



1968

Jesuit Effectiveness in Secondary Education: A Study in Secondary Socialization

John Francis Libens
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses



Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Libens, John Francis, "Jesuit Effectiveness in Secondary Education: A Study in Secondary Socialization" (1968). *Master's Theses*. 2399.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/2399

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1968 John Francis Libens

JESUIT EFFECTIVENESS IN SECONDARY EDUCATION:
A STUDY IN SECONDARY SOCIALIZATION

by
John F. Libens, S.J.

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts

August
1968

LIFE

John Francis Libens, S.J., was born in Cleveland, Ohio, September 28, 1939.

After graduating from St. Ignatius High School in 1957, he entered the Jesuit novitiate at Wernersville, Pennsylvania. In August, 1959 he transferred to Colombiere College of the University of Detroit at Clarkston, Michigan where he took Liberal Arts courses.

In 1961 he transferred to Loyola University, Chicago (West Baden Division). There he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in June, 1962 and was received into the Graduate School of Loyola University in September, 1962. During this time he also pursued the study of philosophy and received a licentiate in June, 1964.

He spent the following year teaching social problems and Latin at St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland, Ohio. During this year he was moderator of the student paper and coached speech. During the years 1965-67 he taught Latin and was Director of Speech Activities at St. John's High School, Toledo, Ohio. During these summers he continued his studies in sociology at Loyola University.

In September, 1967, he entered Bellarmine School of Theology of Loyola University where he is presently studying Theology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
<p>I. JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION: THE QUESTION OF EFFECTIVENESS</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Statement of the problem--Review of the study of Catholic education in this area--Practical problem of Jesuit effectiveness--Background of the schools--Discussion of sociological relevance of the study--Secondary Socialization.</p>	1
<p>II. METHODS OF INQUIRY</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Background of study--Testing the Universe--Content of the research instrument--Hypothesis--Problems of analysis.</p>	42
<p>III. FAMILY AND STUDENT BACKGROUND</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Religious preference--Racial background--Grade school background--Parents educational achievement--Residential background--Fathers' occupational status--Parent-student relations--Selection process of high school--Student participation in family decision making--Parental help in use of freedom.</p>	54
<p>IV. SOCIAL AWARENESS OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Attitudes to Church's social teaching--Emphasis in classes other than religion--Influence of Jesuits on social values--Conflict with previous values--Attitude toward success--Attitudes to social responsibility--Attitudes to other religions--Attitudes toward race.</p>	67
<p>V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Discussion of the hypothesis in relation to findings--The value system of the Jesuit high school--Jesuits' role in the socializing of the students--The Walsh problem.</p>	95
<p>APPENDIX I</p>	103
<p>APPENDIX II</p>	115
<p>BIBLIOGRAPHY</p>	117

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Four school comparative report on the religious preference of the students *	55
2. Four school comparative analysis on racial background of the students	55
3. Four school comparative analysis of residential background of the students	57
4. Four school comparative analysis of elementary schooling of the students	57
5. Four school comparative analysis of the educational background of the students' fathers	58
6. Four school comparative analysis of the educational background of the students' mothers	60
7. Four school comparative analysis of occupational background of the students' fathers	61
8. Four school comparative analysis on selection process of the Jesuit high school	64
9. Fichter-Gannon analysis on decision making involvement of students in family at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High with national average	64
10. Fichter-Gannon analysis on parental help in student use of freedom with responsibility at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High with national average.	65
11. Four school comparative response to question of how much attention the social teachings of the Church regarding social responsibility received in religion classes	68
12. Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question of how much attention the social teachings of the Church regarding social responsibility received in religion classes	69

Table	Page
13. Four school comparative response to question of how much attention the social teachings of the Church regarding social responsibility receive in classes other than religion	69
14. Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question of how much attention the social teachings of the Church regarding social responsibility receive in classes other than religion.	71
15. Four school comparative response to question whether Jesuits tried to communicate a set of Christian social values	72
16. Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question whether Jesuits tried to communicate a set of Christian social values	73
17. Four school comparative analysis by top and bottom class of city-dwellers on question whether Jesuits tried to communicate a set of Christian social values	76
18. Four school comparative analysis by top and bottom class of suburbanites on question whether Jesuits tried to communicate a set of Christian social values	77
19. Four school comparative response to question whether social values prior to high school were in conflict with those which Jesuits made an effort to communicate	77
20. Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question whether social values prior to high school were in conflict with those which Jesuits made an effort to communicate	78
21. Four school comparative response to question whether Jesuits in high schools emphasize too much the goal of material success	80
22. Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question whether Jesuits in high schools emphasize too much the goal of material success	81
23. Four school comparative response to question whether Jesuit education has been very individualistic in its orientation	84

Table	Page
24. Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question whether Jesuit education has been very individualistic in its orientation	84
25. Four school comparative response to question whether Jesuits tried to help develop better understanding regarding people of other religions.	86
26. Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question whether Jesuits tried to help develop better understanding regarding people of other religions.	88
27. Fichter-Gannon comparative analysis on extent to which school gave freshmen and seniors better racial attitudes at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High with national average.	88
28. Fichter-Gannon comparative analysis on freshmen and senior attitudes toward laws for integrated housing at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High with national average. . .	89
29. Fichter-Gannon comparative analysis of attitudes of freshmen and seniors toward the Negro Civil Rights Movement at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High with national average.	89
30. Fichter-Gannon comparative analysis of attitudes of freshmen and seniors toward racially integrated schools at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High with national average.	90
31. Four school comparative response to question whether Jesuits tried to help you develop better understanding regarding people of other races.	91
32. Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question whether Jesuits tried to help you develop better understanding regarding people of other races. . .	92

CHAPTER 1

JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION:

THE QUESTION OF EFFECTIVENESS

The Society of Jesus is confronted today with serious and pressing questions about the future of its work in secondary education. As the Order's most recent general congress concluded: "There are some members of the Society of Jesus, who think that our educational institutions in certain parts of the world have become practically useless and should therefore be given up."¹ This feeling of dissatisfaction is being felt particularly by Jesuits in the United States, faced as they are with extensive commitments to fifty secondary schools throughout the country, increasing demands for involvement in newer and less institutionalized apostolic activities, and steadily decreasing manpower resources.

Unfortunately, however serious and honest these questions are, the Society is also faced with a noticeable lack of empirical information which might provide the basis for informed criticism or for constructive proposals for change. Certainly Jesuits have definite ideas about what they ought to be accomplishing in their high schools. Over the years they have developed an elaborate rationale to support their increasing

¹Documents of the Thirty-First General Congregation (Woodstock, Maryland: Woodstock College Press, 1967), p. 90.

commitment to secondary education.² But either because of a fear to break away from traditional styles of apostolate or because of a skepticism regarding sociological investigation, inquiry into the actual effect of Jesuit education on the values and attitudes of its students has not taken place on a scale commensurate with the esteem and reputation Jesuit high schools have enjoyed.

The deficiency of data, of course, is not a particularly Jesuit problem.³ Sociological studies in the field of public and parochial education generally have labored under severe methodological difficulties. For despite the important position of formal education in the United States today,⁴ the size and influence of the American Catholic school system, the increasing allocation of federal and state monies to education,⁵ and the charges and counter-charges against Catholic

²Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J. (ed.), Teaching in Jesuit High Schools (New York: Jesuit Educational Association, 1957), pp. 4-11.

³Norman M. Bradburn in the preface to Andrew M. Greeley and Peter H. Rossi, The Education of Catholic Americans (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966), p. vi.

⁴Patricia Cayo Sexton, The American School (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1967), p. 4. Robin M. Williams, Jr., American Society (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952), pp. 273-274. Bradburn's preface to Greeley and Rossi, The Education of Catholic Americans, p. v.

⁵Sexton, p. 47.

Schools,⁶ only a few studies have focused on the goals and values officially to be imparted by the school and their relationship to the actually accepted and lived-by values of the students.⁷

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the effectiveness of Jesuit teachers in relation to the social attitudes of their students in four high schools in Ohio and Michigan. In pursuing this question, we will proceed to analyze: (1) the problem of Catholic education in general within which Jesuit education must be understood; (2) the present concern for Jesuit effectiveness; (3) the background of the high schools being studied; (4) the sociological relevance of education as a socialization process, particularly as this process has been discussed by Charles Horton Cooley and George Herbert Mead.

At the outset, it is important to recognize the danger of falling into the trap of facile explanations of how effective the school is in forming attitudes and values. As Greeley warns:

⁶See Neil G. McCluskey, S.J., Catholic Viewpoint on Education (Garden City, New York: Hanover House, 1959), pp. 35-74, especially p. 37 for succinct arguments against separate religious education. Also, Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., Parochial School (Notre Dame: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1958), pp. 109-131 treating the arguments over the "ghetto mentality" inculcated in Catholic education. For a strong Catholic self-criticism of Catholic education, see Mary Perkins Ryan, Are Parochial Schools the Answer (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964). Michael E. Schilitz offers an interesting clarification of the Perkins indictment, Commonweal, 81 (February 5, 1965), p. 622. See also, Robert D. Cross, "The Greeley-Rossi Report," Commonweal, 84 (September 16, 1966), p. 579.

⁷Bradburn, p. vi.

As social scientists, we maintain a skeptical view concerning the efficacy of formal schooling for the teaching of values. To the scientists a view of formal education as an omnipotent socializing agent shows an exaggerated regard for education. The social scientist is not convinced that institutions of formal education are capable of accomplishing all the mammoth tasks that some apparently expect of them. The classroom may well be a place where formal skills are learned; it may also contribute to the transition for the family to larger society. Finally, it may contribute somewhat to the maintenance of a core culture or the creation of a cultural synthesis. But whether formal education really has much influence on either cultural values or social behavior is not evident.⁸

DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

As has already been noted, the problem of Catholic education has long been a debated topic. In the end, the crucial issue in any controversy has been: "Are the Catholic schools successful?" It is possible to view this question from various angles: Are the schools doing the job they set out to do? Are they doing the job their clients want them to do? How do Catholic schools compare, in what they produce, with public schools?

The first question about the goals of Catholic education was the concern of Notre Dame University's study on Catholic schools.

The central consideration, therefore, is this: how does the Catholic school carry out the mandate to provide religious training, while at the same time serving the purposes which are those of education for life in the United States at this period in its history? Note that the question is "how" and not "how well." Here we are attempting to explain, not to evaluate.⁹

⁸ Greeley and Rossi, The Education of Catholic Americans, p. 7.

⁹ Reginald A. Newwein (ed.), Catholic Schools in Action (Notre Dame, Indiana: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1966), p. 2.

The second question possibly transmits the whole issue of traditional goals and involves, rather, a specification of what the goals of Catholic education ought to be today and how the schools are accomplishing what they are setting out to do. As Mary Perkins Ryan writes:

In the past, the question of providing religious formation for the young outside of Catholic schools has been seen primarily in terms of finding adequate teachers and providing suitable times and places. These are, certainly, real and practical problems. But the new outlook places them in a different perspective. As the focus of formation shifts from the classroom to the church and to daily life, the work of formation must become more that of the pastor, the parent, the "coach" in the Christian life, than that of the teacher. Formation so conceived is not primarily the task of the schools. May it not be possible, then, that could be adequately provided outside the schools?¹⁰

The third question asks as institutional question about the relative merits of the public and Catholic schools systems. Thus Greeley and Rossi observe: "We are concerned with it [Catholic education] as an institution designed to produce effects upon the individuals who go through it as students."¹¹

Obviously, all of these questions constitute legitimate inquiries into the problem of the Catholic school. The present study, however, asks whether Jesuits are actively effective in their high schools today relative to what the Jesuit high school sets out to do. Certainly this is an aspect of the larger questions mentioned above, but essentially, this is

¹⁰Ryan, p. 141. See also Daniel Callahan, "The Schools" Commonweal, 81 (January 9, 1965), p. 465.

