that they are an accurate update of the spirit of the Ratio Studiorum.

Useful Concepts

Finally, some of the concepts which emerged during the study have potential theoretical significance. One such concept is the notion of resident Jesuits as exemplars

---

[5]Sills analyzed the Young Men's Christian Association, Women's Christian Temperance Union, and the Red Cross, among others.

of the corporate philosophy at Loyola. Although the data did not indicate a perfect hierarchical pattern of loyalty to the new rationale (as suggested in my analysis), its introduction facilitated the distinction of denominational from role-specific differences in respondents' attitudes. It may prove useful in clarifying goal-related attitudes and behavior in other types of organizations in which founding figures or associations retain an active role (e.g., private hospitals and recently founded voluntary associations, as well as private schools).

In view of the indicated complexity of response to the JYI identity, it may well be that more sophisticated interpretations of the exemplar role are necessary. If researchers were to combine the notion of exemplar with Ouchi's thinking on the difference between clan, bureaucratic hierarchy, and market (1981:70-74), for instance, they might be able to explain the data more accurately and completely. According to this scenario, Loyola abruptly changed its internal structure from that of a clan (i.e., shared common assumptions, symbols, and goals) to the more typically American hierarchy when it altered its RC denominational college mode of operation. Although some vestiges of its former structure still remain (indeed, are essential to keep viable its JYI identity), status-related differences should increase with the greater heterogeneity of faculty and students.

A second concept employed in the preceding analysis is the effect of denominational differences on departmental development. While a recent article by Swatos (1983) has convincingly demonstrated that Summer, Small, Ward and others did not actively seek in the new science of sociology to establish a scientific implementation of Christianity, it is nevertheless true that distinguishing between U.S. sociology and various Christian associations and movements (e.g., The American Institute of Christian Sociology, Christian Sociology, the Social Gospel Movement) has caused historians headaches. Meanwhile, Perkins (1980) has argued that sociology as taught in Christian colleges contradicts many denominations' fundamental premise of individualism. Although he does not explicitly say so, it is reasonable to infer that sociology departments in such settings will reflect denominational effects on curriculum and faculty hiring. Certainly in the case of Loyola, the dominance of Catholic Sociology played a large role in the department's history. With a representative sample of institutions' curricula, faculty religious affiliations, and areas of interest, some interesting research on the lingering influence of denominational influences on sociology may result.

Similarly, this study has demonstrated that examining the differences between various departments in the same college or university can bear interesting results (at least partially related to denominational approaches).

Extrapolating from my data and Perkins' research, for instance, perhaps psychology departments in Christian colleges are more constrained by denominational orientations than are the sociology deaprtments--the opposite of the case at Loyola.[6]

Finally, the notion that members of different organizational strata can have considerably different perceptions of the same organizational structure is not new (cf. Dalton, 1950; Simon, 1964; Pfeffer, 1978:15-30); Perrow, 1979:154-155). Yet the significance of such differences for RC higher education is not so well known. This study underlines the need for more attention to administrator-faculty differences as well as to the changing needs and expectations of students. If Loyola is at all representative of contemporary RC universities, such attention must become a top priority at virtually all of them.

---

[6] I am not prepared to speculate as to what differences might emerge if such analyses were conducted at Jewish, or non-denominational, private schools.

REFERENCES

Babbidge, Homer Jr. and Robert M. Rozenzweig
1962 The Federal Interest in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Baltzeli, E. Digby
1964 The Protestant Establishment. New York: Random House.

Bell, Daniel
1976 The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. New York: Basic Books.

Ben-David, Joseph
1972 American Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Berger, Peter and Thomas Luckman
1967 The Social Construction of Reality. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Allen Lane.

Blalock, Hubert
1972 Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Blau, Peter and Otis D. Duncan
1967 The American Occupational Structure. New York: Free Press.

Bollen, Kenneth A. and Kenney H. Barb
1981 "Pearson's R and coarsely categorized measures." American Sociological Review 46:232-39

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis
1972 "I.Q. and the U.S. class structure." Social Policy 3:65-96.

1976 Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.

Boyer, Ernest and Arthur Levine
1981 A Quest for Common Learning. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Cartter, Allan M
1965 An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Chronicle of Higher Education
1982 "Evaluations of 522 programs in the humanities." November 10.

1983 "Final report in assessment of graduate education rates 639 programs in social, behavioral sciences." January.

Collins, Randall
1971 "Functional and conflict theories of educational stratification." American Sociological Review 36:1002-19.

1979 The Credential Society. New York: Academic Press.

Curran, Charles
1980 "Academic freedom: the Catholic university and Catholic theology." Academe 66:126-35.

Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education. Volume 1,
1981 Number 2.

Dalton, Melville
1950 "Conflict between staff and line managerial line officers." American Sociological Review 15:342-51.

Davis, Kingsley and Wilbert Moore
1945 "Some principles of stratification." American Sociological Review 10:242-49.

Denzin, Norman
1970 The Research Act. Chicago: Aldine.

DiMaggio, Paul and Walter Powell
1983 "The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields." American Sociological Review 48:147-60.

Drucker, Peter
1969 The Age of Discontinuity. New York: Harper & Row.

Durkheim, Emile
1964 The Division of Labor in Society. New York: Free Press.

1966 The Rules of Sociological Method. New York: Free Press.

Durkheim, Emile
1977 The Evolution of Educational Thought. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Edwards, Richard
1979 Contested Terrain. New York: Basic Books.

Ellis, John Tracy
1970a American Catholicism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1970b "A tradition of autonomy?" Pp. 206-70 in Neil McCluskey (ed.) The Catholic University. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.

Farrell, Allan P.
1938 The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education. Milwaukee: Bruce.

Flexner, Abraham
[1930] 1970 "Abraham Flexner criticizes the American university." Pp. 905-21 in Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith (eds.) American Higher Education: A Documentary History. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ford, Charles and E. Roy
1968 The Renewal of Catholic Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association.

Foster, Julian
1967 "Some effects of Jesuit education: a case study." Pp. 163-90 in Robert Hassenger (ed.) The Shape of Catholic Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fredericks, Marcel and Paul Mundy, Joseph Barney
1983 Citizen Jesuit. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Galbraith, John Kenneth
1967 The New Industrial State. New York: New American Library.

Gannon, Thomas and Robert McNamara
1982 "The interplay of intellectual and religious values at Loyola University of Chicago." Report of Loyola-Mellon Study of Religious Values at Loyola, January.

Gannon, Thomas and Robert McNamara
1981 "Sociology of religion in the U.S.: the state of the art." Japanese Journal of Religious Studies 8:261-73.

1982 "Structuralism or structure: a comment on Mayhew." Social Problems 60:877-82.

Geertz, Clifford
1973 The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic books.

Gellhorn, W. and R. Greenwalt
1970 The Sectarian College and the Public Purse. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceania Publications.

Gleason, Philip
1967 "American Catholic higher education: a historical perspective." Pp. 15-53 in Robert Hassenger(ed.) The Shape of Catholic Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gouldner, Alvin
1957 "Cosmopolitans and locals. Toward an analysis of latent social roles." Administrative Science Quarterly. December.

Greeley, Andrew
1963 "Influence of the 'religious factor' on career plans and occupational values of college graduates." American Journal of Sociology 6:658-71.

1974 Catholic Schools in a Declining Church. Kansas City: Sheed & Ward.

1977 The American Catholic. New York: BAsic Books.

Gronbjerg, Kirsten, Kathleen McCourt, and Robert McNamara
1981 "Race and distributive justice in Chicago: does Loyola have a local responsibility?" Paper presented at Loyola-Baumgarth Symposium on Values and Ethics, March 31.

Harter, Carl
1983 "The 'good times' cohort of the 1970s: sometimes less means more (and more means less)." Pp. 586-92 in Robert Perrucci and Dean Knudsen (eds.) Sociology. St. Paul: West Publishing.

Hartnett, Robert and Richard Menges
1981 "Loyola University of Chicago: the first 110 years." Paper written for internal distribution at Loyola University of Chicago.

Hassenger, Robert
1967 "The future shape of Catholic Higher education." Pp. 295-336 in Robert Hassenger (ed.) The Shape of Catholic Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hillery, George A. Jr.
1981 "Triangulation in religious research: a sociological approach to the study of monasteries." Review of Religious Research 23:22-38.

International Federation of Catholic Universities
1980 Administrative Report. XIII General Assembly, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

Janowitz, Morris
1972 "The professionalization of Sociology." American Journal of Sociology 78:105-35.