¹¹Greeley and Rossi, The Education of Catholic Americans, p. 5.

not an institutional question. We are not asking, in other words, whether the schools are effective but rather are the teachers, as members of the Society of Jesus, effective in their work in these institutions.¹² The emphasis on the teachers as individuals is important precisely because we are viewing education in terms of the process of socialization. As Havighurst and Neugarten remark:

The teacher, with or without awareness, and in direct or indirect ways, transmits not only information and knowledge, but also a wide variety of cultural values and attitudes. It is in this sense that the teacher is a potent socializing agent in the life of the child and adolescent. The teacher functions as a socializing agent, furthermore, in being a model for imitation and identification.¹³

In order to probe this viewpoint more deeply, it will be helpful to review the more recent studies of Catholic education in the United States as these relate to the specific problem of Jesuit high schools.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In order to understand the background of Catholic education in the United States we need not review the entire history of the Catholic school system in the United States and the Plenary Council of Baltimore which was responsible for erecting a Catholic school

¹²Certainly, the Jesuits as a group can be viewed as a type of "institution;" yet from the viewpoint of the social system, they constitute a specific sub-group in their definite values and goals as well as particular institutional involvements.

¹³Robert J. Havighurst and Bernice L. Neugarten, Society and Education (Boaton: Allyn and Bacon, Inc, 1959), p. 405.

system.¹⁴ Focusing, rather on the years 1950-1960, it becomes clear that after the Second World War the whole business of schools, both public and private, grew to almost unbelievable proportions. As more and more economic support was required to build and maintain the educational systems, questions were asked about the value of what was being done. On this level the question was deceptively simple: "Are we getting our money's worth?"

Responding to this query, Catholic education squared its shoulders in an attempt to prove that it was offering an education every bit as complete as the public school system. Were the problem to have remained on this level we could assess the results of standardized exams given on subject matter taught simultaneously in both systems.

But with the coming of the Second Vatican Council and the breath of fresh air which Pope John XXIII let into the Catholic Church, the questions about Catholic education deepened. Educators were no longer satisfied with ascertaining only the academic achievement of Catholic school graduates; rather, they wondered whether their students were being formed as good Catholics--and even more basically--as good Christians.

It is in this context, then, that the problem of Catholic education is being discussed today. Unfortunately, little actual information was available to answer the questions being posed until

¹⁴ See especially Neil G. McCluskey, S.J., Catholic Education in America: A Documentary History (New York: Columbia University, 1964).

Joseph H. Fichter's pioneer effort Parochial School (1958). Although Fichter's work was an important beginning, it did not provide information about the secondary school system. In the 1960's Andrew M. Greeley began to study various aspects of Catholic Education in Religion and Career (1963), The Social Effects of Catholic Education (1964), and most recently, together with Peter H. Rossi, The Education of American Catholics (1965). Simultaneous with Greeley's last study was the Notre Dame research project under the direction of Reginald Neuwein, Catholic Schools in Action (1965).

Especially with this more recent research, some empirical foundation was given for realistic discussions about the Catholic secondary school. One further study relevant to our purposes was Fichter's analysis of Jesuit high schools in the United States undertaken in 1966, Send Us a Boy . . . Get Back a Man, which attempted to provide background on specifically Jesuit education.

In general, the motivation for all these studies was the rising criticism of Catholic schools both from within and outside the Church. Perhaps the most articulate attack came from Mary Perkins Ryan, an active laywoman who has been involved in Church problems for the past quarter of a century. In her Are Parochial Schools the Answer? (1964), Mrs. Ryan contends that the Catholic schools are not providing the formation of students which they purport to provide. The Catholic schools, she contends, do not teach what the modern Church desires, but inculcates a "siege mentality" in the students. That is, the children are taught the truths of the faith (how to justify and defend them),

are kept safe from harmful influences, and are separated from the mainstream of society. As a result, the students seem to be loyal to both the Church and their nation in the typical American Catholic tradition. But is this a tradition realistic for today's Catholics? As far as Mrs. Ryan is concerned, the present Catholic school system perpetuates the socio-religious segregation of its students. What is worse, this type of segregation is presented as a desirable practice.¹⁵

As an example Mrs. Ryan cites the matter of vocational counseling. Her findings reveal that while the Catholic school proposes the religious vocation as a very noble pursuit, outside of the religious vocation, vocational counseling is limited to purely academic information and guidance. The key problem, as far as she is concerned, is that students are not confronted with the problem of what they will do with their futures. They are not challenged by the concept that they should be planning their futures in terms of a process of growing understanding and love of God, and thus rendering the fullest service to their neighbor.¹⁶

All of the above mentioned studies and criticisms of parochial education have been directed at the Catholic school as an institution. The precise difference between these analyses and our present study is

¹⁵Ryan, pp. 55-56.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 68.

its focus on the Jesuits in the Jesuit secondary schools, not on the school itself as a social organization. We were interested to discover how effective these teachers are in imparting and inculcating their philosophy of education, especially in regard to the social attitudes of their students.

More precisely, our chief interest was to investigate to what extent Jesuit education verifies the hypothesis that Catholic education is ineffective in helping students to form values of social awareness and tolerance. As Fichter has remarked:

On all other test questions, however, the public school graduates consistently show themselves more socially alert and interested than do the products of Catholic schools. For example, a much larger proportion of them (45%) than of Catholic graduates (28%) are in favor of expanding our foreign economic aid program.¹⁷

Since the Jesuit schools are more selective in their enrollment, thus working with more talented youngsters than the larger parochial school system or the public schools, their possible defect in turning out graduates who are less socially conscious and tolerant than their public school friends would have much to say about the effectiveness of Catholic schools generally.¹⁸ If, after all, Catholic schools are unable to be effective in working with a more select group of students, the whole

¹⁷Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., "Catholics and High School," America, 107 (September 15, 1962), p. 719.

¹⁸"We assume a more than ordinary obligation to society when we select a more than ordinary group of students. . . . If we receive only fine material, we should be careful to produce proportionate results." James A. King, "Guidance in the Jesuit High School," Jesuit Educational Quarterly, 5 (June, 1942), p. 85.

purpose of sectarian education and its ability to act as an important agent of secondary socialization is questionable.

JESUIT EDUCATION IN PERSPECTIVE

In order to gain more perspective on the central question of this study, we turn to a brief consideration of Jesuit education and its problems. Specific concern about the problem of Jesuit effectiveness goes back at least to the early 1940's.¹⁹ Through the years the topic has come up for frequent discussion at annual meetings of the Jesuit Educational Association. Much of this discussion culminated in the Fichter study, Send Us a Boy, which was undertaken to provide background for a special national meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association at Los Angeles in August, 1966, called to consider the current status and future of the Jesuit high school. Since the Fichter project was initiated, the study has been replicated in various provinces of the Society of Jesus as part of a current Jesuit self-study. This present analysis is part of such a larger project which is currently in progress in the Ohio and Michigan region of the Society. However, this study is not a replication of the Fichter project.

¹⁹"Is there any way of estimating the real, factual extent of the influence which our schools exert on the moral and spiritual life of our students? Can ways and means be recommended for improving that influence?" See Allan P. Farrell, "Readers' Survey of the Quarterly," Jesuit Educational Quarterly, 6 (March, 1944), pp. 222-231.

What is it, then, which Jesuits seek to do in secondary education? Certainly, the idea of student formation has been uppermost in Jesuit thinking? "The purpose of secondary teaching is formation, much more than assuring erudition; and for this formation of mind and character, the years of early adolescence are decisive."²⁰ most recently Father Peter Arrupe, the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, remarked, "We must accept the modern adolescent as he is. But ultimately we must transform him, and through him, his world in Christ."²¹ Christian formation, therefore, is a key focus of Jesuit education. What Father Arrupe means by transforming the adolescent and his world is spelled out by the Jesuits' Thirty-First General Congregation in its discussion of education as the transmission of human culture and its integration in Christ:

" . . . to make them [students] not only cultural but, in both private and public lives, men who are authentically Christian and able and willing to work for the modern apostolate."²²

There is little doubt, then, that Jesuit education employs at least a two-fold emphasis--cultural transmission and Christian formation.

²⁰John B. Janssens, S.J., "On the Significance of Our High Schools," (unpublished address of the General of the Society of Jesus), Galloro, Italy, October 30, 1962.

²¹Peter Arrupe, S.J., in a letter to the delegates to the 1966 JEA Workshop, July 31, 1966.

²²Documents of the Thirty-First General Congregation, p. 91.

The General Congregation, however, also stressed the personal element of Jesuit influence in the educational process:

The first care of Jesuits should be that Christian students acquire that knowledge and character which are worthy of Christians, along with the letters and sciences. To this end, it will help very much if, in addition to the suitable amount of time given to the teaching of Christian doctrine and religion according to modern methods, Jesuits also offer to the students a good example of hard work and dedication as well as of religious life.²³

This kind of emphasis is certainly compatible with the traditional view of Jesuit education as outlined in the "General Statement of Philosophy of the American Jesuit High School" developed in 1946.²⁴ That statement has its basis in the encyclical "Christian Education of Youth" by Pope Pius XI. In keeping with the spirit and manner in that letter, the Jesuit statement is strongly deductive. It considers the educational objectives of the school as a secondary school, an American school, a Catholic school, and finally a Jesuit school. Let us consider each of these terms.²⁵

The Jesuit high school, as a specifically secondary school strives to teach adolescent boys how to think intelligently and wisely. Since it cooperates with other educational agencies, the Jesuit high school-- as a high school--strives to promote character education, an intelligent appreciation of beauty, physical health, and proper social attitudes and

²³Ibid., p. 92.

²⁴Reed, pp. 4-11.

²⁵Ibid., the following section is a summary of the document.

habits.

As an American high school, the Jesuit school strives to develop a knowledge and appreciation of the American heritage of democracy and to foster loyalty to American ideals. It seeks to develop students who believe that the American government exists for the benefit of individual citizens, and not the citizens for the benefit of the State. It attempts to lead students to appreciate the fact that American life is based on the sound principle that man has received from God inalienable rights which the State has not created and cannot take away. It desires to encourage students to participate actively and conscientiously in government, whether as voters or officials. Finally, it seeks to develop students who will, in a democratic spirit of tolerance and cooperation, contribute to the formation of wise public policies and to the solution of public problems.

As a Catholic school, the Jesuit school strives "to cooperate with divine grace in forming the true and perfect Christian."²⁶ It wishes to develop men who have a reasonably thorough understanding of Catholic doctrine and practice. It wishes its students to realize that Catholicism is a way of life based upon eternal truths and immutable principles which must affect their attitude toward every problem of life, whether personal or social, which may arise in a changing civilization. Further, it seeks to develop young men who realize the place of truth in

²⁶Ibid., p. 6.

their lives and men who act on Christian principle. Jesuit education holds up the life of Our Lord and the examples of Our Lady and the Saints as models of the Catholic way of living. Participation and cooperation in the work of the Catholic hierarchy according to one's ability and opportunity is encouraged. Jesuit education wishes to develop in its students the refinement in manners, speech, and dress in accordance with Christian ideals. It wishes to develop men who in terms of their Christian heritage, select and promote only what is good and wholesome in art, music, literature, drama, and other forms of entertainment. Jesuit education fosters in its students Christian respect for the human body as a partner of man's immortal soul. It hopes to encourage serious and prayerful thought of the students' future lifework and proper counsel regarding it. Jesuit education seeks to develop young men who are aware of the solidarity of human society and of the effect of their actions upon the lives of others for better or worse, and thus men who are just in their respect for the rights of others, whether individuals or groups, regardless of position, race, nation, or creed. Finally, as a Catholic school, the Jesuit school seeks to develop students who "love their neighbors as themselves" and so are sensitive to the claims of Christian charity, beyond the demands of strict justice.

Finally, as a Jesuit school, it hopes to develop in its students an intense loyalty and devotion to the Holy See; leadership, particularly in religious activities; an intelligent obedience to all duly constituted authority; respect for the significant contributions of the past; the humanistic habit of mind, emphasizing the classic literatures as the best

means to the end; habits of orderly thinking through the medium of an analytic-synthetic study of languages, particularly the classical languages; and competency in the arts of expression.

While Jesuit education in 1968 subscribes to the basic tenets of the 1946 statement which we have just reviewed, it has changed its emphases in light of the spirit of Vatican II. In keeping with Pius XI's thought, Jesuit education in the past emphasized what might be called an exemplary theory of education whereby a desired model was created and each student was poured into it to achieve the desired results. Vatican II, however, stresses the idea of developing the individual's personal potential, the existential acceptance of the student's capacities and limitations:

For a true education aims at the formation of the human person with respect to his ultimate goal, and simultaneously with respect to the good of those societies of which, as a man, he is a member, and in whose responsibilities, as an adult, he will share.

As a consequence, with the help of advances in psychology and in the art and science of teaching, children and young people should be assisted in the harmonious development of their physical, moral, and intellectual endowments. Surmounting hardships with a gallant and steady heart, they should be helped to acquire gradually a more mature sense of responsibility toward ennobling their own lives through constant effort, and toward pursuing authentic freedom.²⁷

With the "Declaration of Christian Education" of Vatican II as background, Robert F. Harvanek, S.J., pointed out to the 1965 conference

²⁷Walter M. Abbott, S.J. (ed.), The Documents of Vatican II, (New York: America Press, 1966), p. 639.

at Los Angeles that were Jesuits to reconsider their philosophy of education in the mid-sixties, they must arrive at a formulation similar to Vatican II:

We can ask whether there is anything distinctive from the Jesuit point of view that should be said about the ideal Jesuit high school graduate. The first response can be that there is not, and that for two reasons. The first reason is that it is precisely the distinctive spirit of the Society to work for the fulfillment of the Church in obedience to the Church and especially to its head upon earth, the Vicar of Christ. Consequently, it might be argued that it is the spirit of the Society not to be distinctive within the Church but rather to further the Church with all its powers. It might therefore properly be taken as the Society's task and purpose in education to work toward the fulfillment of the ideal of Christian education as expressed by the Council.²⁸

Harvanek then explained the relation of Vatican II to Jesuit education on a more contentual level. "There is first of all the view of man as a free responsible person in society who is to work for his own perfection and the improvement of society by his own action under God. This clearly expresses the point of view of the Spiritual Exercises."²⁹ The essence of the Exercises seems to be found in the dialectic of freedom whereby the free responsible

²⁸ Robert F. Harvanek, S.J., "The Profile of the Ideal Jesuit High School Graduate" (unpublished background paper for the 1966 JEA Workshop), p. 44.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 44. The Spiritual Exercises are the basic guidelines of the religious life drawn up by the founder of the Society of Jesus, St. Ignatius Loyola. The spirit of the Jesuit apostolate is derived from the Exercises.

individual opens himself to the free action of his Creator; then becoming conscious of God's will in the concrete situation of his life, he responds in freedom to fulfill God's will.

Besides the strong thrust of the free responsible agent, Harvanek also underscored the Council's strong appreciation of the value of "the natural," particularly the natural human person in society.³⁰ This concern parallels the very distinctive Jesuit emphasis which sees the value of all things precisely in relation to their contribution to the glory of God. As Harvanek remarked:

It is perhaps then no accident that when the Society did enter upon the educational apostolate, the area of education in which it entered most significantly was that which today corresponds to liberal secondary and collegiate education, that is, the area of the arts and sciences which in the older program preceded philosophy and theology. Consequently the Society's tradition in education, perhaps more than that of any other group engaged in education in the Church has always strongly supported the natural powers and knowledge of man and of human society. Characteristically it has been concerned not only with specifically Christian education but also with human education and with integrating the two. Thus the arts and the sciences hold an important place in the historical tradition of the Society.³¹

Such an up-dated Jesuit philosophy of education would be absolutely consonant with Vatican II and its emphases. In summary, then, the Jesuit view of education is a personalist-existentialist one which sees man as a free and responsible person who in the development of his personality is accountable also to other persons and for the

³¹Ibid.

communities and societies of which he is a member. In this responsibility for society the student has the task of contributing to the building of both the city of man and the city of God, just as he has the right and responsibility for the rise or fall of his own personality in mature freedom. Thus, the fulfillment of the student's own personality cannot be separated from his interaction in the world and human society.

BACKGROUND OF THE SCHOOLS

Within this context of the principles of Jesuit education, it is important now to focus attention on the schools which comprised the universe of this study.

The University of Detroit High School, founded in 1875, had an enrollment of 976 in September, 1967. Over the past few years the school administration has been attempting to reduce enrollment to include no more than 900 students. The school itself is located in a changing neighborhood on Detroit's northwest side which at one time was upper middle class. At the time of the present study the surrounding community was composed of a mostly middle-class white population with a small but steadily increasing number of lower middle-class Negroes. While the students come from a variety of backgrounds, they would generally be classified as middle to upper class. The faculty would categorize the U. of D. High students as rather sophisticated, sure of themselves, and quite concerned with their material progress. U. of D. High offers only a college preparatory curriculum which in itself limits

the selection of students. About 1100 applications for entry were received for the 225 positions available in September, 1968. Thus the school is acknowledged to be a selective school, offering excellent educational background in the Detroit area. The faculty is made up of thirty Jesuits and nineteen laymen. During the school year 1967-68 a layman became assistant principal for the first time in the school's history.

St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland, founded in 1886, had an enrollment in 1967 of 1105. Presently it is in the process of deciding whether to expand its enrollment to 1500 or to hold the line at the present number. The school is located on the near west side of Cleveland in an inner-city area, though not specifically in a ghetto. The school enrolls very few students from the neighborhood and thus is not actually looked upon by community residents as contributing to the neighborhood. In the past few years an increase in the number of students assaulted either coming to or leaving the school has caused great concern. The students come from all parts of the city and suburbs and from a variety of backgrounds. Nevertheless, they would be generally classified as middle class to lower-upper class. Faculty have characterized the Ignatius students as being only mildly sophisticated and rather hard working in academic matters. Like U. of D. High, Ignatius enjoys a large number of applications from which it can choose the most desirable students for its admittedly difficult college preparatory curriculum. Since Cleveland is a smaller city

than Detroit, Ignatius' academic and extracurricular excellence is a well known fact in the metropolitan area, so that entrance into the school has a clear prestige value attached to it. The faculty is made up of thirty-three Jesuits and twenty-two laymen. Like University of Detroit High School, the 1967-68 school year saw a laymen become assistant principal for the first time in the school's history.

The other two schools to be included in this study were opened simultaneously in 1965-66 and will see their first graduating classes in 1969.

St. John's High School, Toledo, was originally founded in 1896 but was forced to close during the depression years. It reopened in 1965 on another site just within the city limits. Its enrollment at present is 635. The total enrollment is projected to be about 850. Though the school is located at the edge of the city, a wide spectrum of social class can be found from upper-lower to lower-upper because of a policy of bussing students to the schools. The students have been characterized by the faculty as lacking sophistication, less academically oriented than students in Detroit or Cleveland, basically hard working, and much like Detroit students in their concern about their material progress. St. John's enjoys the advantage of having a well established alumni association since its former days to help establish the school at its reopening. St. John's boasts of its contribution to the education of many in the professional community in Toledo. Thus for a new school, St. John's finds itself in an enviable position of having good public

relations and publicity. All of this backing enables the Toledo school to have a fair selection process in applications, though by no means as great as in Detroit or Cleveland. The faculty is made up of sixteen Jesuits and fourteen laymen. The administration is totally Jesuit.

Walsh Jesuit High School, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, was also founded in 1965 in an area which knew little of Catholic or Jesuit education. It is located in a rural area about nine miles from Akron and fifteen miles from metropolitan Cleveland. The site of the school was chosen on the basis of population trends which point to the Walsh area as a population center in the years to come. In the meantime the school has had to work diligently to interest prospective students in its college preparatory program. In its few short years of operation Walsh has already established itself as a strong academically oriented school. Gradually its enrollment is increasing proportionate to its stringent entrance requirements. The enrollment at present is 520, although the total projected enrollment is 850. This school, through a policy of bussing similar to St. John's, has a student population ranging from upper-lower to lower-upper. The faculty have characterized the Walsh students much like those at St. John's--the students also lack sophistication and are not as academically oriented as students in Detroit or Cleveland. The faculty is made up of fourteen Jesuits and nineteen laymen. The first assistant principal in the school's history who assumed his office in 1967-68 is a layman.

SOCIOLOGICAL RELEVANCE--
THE SOCIALIZATION PROCESS

The sociological relevance of the present study hinges upon the concept of socialization. This process is at the heart of the educational experience. When Greeley undertook his study of American Catholic schools, he focused precisely on the aspect of socialization in Catholic education:

From the point of view of the sociologist, both interests research and theory focus on the socialization process. The continuity of cultural traditions is an inescapable fact, but the mechanisms by which they are maintained are still not fully understood. Surely formal schooling plays a part in this cultural transmission, but it is not at all clear to sociologists that the part of the school is as important in the socialization experience as most Americans think.³²

As Sexton has pointed out, despite the fact that education is one of the primary agencies of socialization, little study has been done to find to what extent the school is as important as "most Americans" think in the socialization experience.³³

Moreover, the problem of socialization seems to be at the heart of most criticism of the Catholic schools waged by both sides of the controversy. On one hand, Mary Perkins Ryan expresses dissatisfaction with Catholic education because it lacks true "formation":

³²Greeley and Rossi, The Education of Catholic Americans, p. 6.

³³"Values form the core of society's culture and the typical values of the society form its norms. These values and norms are presumably taught by schools to the young through the socialization process, which shapes the behavior and personality of the individual." Sexton, p. 76.

This term is used as being more comprehensive than "instruction" and as synonymous with "education" in the very broad sense of the development and training of the whole person--here, the whole Christian person.³⁴

On the other, James B. Conant's remarks that: "The greater the proportion of our youth who attend independent schools, the greater the threat to our democratic unity."³⁵ Obviously both camps are criticizing Catholic schools either because they are deficient in socializing their students or because they subvert the socialization experience.

It is clear, therefore, that a study of the socialization process precisely as it affects education is important to sociology. Even more, since any sociological investigation has to do with the the inter-relations of people in society, adequate understanding of these individuals presupposes that one ~~has~~ probed the socialization process through which these people have assumed adult roles in our society.

Socialization may be defined as the process by which an individual acquires the values and knowledge of his society and learns the social role appropriate to his position in it. This process has an objective and subjective aspect: the external society

³⁴Ryan, p. 5.

³⁵James B. Conant, speech to American Association of School Administrators, April 7, 1962, cited in McCluskey, Catholic Viewpoint on Education, p. 37.

into which a person is socialized and the person's internal acceptance of that society with its norms and values.³⁶

From the society's point of view new members must be initiated into its culture and motivated to participate in established relationships. To accomplish this the new member must be informed of the norms or values by which he must abide if he is to function satisfactorily in that society. Americans, for example, thus learn that competition and aggressiveness are important in their society since its democracy ultimately rests on the competitive acquisition of its abundant resources.³⁷ In medieval Europe, on the other hand, individuals would have learned that involvement with religion was the chief means of social acceptance in a society in which the religious institution predominated.

Moreover, society also teaches its new members a system of status and roles. That is, the individual learns how to relate to other people in terms of social ranking (status), as well as what specialized positions exist in that society (roles). Thus he learns that society is stratified, that there are people on the top who have considerable power and prestige and people on the bottom who have none. Likewise, he learns what society expects people to do when they are fathers, mothers, bankers, store clerks, ministers, teachers, or government officials. Nevertheless, in absorbing the society's notions of status and role the individual

³⁶Joseph H. Fichter, Sociology (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 19-39.