1977 Social Control of the Welfare State. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1977 The Last Half-Century. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman
1968 The Academic Revolution. Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday.

Jencks, Christopher et al.
1972 Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss
1977 Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books.

Karabel, Jerome and A. H. Halsey
1977 "Educational research: a review and an interpretation." Pp. 1-77 in Jerome Karabel and A. H. Halsey (eds.) Power and Ideology in Education. New York: Oxford University Press.

Katz, Daniel and Robert Kahn
1970 "Open-system theory." Pp. 149-58 in Oscar Grusky and George Miller (eds.) The Sociology of Organizations. New York: Free Press.

Katz Michael
1977 "From voluntarism to bureaucracy in American education." Pp 386-97 in Jerome Karabel and A.H. Halsey (eds.) Power and Ideology in Education. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kearns, Francis
1967 "Social consciousness and academic freedom in Catholic higher education." Pp. 223-49 in Robert Hassenger (ed.) The Shape of Catholic Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kim, Jae-On and Frank J. Kohout
1975 "Special topics in general linear models." Pp. 368-97 in Norman Nie et al. (eds.) Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kuhn, Thomas
1973 The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Labovitz, Sanford
1970 "The assignment of numbers to rank-order categories." American Sociological Review 35:515-24.

1972 "Statistical usage in sociology: sacred cows and rituals." Sociological Methods and Research 1:13-37.

1975 "Comment on Henkel's paper: the interplay between measurement and statistics." Pacific Sociological Review 18:27-35.

LaMagdeleine, Donald
1983 "Catholic justice and peace education: its origins, dynamics, and prospects." Unpublished manuscript.

Larson, Magali
1977 The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis. Berkeley: University of California press.

Lasswell, Harold
1935 World Politics and Personal Security. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lenski, Gerhard
1961 The Religious Factor. Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Linton, Ralph
1936 The Study of Man. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Loyola University of Chicago
1947-48 College of Arts and Sciences Catalog.
1955-56
1958-59
1961-62
1965-66
1967-69
1969-70
1971-72
1973-74
1977-78
1979-81

1982 Faculty Council Minutes, March 17.

1954 Institute of Industrial Relations Faculty Meeting, March 30.

1982 "Historical enrollment survey." Report prepared for internal distribution by Office of Registration and Records.

1980 Research Review, February.

1981 Research Review, May.

1982 Research Review, April 30.

1950-52 School of Social Work Catalog.

1982 WE. Informal newsletter distributed by the President's office 6:6.

McCluskey, Neil
1970 The Catholic University. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

McNamara, Robert
1963 "The interplay of intellectual and religious values." Unpublished dissertation written at Cornell University.

McNamara, Robert
1967 "Catholics and academia." Review of Religious Research, Winter.

1969 "Higher education and American Catholicism: a review article. Sociological Analysis 25:238-47.

1969 "Organizations, colleges and values." Sociological Analysis 30:125-31.

1983 "Modernity, morals, religious beliefs: Catholic college students in 1961 and 1981." Unpublished paper read at Society for the Scientific Study of Religion meetings, November 4-6.

MacRae, Duncan
1974 "Policy analysis as an applied social science discipline." Paper read at annual meeting, American Sociological Association.

Manderscheid, Ronald
1976 "The Research sociologist in a Federal research setting." Paper read at annual meeting, Society for the Study of Social Problems.

Mannheim, Karl
1952 Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Markides, Kyriacos and Steven Cohn
1982 "External conflict/internal cohesion: a reevaluation of an old theory." American Sociological Review 47:88-98.

Masuda, Yoneji
1981 The Information Society. Bethesda, Md.: World Future Society.

Mayhew, Bruce
1980 "Structuralism versus individualism: part I, shadowboxing in the dark." Social Forces 59:335-75.

Merton, Robert.
1949 Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

North Central Report
1975 "Report of a visit to Loyola University of Chicago." Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

O'Boyle, Lenore
1983 "Learning for its own sake: the German university as nineteenth-century model." Comparative Studies in Society and History 25:3-25.

O'Brien, Sister Mary Consilia
1939 Catholic Sociology. New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons.

O'Dea, Thomas
1958 American Catholic Dilemma. New York: Sheed & Ward.

Parsons, Talcott and Gerald Platt
1973 The American University. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Perkins, Richard
1980 "Sociology and the christian student: a statement of the problem. Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 32:114-18.