³⁷See David M. Potter, People of Plenty (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954).

accepts or rejects them in his process of internalization thereby becoming socialized or deviant.

At the same time the individual learns about values and roles he also learns the patterned behavior of people exercising roles in the institutions of society. These institutions consist not of buildings or organizations, but of the established practices, or ways of doing things in that society. American society, for example, has institutions like constitutional government, monogamous marriage, legitimate divorce, private enterprise, and a pluralistic religious structure.

Society also imparts to its new members how people share a common position in the economic order. In this way individuals learn what is involved in low class or high class in terms of economic power, education, relative power over other people, and prestige in social relations.

Now relations between various groups within a society are usually established and regulated through custom. For instance, the relations between religious, national, and racial minorities in the United States are officially equal. Consequently the more in which individuals are educated to understand these relations, the more effective will be their future social interaction with people who come from backgrounds different from their own. At the same time people coming from similar backgrounds will have certain expectations regarding behavior patterns of their peers; only in this way can they recognize the acceptance or rejection of such official norms by their immediate

associates and, in the process, define themselves.

Finally, society must communicate to new members some notion of its attitude toward social change. Thus it may promote progress as a desirable goal and place a high value on social change; or it may hold its traditions very securely and discourage departure from time honored methods, and place a low value on social change.

In the end, however, society can only impart this knowledge and enforce external conformity on its new members; it cannot force internal acceptance or rejection. Radical socialization, then, only occurs in the context of mutual interaction between free individuals and a concerned society. General discussions of socialization in American sociology have most often centered on the child's development of his social identity, or "social self." The society attempts to transmit to the child what it expects of him. Simultaneously, the child looks to see how he can develop and grow in that society.³⁸ Hence, through its various agents, society inculcates in its young certain basic disciplines ranging from body care to methods of scientific investigation. Socialization thus teaches the American child that it is a value to gain self control and to conform to basic time and schedule obligations. More importantly, it teaches him what are the social roles of that society and what the attitudes and behavior of the respective players of those roles should be.

³⁸ Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick, Sociology (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1963), p. 93.

Having sketched this theoretical picture of the general process of socialization, it should be helpful to focus on some of the thinking that has been most influential in developing further the implications of this scheme.

While socialization is concerned with inculcating some degree of conformity to society's norms and an acceptance of its basic values, it is not unilateral in its operation. Primarily, the socialization process must be adapted to each individual and is received by him in different ways. The very backgrounds of two individuals will determine them to different socialization. The disadvantaged child brought up in a large urban ghetto will be socialized far differently than the child of wealthy suburban parents. Further, non-conformity itself may be transmitted as a value of society so that socialization toward conformity is prevented.³⁹

The primary agents of socialization in the United States are the family, the peer group, the school, and the mass media.⁴⁰ These are the means by which the society transmits its values and other necessary knowledge to its new members. Undoubtedly the family constitutes the chief agent of socialization since the child establishes his most intimate relations with them and his activities are so exclusively

³⁹ Ibid., p. 96.

⁴⁰ Frederick Elkin, The Child and Society (New York: Random House, 1960), pp. 45-46.

controlled by the family in his early and formative years. The family thus becomes a screen through which all knowledge and information must be sifted before it comes to the child.

The child's peer group, on the other hand, exerts influence on his adaptation to the larger society. In fact, peer groups have often been seen as a competitor with the family in the process of socialization--especially during the later years of growth.⁴¹ It is in the peer group that the child first experiences relative freedom from externally imposed authority. As a member of the peer group the child has a voice in its collective decisions and achieves a kind of control over his actions relative to his own group which he has not experienced in the family situation.

A third agent of socialization is the mass media--radio, television, newspapers, magazines, and books. In a very real sense, since the mass media are more and more infiltrating the family and its exclusive formation of the child, they have become an ever increasingly significant agent of socialization.⁴²

Once the family has provided the child with a basic orientation to the world, the child enters into a more formal process of socialization--education. The school is responsible for a more formalized type of training than the kind exercised within the scope of parental

⁴¹See David Riesman, Reuel Denney, and Nathan Glazer, The Lonely Crowd (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950).

⁴²Elkin, pp. 70-75.

competence. Today the school acts in loco parentis more frequently than before, thus becoming an increasingly vital factor in the socialization process.

Against the background of this profile of the agents of socialization it is important to ask precisely how the socialization process takes place in the individual. The approach used by contemporary social scientists to answer this query originates from the theories of Charles Horton Cooley and George Herbert Mead.

Cooley's formulation has been referred to as the "looking glass theory":

As we see our face, figure, and dress in the glass, and are interested in them because they are ours, and pleased or otherwise with them according as they do or do not answer to what we should like them to be; so in imagination we perceive in another's mind some thought of our appearance, manners, aims, deeds, character, friends, and so on, and are variously affected by it.⁴³

According to Cooley, moreover, the social self develops only in relation to another person. Only through interaction with others of his own age can the child grasp how he is expected to act. From this experience the child also adduces what kind of person he thinks he should be. The social self emerges, then, from a fusion of this objective self image and the ideal self one hopes to become. Basically, then, the process of socialization is twofold--on the one hand, the society presents its

⁴³ Charles Horton Cooley, "The Social Self" in Theories of Society II, Talcott Parsons (ed.), (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961), p. 824.

norms to the individual through other persons who affect the child and stimulate his reaction and, on the other, the child appropriates or fails to appropriate these values. This importance of "the other" in such socialization is further brought out by Cooley:

The thing that moves us to pride or shame is not the mere mechanical reflection of ourselves, but an imputed sentiment, the imagined effect of this reflection upon another's mind. This is evident from the fact that the character and weight of that other, in whose mind we see ourselves, makes all the difference with one's feeling.⁴⁴

Following Cooley's lead, Mead's theory is characterized by an equally strong emphasis on the role of "significant others" in socialization. The child observes the behavior of people whom he has come to perceive as models, or, in his own terms, as "significant" to himself. If one of these significant people performs an action, that action takes on value for the child. But if the significant other does not value society's practices or institutions, the susceptible child will also reject the value. As the child enlarges his field of significant others, he begins to understand that a particular value is not necessarily related to just one significant other. Rather, he has found that many of these significant others hold the same values. This less personalized outlook, according to Mead, leads the child to a view of the "generalized other":

⁴⁴Ibid.

The organized community of social group which gives to the individual his unity of self may be called the "generalized other." The attitude of the generalized other is the attitude of the whole community. Thus for example, in the case of such a social group as a ball team, the team is the generalized other in so far as it enters—as an organized process or social activity—into the experience of anyone of the individual members of it.⁴⁵

This "generalized other" thus leads the individual to construct his own goals and values (that is, his subjective acceptance of society's norms); he also ascertains what society expects of him.

It is at this point that the individual develops a notion of self identity which Mead analyzes as the "I" and the "me." The active part of the self is the "I"—that which is involved in subjective socialization, the acceptance or rejection of society's norms and values. According to Mead the "me" is the objective component of socialization—that which society expects of the individual:

These are the different types of expressions of the "I" in their relationship to the "me" that I wanted to bring out in order to complete the statement of the relation of the "I" and the "me." The self under these circumstances is the action of the "I" in harmony with the taking of the role of others in the "me." The self is both the "I" and the "me" setting the situation to which the "I" responds. Both the "I" and "me" are involved in the self, and here each supports the other.⁴⁶

As we have noted earlier, socialization very basically takes place in the family. Here the child learns the basic norms and values of the society as interpreted for him by his parents and siblings.

⁴⁵George Herbert Mead, Mind Self and Society (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934), p. 134.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 277.

Within this atmosphere he also begins to internalize conceptions about various social roles. All of this knowledge is learned in an informal manner and also reinforced through peer group relations. There comes a time, however, when the family is no longer competent to complete the child's training. It is at this time that the child goes to school and begins his formal education. Now he is inaugurated into the process of secondary socialization which builds on the primary process which has already taken place. Let us dwell briefly on this aspect of secondary socialization.

According to Berger and Luckmann:

Primary socialization is the first socialization an individual undergoes in childhood, through which he becomes a member of society. Secondary socialization is any subsequent process that inducts an already socialized individual into new sectors of the objective world of his society.⁴⁷

Thus, a child's introduction to society at large is primary socialization; all the subsequent techniques to continue and operate effectively in that society is secondary socialization.

One of the difficulties in the sociological analysis of education is the failure to differentiate between these stages of primary and secondary socialization. Most previous sociological studies of education have focused on the grammar school; since, at this level, there is a combination of both primary and secondary

⁴⁷Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Reconstruction of Reality (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1966), p. 120.

socialization, the distinction between these two phases has not been sufficiently delineated nor appreciated. When dealing with the high school student, however, one can assume that secondary education chiefly involves the process of secondary socialization. The present study presupposes that the high school student has a basic notion of self, that he has "taken over" the world in which others also live, that at the point when a child develops a concept of the generalized other, he is ready to move beyond the level of primary socialization.⁴⁸

As Elkin points out:

It is at once evident that primary socialization is usually the most important one for an individual, and that the basic structure of all secondary socialization has to resemble that of primary socialization. Every individual is born into an objective social structure within which he encounters the significant others who are in charge of his socialization.⁴⁹

By the time a child reaches high school, he now has to relate to people who, as potential "significant others," help him to develop himself further. This point is reinforced by Havighurst and Neugarten:

The teacher is the key figure in the educational system. It is the teacher's behavior in the classroom situation that must eventually be the focus of our attention if we are to understand how society through its agent, the school, and in turn, the school through the person of the classroom teacher, influences the lives of the children.⁵⁰

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 121.

⁵⁰Havighurst and Neugarten, p. 401.

Primary socialization thus takes place without the individual knowing what is actually happening to him.⁵¹ Secondary socialization on the other hand, is dependent upon "the complexity of the division of labor and the concomitant social distribution of knowledge" of the society.⁵² In the United States education is involved in a quite extensive process of secondary socialization since it prepares students to live in a highly developed and diversified economy. Moreover, the sectarian school in a pluralistic society with its goal of forming religious values has a more extensive obligation in secondary socialization.

The problem which any value education confronts, of course, arises because it tends to resist new content.⁵³ In other words, individuals tend to hold on to views of the world and ideas about behavior and expected behavioral patterns which they have already learned. These are rooted in primary relations with parents and peers which are the most emotionally intense relations a child constructs. To displace these early views is to endanger the displacement of meaningful others in the child's life. Such a process can come about only at great emotional expense to the child.

Early internalizations are even more problematic if the

⁵¹Berger and Luckmann, p. 124.

⁵²Ibid., p. 127.

⁵³Ibid., p. 129.

agents of primary socialization, especially the parents and family, hold views opposed to the new content of secondary socialization. Thus, "to maintain consistency secondary socialization presupposes conceptual procedures to integrate different bodies of knowledge."⁵⁴ This means, for example, that when parents introduce children to school they implicitly acknowledge the fact that teachers are able to offer their children something which the parents themselves are unable to provide. In this way, parents predispose children for secondary socialization. Through grade school this mechanism is reinforced at various times when children encounter difficulties with the educational institution and its functionaries. When, however, parents reinforce the school's authority, the procedural mechanism of predisposition is reinforced.

The existence or recognition of significant others in secondary education, as in secondary socialization, is not absolutely necessary. As Berger and Luckmann emphasize:

The teachers need not be significant others in any sense of the word. They are institutional functionaries with the formal assignment of transmitting specific knowledge. The roles of secondary socialization carry a high degree of anonymity; that is, they are readily detached from their individual performers. The same knowledge taught by one teacher could also be taught by another. Any functionary of this type could teach this type of knowledge. The individual functionaries may, of course, be subjectively differentiated in various ways (as more or less congenial,

better or worse teachers of arithmetic, and so on), but they are in principle interchangeable.⁵⁵

Nevertheless there is little doubt that the effectiveness of the socialization process will be aided by identification: "The teacher functions as a socializing agent, furthermore, in being a model for imitation and identification."⁵⁶

The basic hypothesis of the present study is that although significant others are not absolutely necessary for secondary socialization, they are undoubtedly aids to this process. Insofar as the teachers are significant others to the student, the process of secondary socialization will be easier for the student and more successful for the teacher. Moreover, Jesuit educational theory puts crucial emphasis on the influence of the Jesuit teacher on the student in the process of formation. Thus the teacher is not merely a functionary who may be slotted to this or that position, but is a potential "significant other" to the students with whom he comes in contact.

It is important, however, that the student does not feel the same emotional attachment for the teacher as he does for the parent. If the adolescent does not learn a degree of detachment from parental authority he will not develop the self confidence necessary for his own

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 133.

⁵⁶Navighurst and Neugarten, p. 405.

proper growth. The transference of dependence upon parental authority to dependence upon a teacher's authority would definitely hinder favorable emotional development in the student.

This very basic detachment on the level of ordinary academic matters should be expected. But sectarian education, where religious observance and commitment are important goals, demands a greater intensity of socialization. Though in the following citation Berger and Luckmann are speaking of a person entering religious life, it aptly applies to the matter of religious education:

But even short of such transformation, secondary socialization becomes affectively charged to the degree to which immersion in and commitment to the new reality are institutionally defined as necessary. The relationship of the individual to the socializing personnel becomes correspondingly charged with "significance," that is, the socializing personnel take on the character of significant others vis-a-vis the individual being socialized. The individual then commits himself in a comprehensive way to the new reality.⁵⁷

The importance of significant others in religious education is underscored by Gabriel Moran: "But the witness of Christian life far from being one of the four ways to teach about Christianity, is the continuing locus of all religious teaching."⁵⁸

In summary, secondary socialization is involved in secondary education because of the necessity of imparting a widely diversified store of knowledge. This complexity is even more marked in sectarian

⁵⁷ Berger and Luckmann, p. 131.

⁵⁸ ibid., p. 133.

education which, because of its marginal situation, calls for intensified measures of socialization which might be dispensed with in the ordinary educational routine. Finally, the problem of continuity with primary socialization is crucial. As Berger and Luckmann comment: "In secondary socialization the present is interpreted so as to stand in a continuous relationship with the past, with the tendency to minimize such transformations as have actually taken place."⁵⁹ Through a clear understanding of this secondary socialization process, our understanding of the effectiveness of Jesuits should be more precise.

CONCLUSIONS

Before discussing the methodology of this study, let us briefly review the theoretical background of this investigation as it has been developed in the preceding pages.

First, the focus of the present study is the effectiveness of Jesuits as teachers in high schools. The problem is interesting sociologically both because there has been little study in this area and because the topic has serious implications for the possibility of success in sectarian education.

Second, the problem is more precisely defined as an inquiry into the question of whether the schools are doing not only what they set

out to do, but whether they are accomplishing what they should accomplish.

Third, the problem takes its relevance from the recent criticism of Catholic education, especially that of Greeley and Perkins. This recent criticism has highlighted the deficiency of the Catholic schools in the areas of development of social attitudes and Christian formation.

Fourth, Jesuits in education have been interested in self-study in relation to its projected goals. However, it appears that the philosophy of Jesuit education might well be taken from Vatican II's "Declaration on Christian Education." Further, the emphasis in Jesuit education is on formation of the student as a free responsible individual aware that he is living in a world with other men, and as a Christian attempting to transform that world.

Fifth, the four schools to be studied have some similarities in their make-up, especially in their college preparatory curriculum and basic similarity in Jesuit administration and staff. The schools differ in their milieu and the problem arising out of these specific situations. The students likewise appear to differ, at least superficially, in their attitudes and application to the academic process.

Sixth, the sociological relevance of the study hinges on the socialization process as it has been understood and developed by Charles Horton Cooley and George Herbert Mead. Special concern in the socialization process was placed in the school as a socializing agent,

which seems to be at the heart of the criticism of the Catholic schools--that they are deficient as socializing agents.

Seventh, the process of secondary socialization is fundamental to the theoretical understanding of the sociology of education. It focuses on the teacher as agent, taking into consideration the problems of relating to teachers as significant others, continuity between primary socialization and its follow-up, and the problem of student development through detachment from strictly parental authority. Yet, in our adaptation of the concept we point to the problems of sectarian education and the necessity for the socializing agent to be a significant other to the student.

CHAPTER II

METHODS OF INQUIRY

An understanding of the methodology of the present study involves a consideration of the initiating factors, hypotheses, the formulation of the research project itself, as well as the pilot study and the final administration of the questionnaire.

BACKGROUND

At the outset, some attention must be given to two questions which underlie our investigation. First, why study these particular schools in the Ohio and Michigan Area? Second, how does this study figure into the larger sociological study of the Jesuit order of which it is a part?

There can be little question, of course, that a study of these four schools would benefit the institutions, faculties, and students involved. Moreover, the schools are all subject to one administrative jurisdiction and thus are easily approachable. Certainly, both these factors did influence undertaking the present study. But these factors of themselves, would neither justify nor negate the validity of the sociological inquiry that was conducted.

As has been pointed out earlier, few studies of sectarian education in the United States exist. The four schools studied were judged to be representative schools of the Society of Jesus in America and, as such, provide an opportunity for studying the possibility and success of American sectarian education. By the very fact that the Society of Jesus conducts fifty secondary schools in the United States, the study of four representative schools in that system can have far reaching effects.

The Jesuit secondary school system itself displayed a manifest concern for self-study when, in the school year 1964-65, the faculties of Jesuit high schools throughout the United States were asked to suggest areas of inquiry for the Fichter study preparatory to the Jesuit Educational Association meeting of August, 1966.⁶⁰ With the help of these suggestions, Fichter constructed a questionnaire, tested it and, after making necessary corrections, administered it to a sample of freshmen and seniors in each Jesuit high school in the United States which had a four year program.⁶¹

The results of this study formed the basis for Fichter's *Send Us a Boy* published in 1966. Many Jesuits involved in the high schools studied felt, however, many problems existed in both the

⁶⁰ Joseph H. Fichter, Send Us a Boy . . . Get Back a Man (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge Center for Social Studies, 1966), p. 8.

⁶¹ Ibid., 11-13.

questions asked and the sampling procedures employed. It should be recalled that the Fichter study was the first official and genuine social science research conducted in Jesuit high schools in the United States. Obviously, it would be critically scrutinized by those whom it affected. Because of a lack of familiarity with this type of study, Jesuit criticism was frequently negative.

When, late in 1966, the Society of Jesus ordered a sociological study of its entire organization to be conducted on the international, national, and local provincial levels, the Detroit Province (encompassing Ohio and Michigan) decided to study its own institutional commitments first. Following the advice of a Province-wide advisory committee, questionnaires were to be constructed to study the people who were being serviced by Jesuits in Ohio and Michigan.

The present study, therefore, is one of six parts of this Detroit Province sociological self-study. In its first plenary meeting, the advisory committee recommended that heavy emphasis be given to the social attitudes of the students to be studied. The committee also believed that there was a strong relation between the development of these student social attitudes and the religious formation which was taking place in the schools.

Areas of inquiry were again sought from Jesuits teaching in the four schools during the Fall of 1966 in light of the criticism of the Fichter study. This quest yielded preliminary questions which were

then criticized by young Jesuits in training at Colombiere College, Clarkston, Michigan. The results of their replies helped focus attention on key areas which appeared to be most promising for investigation.

During the Winter of 1966 and Spring of 1967 further questions were developed by former teachers in the high schools who were residing at Bellarmine School of Theology, North Aurora, Illinois. These preliminary questions and areas of investigation were also evaluated by the original Province advisory committee twice in the Spring of 1967.

After sifting the previous data of the previous questionnaires and other studies related to this investigation, a rough draft of questions was composed during the summer of 1967 which was then submitted to a research team for criticism.

While the author had the various other questionnaires at hand as source material in the construction of the research instrument, the chief criterion in formulating the questions was whether or not its response could reveal something about the actual activity of the Jesuits in relation to the stated objectives in publications of the Jesuit Educational Association and of the individual schools themselves.⁶²

⁶²Principal sources for this material were the research of the Fichter report, the publication of the Jesuit Educational Association, The Christian School--A New View (Washington: JEA, 1966); and a publication commissioned by the 1966 JEA Conference, Adolescence is a Bridge, a twenty-four page brochure based on the documents of the summer conference, prepared by Mark Link, S.J., (Chicago: Loyola Press, 1967). Besides these more recent documents, other important sources were John W. Donohue, S.J., Jesuit Education (New York: Fordham University Press, 1963) and Reed, Teaching in a Jesuit High School.

Thus, from its inception, the study was guided by the key concept of the Jesuit high school as an agent of a particular kind of socialization.

When the final draft of the research instrument was completed, copies were sent to members of the Province advisory committee and the administration and faculties of the four high schools to be studied. The administrators were asked both to obtain a sample of students to take the questionnaire as a pre-test of the instrument and to analyze critically the instrument in light of their experience in teaching and administration. The project coordinator and the author then visited each school to confer with the administration and interested faculty about the survey instrument.

After the results of the pre-testing were analyzed and the conferences with the high school personnel were evaluated, the questionnaire was revised. The responses were carefully analyzed, some questions were revised or rearranged, others were omitted or added. The final revised questionnaire is found in Appendix I.

TESTING THE UNIVERSE

One of the major complaints about the Fichter study centered on the sampling procedure. Specifically, many Jesuits felt that Fichter's samples were neither representative nor random; hence his results were unreliable. In discussing this problem Fichter remarks:

Taking into consideration the limited resources at our disposal, we felt that we could afford to administer, process and analyze approximately seven thousand question-

naires for this study. This meant that we would have to devise a sample selection and could reach somewhat more than four out of ten students (44.25) from each level at each school. This rigid sampling procedure would unquestionably have provided the most reliable national results of the survey, but it had to be abandoned because it prevented us from obtaining the most widely useful local results envisioned in the study. . . .

We aimed at an average of about eighty students per class per school for each province. What this meant in practice is that we administered the questionnaire to all the freshmen and seniors in the smaller schools, but to somewhat less than one hundred in each class in the larger schools.⁶³

But while the samples taken of individual schools was admittedly small, the smallness itself was not the chief objection. The main difficulty was the lack of control within the sampling procedures used by the local schools. The school administration themselves were left responsible for obtaining a cross-section of the classes which were to answer the questionnaire. No uniform sampling procedures on the local level were enforced. Thus, at St. Ignatius High School in Cleveland, for example, the first and seventh classes (out of eight) academically ranked, received the questionnaires. Many Jesuits felt that a spread of this kind could not yield accurate results. While Fichter has defended his sampling procedures and the results of the study, the fact remains that the limited confidence with which they were received by many high school personnel has impaired the study's potential effectiveness.

⁶³Fichter, Send Us a Boy, p. 7.

Confronted with this problem, it was felt that the sampling procedures must be more carefully controlled. In view of the difficulties in high school scheduling and the continual shifting of students during the school day, it was decided to test the entire student universe rather than a random and stratified sample. It was also felt that the universe (3200 students) would easily be manageable and would give the individual cooperating institutions more detailed information about their students. This procedure would also allay some potential criticism of teachers in the schools who were unacquainted with social science research techniques.

Consequently, the research questionnaire was answered by all the students in the four high schools during the week of November 13, 1967. The project coordinator personally supervised the administration in each high school. Each teacher administering the questionnaire was given a set of instructions which he was to read to the class and follow himself to insure uniformity in understanding the content of the questionnaire.⁶⁴ Special instructions were given to freshmen and transfer students with only brief experience in a Jesuit school.⁶⁴ The final results of the questionnaire were coded at John Carroll University under the direction of the project coordinator and then tabulated at the data processing center of the University of Detroit.