Perrow, Charles
1978 Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman & Company.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey
1978 Organizational Design. Arlington Heights, Ill.: AHM Publishing.

Ratterman, P. H.
1968 The Emerging Catholic University. New York: Fordham University Press.

Reiss, Paul
1969 "Faculty and administration: the Jesuit-lay character." Jesuit Educational Quarterly 32:99-116.

Riesman, David
1967 "Foreword" in Robert Hassenger (ed.) The Shape of Catholic Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ritzer, George
1975 Sociology: A Multiple Paradigm Science. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Rodgers, Willard
1982 "Estimable functions of age, period, and cohort effects." American Sociological Review 47:774-87.

Schutz, Alfred
1962 Collected Papers I: The Problem of Social Reality. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Sills, David
1969 "The succession of goals." Pp. 175-87 in Amitai Etzioni (ed.) A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Simon, Herbert
1964 "On the concept of organizational goals." Administrative Science Quarterly, June.

Snider, Louis
1953 "The department of psychology at Loyola University, Chicago." American Catholic Psychological Association Newletter Supplement #2, March.

Swatos, William H., Jr.
1983 "The path of the fathers: on the Christianity of early American sociology." Sociological Analysis 44:33-52.

Sullivan, William
1970 "The Catholic university and the non-Catholic student." Pp. 104-15 in Eugene Grollmes (ed.) Catholic Colleges and the Secular Mystique. St Louis: E. Herder.

Suttles, Gerald
1974 The Social Order of the Slum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Toffler, Alvin
1980 The Third Wave. New York: Bantam Books.

Tracy, David
1978 A General Theory of Secularization. New York: Harper & Row.

Tuchfeld, Barry
1976 "Putting sociology to work: an insider's view." American Sociologist 11:188-92.

United States Catholic Conference
1980 "Catholic higher education and the pastoral mission of the church." Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference.

Vanfossen, Beth
1979 The Structure of Social Inequality. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.

Veblen, Thorsten
1957 The Higher Learning in America. New York: Hill & Wang.

Veysey, Laurence
1970 The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Von Koenel, George
1970 "The role of the college or university chaplain." Pp. 116-28 in Eugene Grollmes (ed.) Catholic Colleges and the Secular Mystique. St. Louis: B. Herder.

Warren, Roland
1972 "The interorganizational field as a focus for investigation." Pp. 313-18 in Merlin Brinkerhoff and Philip Kunz (eds.) Complex Organizations and their Environments. Dubuque: William C. Brown.

Wauck, Leroy
1979 "The story of psychology at Loyola 1929-1979." Unpublished paper commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the department.

Weber, Max
1958 The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

1974a "The Chinese literati." Pp. 416-44 in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.) From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press.

1974b "Bureaucracy." Pp. 196-244 in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.) From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press.

1974c Economy and Society. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wells, Richard and J. Steven Picou
1982 "The becoming place: a study of educational change in a small college." Research in Higher Education 17:15-32.

Whyte, William Foote
1973 Street Corner Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilensky, Harold
1964 "The professionalization of everyone?" American Journal of Sociology 70:137-58.

Wrong, Dennis
1976 "Competent authority: reality and legitimating model." Pp. 262-72 in Richard Coser and Otto Larsen, The Uses of Controversy in Sociology. New York: Free Press.

APPENDIX A

1947-48 English Department Offerings

Course No.	Title
100	Preparatory English (English pre-collegiate fundamentals)
101	Composition and Rhetoric
102	Advanced Rhetoric
104	Creative Writing, Its Practice and Criticism
115	Advanced Creative Writing
121	The History of English Literature: 450-1700
122	The History of English Literature: 1700-1946
131	The Study and Appreciation of Literature I
132	The Study and Appreciation of Literature II
245	Shakespeare
290	The History of American Literature: 1650-1940
301	Principles of Literary Criticism
334	English Drama to 1640
336	Introduction to Chaucer
343	English Poetry of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries
346	Advanced Shakespeare
352	English Drama from 1640 to the Present
353	Milton
356	Dryden, Pope, and Their School
361	Eighteenth Century Poetry
366	The Age of Johnson
369	The English Novel
371	The Romantic Movement
372	Victorian Prose
373	Victorian Poetry
374	Tennyson and Browning
375	Newman
385	Modern Catholic Writers
387	Modern English and American Poetry
388	Modern Drama
389	The Modern Novel
394	American Drama
395	The American Novel

SOURCE: Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:66-70.

APPENDIX B

1947-48 History Department Offerings

Course No.	Title
101	Development of Europe to 1500
102	Development of Europe Since 1500
251	The United States to 1865
252	The United States Since 1865
322	History of Medieval Culture
323	Primitive Christianity to Charlemagne
325	The Renaissance
331	Protestant Revolt and Catholic Reform
333	The French Revolution
337	Recent Southeastern Europe
339	Europe Since 1918
344	The British Empire
353	The United States, 1865-1900
354	The United States Since 1900
355	American Foreign Relations
361	Constitutional History of the United States to 1789
362	Constitutional History of the United States, 1789-1860
363	Constitutional History of the United States, 1860-1900
364	Constitutional History of the United States, Since 1900
365	English Constitutional History to 1699
367	English Constitutional History Since 1688
371	Colonial Hispanic America
372	The Revolutionary Period in Hispanic America
373	The Republics of Hispanic America
375	Mexico and the Caribbean Area
376	Argentina, Brazil, and Chile or Colombia
377	The United Nations of the Americas

SOURCE: Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:70-73

APPENDIX C

1947-48 Psychology Department Offerings

Course No.	Title
101	General Psychology
111	Rational Psychology
217	Readings in Rational Psychology
221	Experimental Psychology I
222	Experimental Psychology II
246	Abnormal Psychology
301	Comparative Psychology
322	Psychology of Learning
323	Advanced Experimental Psychology I
324	Advanced Experimental Psychology II
325	Advanced Experimental Psychology III
327	Readings in Experimental Psychology
331	Personality Problems and Mental Health
341	Psychology of Childhood
342	Psychology of Adolescence
344	Psychology of the Mentally Handicapped Child
345	Social Psychology (Sociology 345)
356	Psychology of Reading Difficulties
361	Applied Psychology
362	Industrial Psychology
367	Readings in Applied Psychology
380	Statistical Methods

SOURCE: Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:84-86

APPENDIX D

1947-48 Sociology Department Offerings

Course No.	Title
200	Introductory Sociology
207	Christian Social Action
208	Statistics
210	Labor Problems
214	Social Problems
301	History of Social Thought
303	Social Origins
315	Interracial Problems
318	Population Problems
320	Criminology
321	Community Organization
324	Juvenile Delinquency
326	Marriage and the Family (Religion 326)
345	Social Psychology (Psychology 345)
349	Papal Social Encyclicals (Religion 349)

SOURCE: Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48

APPENDIX E

1947-48 Religion Department Offerings

Note: All students had to take religion every semester. The first four courses had to be within the department. The others could be cross-listed.

Course No.	Title
100	Survey of the Catholic Religion
101	Bible Study I (for non-Catholics)
102	Bible Study II (for non-Catholics)
103	Bible Study III (for non-Catholics)
104	Bible Study IV (for non-Catholics)
106	Christian Origins (Apologetics)
131	Creation and Redemption (RC dogma: Trinity, original sin, etc.)
132	The Sacraments (seven sacraments)
141	Catholic Morals I
142	Catholic Morals II
215	New Testament I
216	New Testament II
238	Catholic Life and Worship (the Mass)
326	Marriage and the Family (Sociology 326)
349	Papal Social Encyclicals (Sociology 349) (Leo XIII on labor; Pius XI on Reconstruction and Education; Pius XII on Human Unity and the Mystical Body of Christ)

Some Other Cross-Listed Courses Satisfying the Religion Requirement

Eng. 375 Newman
Eng. 385 Modern Catholic Writers
Hist. 331 Protestant Revolt and Catholic Reform
Soc. 207 Christian Social Action

(11 courses qualified in all)

SOURCE: Arts & Sciences Catalog, 1947-48:86-87

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Donald R. LaMagdeleine has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Thomas M. Gannon, Director
Professor, Sociology, Loyola

Dr. Kathleen McCourt
Assistant Professor, Sociology, Loyola

Dr. Robert McNamara
Professor, Sociology, Loyola

Dr. Ross Scherer
Assistant Professor, Sociology, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

November 7, 1983 — Date

Thomas M. Gannon, S.J. — Director's Signature