⁶⁴These instructions constitute Appendix II of this thesis.

CONTENT OF THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

As already indicated, both the areas of investigation and the final questions of this study were selected on the basis of their ability to reveal something about the actual activity of the Jesuits in relation to their stated objectives in secondary education. A problem encountered early in the study was whether the stated objectives were up-to-date, whether they were the objectives which Jesuits were actually pursuing in their education. In general, the research team felt that the Jesuit Educational Association's statement of policy was most inclusive. While its statement is different from Vatican II's formulation of educational philosophy, the basic content remains the same. Nor was there felt to be any major discrepancy between the areas of investigation in the present study and the stated objectives of the schools as confirmed in the brochures and manuals of the schools themselves.

HYPOTHESIS

In view of the literature cited in chapter one and the initial reactions from the high school teachers concerning the socializing aspects of the educational process of Jesuit education, the following hypothesis was proposed for study: the Jesuit high school as an agent of socialization inculcates in its students those social attitudes which by its philosophy it purports to impart. In concrete

terms, this means that Jesuit effectiveness is related to the social attitudes of students insofar as the students have experienced more or less of Jesuit education.

Inculcation of social attitudes should be an important characteristic of the schools' process as a socializing agent. In the first place, the Jesuit secondary schools have enunciated this goal as one of supreme importance. Abstractly the goal has little meaning if it is not adequately enunciated by the school administration and faculty; concretely, one should be able to reasonably expect the students to give evidence of assimilating the values that are proclaimed. Secondly, Jesuit education purports to lay heavy emphasis on the individual's own character development through its guidance program. Such guidance is an important part of the socializing process since each individual as a receiver of goals must interpret and inculcate them in himself. But the adolescent, lacking a wide experience, needs help in this area.

Thirdly, the schools' formal purpose is intellectual formation and since a major component of attitudes should be intellectual, the school ideally plays a major role in attitude formation.

Fourthly, the three attitudinal areas of public responsibility, the school, and religion are key indicators of the students' social attitudes. If the American system of democratic education has any meaning, the school must inculcate favorable attitudes toward public responsibility; when it fails to propagate these values it fails as a

socializing agent. If a school does not inculcate responsible social attitudes towards the on-going life of its students who participate in its own social life, it fails to transmit an important part of the belief system which it holds and abdicates its own social responsibility. Finally, the avowed purpose of a sectarian school is to promote the religious denomination's own belief system. If the sectarian school does not positively influence the beliefs and religious values of its students, the institutions' reason for existence is negated.

PROBLEMS OF ANALYSIS

Since the emphasis in this study is on the effectiveness of Jesuits relative to the social attitudes of the students, we are interested in learning whether the students recognize the value system which the Jesuits hold and whether they adhere to it themselves. Questions were therefore formulated along these lines and the items were specifically related to Jesuits when possible in order to isolate their influence in the student's life. Moreover, since Jesuit education and its philosophy is primarily related to the Church's teaching, it is logical to conclude that the social attitudes proclaimed in the Church's social documents should find expression in its teaching. Thus two questions were asked directly related to this problem.⁶⁵

⁶⁵Appendix I, question A39 and A40.

In order to probe the way in which the students perceived their Jesuit teachers communicated these values, we attempted to ascertain the student's direct recollection of Jesuit influence.⁶⁶ Related to this was the question of whether the value system the students were being taught conflicted with the attitudes the student possessed before he became acquainted with Jesuit education.⁶⁷

At the core of the Jesuit value system one also finds a concerned awareness of material goods and their use in relation to man's proper development and hence his attitude toward material success. Whether this concept is properly imparted, or whether it is over emphasized was also investigated.⁶⁸ Since an understanding of man's interrelatedness is important for proper social formation, we also asked if Jesuit influence had provoked lack of social responsibility.⁶⁹

To test whether or not the students were helped to develop more formulated Christian social attitudes two questions concerned the students' own views regarding people of other religions and races.⁷⁰

⁶⁶Ibid., B27.

⁶⁷Ibid., B28.

⁶⁸Ibid., B29.

⁶⁹Ibid., B33.

⁷⁰Ibid., B57 and B58.

The limits of the present thesis prohibit analysis of all the data collected in the research questionnaire. Thus it was decided to select eight items for analysis and, in view of the research hypothesis, to compare the responses of the senior and freshmen students of St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High; and the junior and freshmen classes at St. John's and Walsh, since they did not have senior classes at the time the questionnaire was administered. In this way the development of the students' social attitudes could be related to the number of years of Jesuit education which they had experienced. Moreover, by comparing the data from each of the four schools, it will be possible not only to construct a picture of the attitudes of the total number of students involved in the study but also to better understand how a particular unit of analysis, e.g. Walsh juniors, fit into the average response of the whole universe.

CHAPTER III

FAMILY AND STUDENT BACKGROUNDS

The students in this study are, as would be expected, predominantly Catholic (96%). Protestants make up less than two per cent of the school enrollments. The two established high schools, St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High, have only a fraction of non-Catholic students compared to a four percent average for the two newer schools (Table 1). Since the latter schools opened after Vatican II in a more ecumenical spirit and were looked upon as "new" schools, it is likely that the non-Catholics felt more comfortable than if they were, as it might seem, breaking a precedent in one of the established schools.

The data reveals that the four high schools are overwhelmingly white with less than two percent black enrollment. Table 2 reveals that three percent of St. John's students identify themselves as non-Caucasian.

Suburbia is called home by a majority of young people in each of the schools, with one out of every two students residing in a suburban area. In view of the fact that the two newer schools are located in suburban areas, it is interesting to note that the most

TABLE 1. -- Four school comparative report on the religious preference of the students.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. Catholic	98.1	97.8	94.2	91.5	96.2
2. Protestant	0.2	0.8	3.9	4.2	1.8
3. Orthodox	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
4. Jewish	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.6	0.3
5. Other	1.7	1.3	1.3	3.4	1.8
Number	1048	928	636	497	3109

TABLE 2. -- Four school comparative analysis on racial background of the students.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. Caucasian (white)	98.8	97.9	97.0	98.9	98.2
2. Negro (black)	1.1	1.7	2.5	0.6	1.5
3. Other	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.3
Number	1047	926	635	496	3104

"inner-city" of the schools, St. Ignatius, draws nearly seven out of ten students from the suburbs. As would be expected from their locations, the two newer schools have a greater representation of rural and town students with one out of six at St. John's and nearly one out of four at Walsh coming from a town or rural area (Table 3).

Just as the students would be expected to be mostly Catholic so might they be expected to come from predominantly Catholic grade schools. As Table 4 indicates almost eighty-two percent of the students come from a completely Catholic educational institution while four and one-half percent come from a completely public school background. Thus the data reveals no substantial change from what Fichter found at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High in 1966 where the average of completely Catholic education was eighty-five percent and seventy-eight percent, respectively at the two schools.⁷¹

The students in the present study reveal a great similarity in the fathers' educational background, particularly in the number of those attending college after high school and graduating from college. There is little difference at St. John's where a slightly greater percentage of fathers has not attended high school and where less have pursued a degree beyond the bachelor's level (Table 5). These statistics

⁷¹Thomas M. Gannon, S.J., unpublished "J.E.A. Survey of Jesuit High School Students Detroit Province Comparative Report" (Detroit, 1966), p. 1.

TABLE 3. -- Four school comparative analysis of residential background of the students.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. City	28.1	46.2	45.2	35.9	38.3
2. Suburb	69.4	50.3	38.7	40.3	52.8
3. Town	1.5	2.3	7.1	13.7	4.8
4. Rural ¹⁵	0.9	1.2	8.9	10.1	4.1
Number	1044	928	635	496	3103

TABLE 4. -- Four school comparative analysis of elementary schooling of the students.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. All Cath.	87.6	79.7	86.6	72.4	86.6
2. Mainly Cath. some public	7.8	13.3	6.3	8.2	9.2
3. Half Cath. Half Public	1.4	2.2	0.6	3.4	1.8
4. Mainly pub. some Cath.	1.2	1.6	1.4	5.0	1.9
5. All public	0.8	2.6	4.2	10.5	3.6
6. Other	1.1	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.8
Number	1047	927	636	497	3107

TABLE 5. — Four school comparative analysis of the educational background of the students' fathers.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. 8th grade or less	3.3	2.6	2.4	3.2	2.9
2. some high school	8.5	9.5	11.5	6.0	9.0
3. high school graduate	24.2	19.1	24.1	23.2	22.5
4. some ed. beyond h.s.	23.5	22.4	23.7	23.4	23.2
5. college graduate	25.6	27.3	27.3	29.2	27.0
6. grad. or prof. degree beyond bach.	14.9	19.2	11.0	14.9	15.4
Number	1043	928	634	496	3101

reveal a close similarity to Fichter's 1966 findings both at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High in the categories of college graduate and degrees obtained beyond the bachelor's level. The 1966 study, however, showed a larger number of fathers who achieved less than a high school education. Thus it would seem that the educational level of the fathers of Jesuit high school boys is gradually rising—even over a two year period.⁷²

On the other hand, forty-four percent of the students' mothers attended school beyond high school, with nearly twenty percent of them graduating from college as reported (Table 6). This latter fact compares positively with the 1966 data which indicated that mothers of students at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High graduated from college at the rate of seventeen percent, just one point above the national average for mothers of Jesuit high school students across the country.

Turning to occupational backgrounds of the students' families, we find about a quarter of the boys indicated that their father is a member of one of the professions. Managerial positions are held by nearly one third of the students' fathers. At the other end of the scale less than one out of ten fathers is employed in semi-skilled or unskilled occupations (Table 7). The contrast is most pointed at University of Detroit High where one out of three students'

⁷²Ibid.

TABLE 6. -- Four school comparative analysis of the educational background of the students' mothers.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. 8th grade or less	2.1	2.8	1.7	2.0	2.2
2. Some high school	7.6	7.3	6.8	5.3	6.9
3. High school graduate	50.4	41.2	46.3	47.1	46.2
4. Some ed. beyond h.s.	17.1	21.6	20.2	25.1	20.4
5. College graduate	19.2	20.4	20.7	16.9	119.5
6. Grad. or Prof. degree beyond bach.	3.6	6.8	4.3	3.6	4.7
Number	1044	928	633	495	3100

TABLE 7. -- Four school comparative analysis of occupational background of the students' fathers.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	walsh	Totals
1. Professional	23.2	32.5	18.9	20.5	24.7
2. Manager or proprietor ^a	16.0	15.5	15.9	21.5	16.7
3. Manager or proprietor ^b	10.2	8.5	16.2	13.3	11.4
4. Sales or clerical work	13.9	12.8	11.0	14.1	13.0
5. Skilled craft. or foreman	14.9	14.7	16.0	12.9	14.8
6. Service worker for business or profession	6.5	4.1	6.8	5.2	5.6
7. Protective service	5.9	3.3	2.9	1.2	3.8
8. Semi-skilled; machine op.	6.1	5.6	6.8	6.8	6.2
9. Unskilled; common lab.	1.5	1.3	1.6	2.2	1.6
10. Other	1.6	1.6	3.9	2.2	2.2
Number	1048	929	636	497	3110

^aProprietor of a business employing 25 or more.

^bProprietor of a business employing less than 25.

fathers is a professional, while only one out of twelve has a father employed in a semi-skilled or unskilled capacity.

Considering educational and occupational background of these students, it is apparent that they represent high status families. In summary, then, the majority of students from the participating schools generally come from families which are white, Catholic, suburban, upper-middle class. Generally, their parents have been well educated and have assumed status employment; thus they have been able to provide their sons with the opportunity to obtain what is considered to be a fairly prestigious education in Cleveland and Detroit. These boys are presently studying in an overwhelmingly Catholic atmosphere, though about ten percent of them had little or no previous Catholic grade school background.

PARENT-STUDENT RELATIONS

Though the present research project does not contain more than one item leading to a better understanding of parent-student relations, this material is helpful for a deeper appreciation of the data under consideration. For such material we draw on the 1966 Fichter study results as analyzed for St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High.⁷³

One questionnaire item in the present study is similar to Fichter's question about the choice of the Jesuit high school related to its source. In Fichter's analysis at Ignatius, six percent of the students

⁷³ Ibid.

claimed parental decision as opposed to six and one-half percent in Detroit. Thirty percent of Ignatius students and thirty-two percent of the University of Detroit high students claimed themselves as primary source of the decision. Agreement by both student and parents was responsible for the choice of a Jesuit high school in fifty-seven percent of the cases at Ignatius and fifty-nine percent at University of Detroit High. The present research data indicates a slightly higher percentage of agreement. (Table 8)

Parent-student relations are also demonstrated in Fichter's items concerning discussion on family decisions and parental help in student use of freedom with responsibility. In these items it is clear that Jesuit students come from a democratic family Background in which decision making is shared. (Table 9)

In regard to helping students use freedom with responsibility Jesuit students acknowledge considerable help from their parents with only a small percentage denying the proposition (Table 10). This response is in accord with the other data presented which indicate generally favorable rapport between parents and students.

In conclusion, besides the families being white, Catholic, suburban, upper-middle class, they also are democratically oriented in regard to decisions concerning their adolescents.

TABLE 8. -- Four school comparative analysis on selection process of the Jesuit high school.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. Parental decision only	2.6	5.5	5.1	9.1	5.0
2. Agreement of self & parents	62.4	62.8	60.0	58.2	61.3
3. Mainly my own idea	32.9	29.8	32.2	30.9	31.5
4. Other	2.2	1.9	2.7	1.8	2.2
Number	1044	929	633	495	3099

TABLE 9. -- Fichter-Gannon analysis on decision making involvement of students in family at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High with national average.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	National
1. Parents always involve student	30.0	33.0	32.0
2. They do so most of the time	42.0	43.0	43.0
3. They do once in awhile.	24.0	20.0	20.0
4. They never involve the student	4.0	4.0	5.0

TABLE 10. -- Fichter-Gannon analysis on parental help in student use of freedom with responsibility at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High with national average.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	National
1. Parents help very much	51.0	41.0	51.0
2. They help somewhat	31.0	38.0	33.0
3. They do not give much help	11.0	9.0	10.0
4. They give no help at all	5.0	5.0	3.0
5. They oppose it	2.0	7.0	3.0

CONCLUSION

This chapter attempted to provide the methodological background of the present study and some of the suppositions underlying the sociological relevance of the investigation for the high schools involved. The rather lengthy process of preparation of the research instrument has indicated both the wide participation of many of the interested parties and the careful scrutiny of the questionnaire items. The decision to test the entire student population of these schools rather than a sample was based on the manageability of the universe and on the advisability of offering more detailed results to the institutions. In view of the sampling problems involved in the Fichter study this decision should help to gain support for the conclusions of the study. The content of the questionnaire has been carefully screened to ensure that it corresponds to the Jesuits' stated objectives in the educational process. Finally, the hypotheses which will be tested in this inquiry have centered on the school as a socializing agent and its Jesuit faculty's influence on the development of social attitudes.

CHAPTER IV

SOCIAL AWARENESS OF JESUIT

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

According to Harvanek, the key to understanding the Jesuit philosophy of education is its dedication to the teachings of the Church.⁷⁴ The first set of student social attitudes to be analyzed thus concerns the Church's social doctrine.

ATTITUDES TO CHURCH'S SOCIAL TEACHING

Obviously, if the students are to understand their social responsibility as it is understood according to their teachers and enunciated by the Church, they must first be exposed to it. The time which is most appropriate for this kind of indoctrination would seem to be the weekly religion classes. Table 8 indicates that generally seven out of ten students stated that the Church's social teachings were taught to them, while less than one out of ten felt that this

⁷⁴Harvanek, p. 44.

subject received no specific attention. Moreover, it is clear from Table 9 that in all the schools but Walsh more than twice as many upperclassmen as freshmen stated that the social teachings of the Church had been taught them. At Walsh, however, three out of ten freshmen report that much attention is given to these teachings--a considerably higher report by freshmen than in the other three schools. Interestingly enough, Walsh's upper classmen, to only a slightly higher degree than the freshmen, report much attention to the Church's teaching. In regard to the hypothesis of this study, then, the situation in which

TABLE 11. --Four school comparative response to question of how much attention the social teachings of the Church regarding social responsibility received in religion classes.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. Much	22.4	29.3	24.4	36.0	27.0
2. Some	45.9	41.7	44.6	44.3	44.1
3. Little	23.0	24.0	21.3	14.8	21.7
4. No Attention	8.7	4.9	9.7	4.9	7.1
Number	1004	903	587	461	2955

TABLE 12. --Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question of how much attention the social teachings of the Church regarding social responsibility received in religion classes.

	Ignatius		U. of D.		St. John's		Walsh	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.
1. Much	34.1	12.9	46.2	19.7	42.2	10.6	35.2	30.5
2. Some	50.5	36.0	34.1	43.7	42.7	43.4	51.4	43.0
3. Little	13.6	32.7	13.8	28.6	12.2	26.8	11.9	17.2
4. No attention	1.8	18.4	0.9	7.9	2.5	19.2	1.4	9.3
Number	220	272	223	213	192	198	143	151

TABLE 13. --Four school comparative response to question of how much attention the social teachings of the Church regarding social responsibility receive in classes other than religion.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. Much	5.2	6.3	8.6	6.3	6.4
2. Some	31.6	41.7	39.5	42.1	37.9
3. Little	40.6	41.7	38.8	40.4	40.6
4. No attention	22.5	10.3	13.1	11.1	15.1
Number	967	904	582	458	2911

an average of eighty-four percent of the upperclassmen respond that much or some attention is given to the Church's social doctrine would indicate that during the students' Jesuit high school education they have received an increasing exposure to these doctrines. This is more apparent when one compares the finding that an average sixty-one percent of the freshmen felt the social teachings received much or some attention, while fourteen percent indicated the social teaching received no attention at all.

As indicated in Table 13, however, this attention to the social teachings of the Church, is almost exclusively relegated to the religion classes. In a composite view of the schools less than seven percent of the students said that the social teachings of the Church received much attention while double that number (14%) indicated that they received no attention at all in the other classes.

Returning to the hypothesis, Table 14 suggests that more of the upperclassmen (45% upperclassmen vs. 55% for freshmen) felt that the social teachings receive less attention in their other classes outside of religion. On the other hand, only ten percent of the upperclassmen say that no attention is given to the social teachings in their other classes, while a slightly higher twelve percent of the freshmen report this to be the case. Thus, it does not appear that an appreciable difference exists for those students who have experienced Jesuit education for a longer time with regard to the attention given the social teachings

TABLE 14. --Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question of how much attention the social teachings of the Church regarding social responsibility receive in classes other than religion.

	Ignatius		U. of D.		St. John's		Walsh	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Sun.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.
1. Much	4.5	7.0	6.7	6.5	9.4	10.2	4.3	8.7
2. Some	35.9	44.8	39.9	50.9	39.0	48.5	40.4	42.3
3. Little	43.6	36.7	44.4	32.2	40.1	29.6	40.4	36.9
4. No attention	15.9	11.5	8.9	10.3	11.5	11.7	14.9	12.1
Number	220	270	223	214	192	196	141	149

of the Church in classes other than religion. Only University of Detroit high seniors and St. John's juniors indicate a response in the direction of the hypothesis. On the face of it, therefore, the situation indicated by Table 14 does not seem extraordinary, since the place for the social teachings is most clearly the religion class. Yet in view of Jesuit secondary education's emphasis on college preparation with concentration on language and literature studies, it was expected that more upper-classmen would have indicated more general exposure to social teachings in these classes. Still, the responses do verify the hypothesis.

While it is clear that the students feel that the social teachings of the Church are taught to them—particularly in religion classes—it was desirable to probe this finding further and to inquire whether the

students perceived that their Jesuit teachers specifically had attempted to communicate a set of Christian social values. This factor is much more clearly related to the study's hypothesis. Table 15 indicates that almost nine out of ten students believe their Jesuit teachers made much or some effort to impart a set of social values, while a small number of students denied any effort in this direction by the Jesuits.

But is there a relation between the length of experience with the Jesuits and the students' recognition of and development in social attitudes? Table 14 supplies the basic comparative data between freshmen and upperclassmen.

TABLE 15. --Four school comparative response to question whether Jesuits tried to communicate a set of Christian social values.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. Much	46.5	54.5	40.5	52.5	48.7
2. Some	43.0	36.0	45.9	39.6	40.9
3. Little	8.5	8.5	9.4	5.9	8.3
4. Not at all	1.9	0.9	4.2	2.0	2.1
Number	927	905	593	444	2869

TABLE 16. --Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question whether Jesuits tried to communicate a set of Christian social values.

	Ignatius		U. of D.		St. John's		Walsh	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.
1. Much	53.8	45.1	56.6	53.8	48.0	38.2	63.7	46.5
2. Some	36.3	42.3	33.2	37.2	41.6	44.4	32.2	39.4
3. Little	7.6	10.4	8.8	7.5	8.9	10.1	4.1	8.7
4. Not at all	2.2	2.2	1.3	1.5	1.5	7.3	0.0	5.5
Number	223	182	226	199	202	178	146	127

At Ignatius no development is apparent, though there is an eight percent difference in the number of seniors who believe that Jesuits show much effort to impart social values. In both senior and freshmen groups there appears a constant two percent who see no Jesuit effort at all in this area.

University of Detroit high results show a slight three percent more seniors than freshmen who see specific Jesuit effort to impart social values. When the top two categories are combined there is a slight one percent edge in favor of the freshmen. Thus, there seems to be no apparent development here as the hypothesis would predict. There is, likewise, no increase or substantial decrease in the one percent of the students who believe their Jesuit teachers expend no effort along these

lines.

Differing from the two established schools, St. John's students show a ten percent increase in the juniors who believe the Jesuits attempt to communicate social values. Even in the category of those who think the Jesuits make no effort, there is a six percent decrease between freshmen and upperclassmen in favor of the hypothesis. It is apparent that this direction in the statistics from St. John's is more pronounced because of the low score of St. John's freshmen when compared to the other three schools. Evidently a greater impression along these lines is made earlier in the other schools.

Walsh juniors record an emphatic response to the question with sixty-four percent answering that the Jesuits there give much attention to social teaching. This figure indicates a seventeen percent difference with the Walsh freshmen. When the first two scores are combined, ninety-six percent of the upperclassmen compared to eighty-six percent of the freshmen indicate that their Jesuit teachers show much or some effort in imparting a set of social values. At the other end of the scale six percent of the Walsh freshmen believe Jesuits show no effort at all. Hence, at Walsh the hypothesis that greater experience of Jesuit education should correlate with high recognition of social attitudes is verified.

In the end, then, the hypothesis of the study is not solidly verified at St. Ignatius nor at University of Detroit High, but is verified at St. John's and Walsh.

These findings could be explained several ways. First, at the two new schools there is a general absence of previous familiarity with the Jesuits on the part of the students, whereas in the older schools there is the possibility of a greater pre-conditioning to Jesuit values because of the greater publicity of their established traditions. However, since the Walsh freshmen compare favorably to the Ignatius freshmen, this explanation does not seem applicable. A second answer might be that the specific group of Jesuit teachers at the four schools accounts for the differences in their manner of adapting to the Jesuit philosophy of education. Since all the students do display an awareness of the Church's social teachings, it seems that they do communicate these values, but they do this in their own way according to the needs of the individual schools.

On the other hand, part of the explanation of the difference in the students' response could lie in the young people's social background. Students who reside in the larger metropolitan areas from which Ignatius and University of Detroit high draw their enrollments could be more sensitive to the social situation in the school's own neighborhood and feel that the Jesuits should be making more effort in this area. Hence, the students might be inclined, as upperclassmen, to be more critical of their Jesuit teachers.

However, in controlling the data for residence, this latter explanation does not seem plausible. There is no appreciable difference between the old and new high schools in a city proper-suburban split (Tables 16 and 18). Only in the response from Walsh do we see a surprising

difference (16%) between the juniors and freshmen who reside in the city proper, when the scores are polarized. Among the suburbanites, the St. John's students, in a polarized schema, demonstrate a fifteen percent difference between juniors and freshmen. Thus no generalization can be adduced concerning the relative success in attitude formation of the students on the basis of residence.

TABLE 17. —Four school comparative analysis by top and bottom class of city dwellers on question whether Jesuits tried to communicate a set of Christian social values.

	Ignatius		U. of D.		St. John's		Walsh	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.
1. Much	56.9	50.9	54.5	45.9	45.8	40.3	62.3	40.6
2. Some	35.3	37.7	33.1	42.4	43.7	46.8	37.7	43.7
3. Little	5.9	5.7	10.7	10.6	10.4	7.8	0.0	9.4
4. Not at all	2.0	5.7	1.7	1.2	0.0	5.2	0.0	6.2
Number	51	53	121	85	96	77	53	32

Correlative to this question is the prior social attitudes held by the students before coming to the Jesuit high school. In other words, do the social values communicated by the Jesuits conflict with the students' previous value system. As Table 19 indicates, only one out of twelve students felt that their previous value system conflicted with what the Jesuits presented. At the other end of the scale one out of four students reported that there was no conflict at all. Roughly seven out of ten students,

TABLE 18. --Four school comparative analysis by top and bottom class of suburbanites on question whether Jesuits tried to communicate a set of Christian social values.

	Ignatius		U. of D.		St. John's		Walsh	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.
1. Much	53.6	41.7	60.4	59.4	47.4	40.3	65.6	47.4
2. Some	36.3	45.8	32.7	33.0	43.4	35.8	29.5	40.4
3. Little	7.7	11.7	5.9	5.7	6.6	13.4	4.9	7.0
4. Not at all	2.4	0.8	1.0	1.9	2.6	10.4	0.0	5.3
Number	168	120	101	106	76	67	61	57

TABLE 19. --Four school comparative response to question whether social values prior to high school were in conflict with those which Jesuits made an effort to communicate.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. Much	7.1	7.2	9.5	8.7	8.4
2. Some	31.9	28.8	35.7	37.1	31.2
3. Little	33.3	34.7	30.4	28.4	30.9
4. not at all	24.4	27.2	20.0	22.7	20.8
5. Jesuits made no effort	3.3	2.0	4.3	3.1	4.7
Number	885	389	560	423	2757

TABLE 20. —Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question whether social values prior to high school were in conflict with those which Jesuits made an effort to communicate.

	Ignatius		U. of D.		St. John's		Walsh	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.
1. Much	6.4	6.7	6.2	9.1	10.7	8.9	4.8	8.3
2. Some	36.4	32.0	34.2	22.6	37.2	34.4	35.6	31.5
3. Little	31.9	28.0	36.4	39.8	35.7	23.6	33.6	19.4
4. Not at all	22.3	28.7	21.8	26.9	13.8	26.1	23.9	34.3
5. Jesuits made no effort	3.2	4.7	1.3	1.6	2.6	7.0	2.1	6.5
Number	220	150	225	186	196	157	146	108

however, admit some conflict. This factor would indicate that at least some development has taken place in a great number of students.

In the breakdown for the individual schools as presented in Table 20, there seems to be no remarkable deviations or progress in the Ignatius statistics. University of Detroit high seniors, however, report a five percent increase over the freshmen who thought there was at least some conflict. At the same time, there was a five percent decrease among the University of Detroit high seniors in comparison to freshmen who thought there was no conflict at all.

Scores from St. John's indicate a seven percent higher combined score of the first two items as compared to the Walsh juniors. Over-all the St. John's juniors indicate in eight out of ten cases that some conflict

exists. More importantly, there is a thirteen percent decrease in the number of St. John's juniors who felt there was no conflict at all in this area. Again it appears that there is a greater recognition of the Jesuits' social values by students who have had a longer relationship with them.

Table 20 thus indicates that the students from both St. John's and Walsh verify the hypothesis. The Walsh juniors register a two percent indication that Jesuits made no effort in this area in contrast to six percent of the freshmen. What is interesting in this statistic is that no Walsh juniors made this response to the previous question.

In appraising this particular questionnaire item and the resulting answers, it appears that there is a definite conflict in social values between what the students possessed prior to their Jesuit education and what they find their Jesuit teachers hold; Table 19, for example indicates that only one quarter of the students generally deny any conflict or believe Jesuits made no effort in this area. The relevance of this data to the hypothesis is the clear indication that there is a recognition by the students of some conflict and hence a clear opportunity for the Jesuit teacher as a socializing agent to influence this aspect of the student's education. Further, the differences between the senior and freshmen scores are in a direction favorable to the hypothesis.

ATTITUDE TOWARD SUCCESS

Jesuit educators, following the Spiritual Exercises of their founder, Ignatius of Loyola, work on the principle that material goods are to be used by men to help them toward their eternal goal. Insofar as these material goods hinder this end they are to be set aside by the individual. Since this concept of the proper use of material goods is a key element in the Jesuit philosophy of education it was felt that this item should also be tested. If Jesuits were unable to impart such a basic attitude toward material success, then their effort in the development of social attitudes of their students would be weakened. The question was concretely posed in terms of whether Jesuits emphasized too much the goal of material success.

TABLE 21. —Four school comparative response to question whether Jesuits in high schools emphasize too much the goal of material success.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. Strongly agree	4.7	5.6	8.0	7.7	6.1
2. Agree	11.4	15.6	15.3	17.9	14.5
3. No opinion	30.3	25.5	36.5	32.7	30.4
4. Disagree	44.2	41.9	31.5	32.0	39.0
5. Strongly disagree	9.5	11.4	8.7	9.6	9.9
Number	921	897	587	428	2833

TABLE 22. —Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question whether Jesuits in high schools emphasize too much the goal of material success.

	Ignatius		U. of D.		St. John's		Walsh	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.
1. Strongly agree	3.6	5.1	8.4	2.6	8.5	6.9	7.5	4.5
2. Agree	15.6	6.7	15.5	13.6	16.4	13.2	16.4	19.6
3. No opinion	20.9	42.7	17.3	36.1	28.9	43.7	28.8	38.4
4. Disagree	47.8	36.5	46.0	36.1	35.3	25.9	33.6	30.4
5. Strongly disagree	12.1	8.9	12.8	11.5	10.4	10.3	13.7	7.1
Number	224	178	226	191	201	174	146	112

In the over all view of the four schools there is a wide spread of opinion (Table 21). In the polar views only six percent of the students strongly agree that the Jesuits emphasize material success too much, while ten percent strongly disagree. When the scores for the two sides of the scale are combined, roughly two out of ten students agree and five out of ten students disagree, with a noticeable three out of ten students holding no opinion.

Relative to this study's hypothesis it appears that while Jesuit teachers are basically communicating an attitude toward material success consistent with their philosophy to half of the students, there remains a sizable number who find their teachers' position unclear enough that they are unable to make a judgment. To probe this finding further, it will be helpful to analyze the individual school's scores as presented in

Table 22.

The Ignatius figures confirm the direction of the research hypothesis, though not without qualification. Sixty percent of the seniors and forty-five percent of the freshmen disagree with the idea that their teachers stress material success too much. On the other hand nineteen percent of the seniors and twelve percent of the freshmen agree with the idea under discussion. Another factor indicated in Table 22, however, is that twice as many freshmen as seniors have no opinion regarding Jesuit attitudes toward material success. This finding seems to indicate that at least the Jesuit view has come across to the seniors more clearly than to the freshmen. The Ignatius student response also confirms the hypothesis by indicating that there is a growth in the student view consequent to longer experience of Jesuit education.

Generally, the University of Detroit results also tend to support the direction of the hypothesis by indicating a greater number of seniors than freshmen who disagree with the stated position and a smaller number of seniors who have no opinion.

St. John's students tend to verify the hypothesis that longer experience with Jesuit education correlates with a development of social attitudes. Walsh students follow the same pattern. But in comparison with the other three high schools, Walsh does not show as much of a clarification of student views in the no opinion category. It would appear, then, that this response category might better reveal the clarification of the Jesuit position and hence the development of student views as they advance in high school.

In summary, the data indicates that the Jesuit faculties of the four participating schools did not generally emphasize material success. It is also apparent, however, that the values the Jesuits communicated were consistent to their philosophy and tradition in the attitudes toward material success and the use of material goods and that the students evidenced their own attitudes in a direction supporting the study's hypothesis.

ATTITUDES TO SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

One of the focal points in Harvanek's treatment of Jesuit education is that the student must understand that he is a man among men in the world and, hence, that he must assume the social responsibilities consequent upon his basic relationships. Thus one of the survey items asked whether students agree or disagree that Jesuit education has been very individualistic in its orientation as opposed to emphasizing social responsibility.

The results of this query are reported in Table 23. Generally, seventeen percent of the students feel their education too individualistic, while forty-six percent report an emphasis on social responsibility. A solid thirty-six percent of the students indicate that they have no opinion. Again the crucial area of analysis seems to lie in the no opinion category.

Variations between freshmen and upper classmen are slight except at Walsh; here there is an eight percent increase in the juniors' response—

TABLE 23. --Four school comparative response to question whether Jesuit education has been very individualistic in its orientation.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. Strongly agree	4.4	3.8	5.9	7.5	4.99
2. Agree	10.9	12.7	11.8	15.7	12.4
3. No opinion	35.4	31.6	43.5	39.5	36.4
4. Disagree	38.0	39.3	28.0	29.3	35.1
5. Strongly disagree	11.2	12.6	10.8	7.9	11.1
Number	910	890	575	413	2788

TABLE 24. --Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question whether Jesuit education has been very individualist in its orientation.

	Ignatius		U. of D.		St. John's		Walsh	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.
1. Strongly agree	2.7	6.9	4.4	4.3	5.0	9.9	6.9	7.7
2. Agree	10.3	6.9	11.9	8.1	12.0	10.8	18.2	9.6
3. No opinion	25.1	46.2	23.5	38.9	27.0	52.4	36.4	41.3
4. Disagree	46.2	30.1	47.3	32.9	38.5	17.9	30.0	32.7
5. Strongly disagree	15.7	9.8	12.8	15.7	17.5	10.9	8.4	8.6
Number	223	173	226	185	200	164	143	104

a finding against the direction of the hypothesis. In the combined scores expressing disagreement, Walsh again stands out as the only institution which negates the hypothesis. In the other three schools there is a strong development between the freshmen and juniors and seniors as indicated in Table 24. Likewise, in the no opinion category, the Walsh scores show the least amount of clarification on the part of the upper-classmen. On a comparative basis, therefore, some presently unknown factors exist at Walsh which point to the fact that the Jesuit teachers do not communicate a concern for social responsibility to the same degree as they do in the other schools.

In summary, the data obtained from the inquiry about Jesuit emphasis on individualism vs. social responsibility has indicated that the Jesuit teachers in the four schools generally do convey a concern for social responsibility. Further, in all the schools except Walsh, the hypothesis of this study is substantially verified so that a clear indication of development of attitudes is shown to be possible.

ATTITUDES TO OTHER RELIGIONS

If Mary Perkins Ryan's criticism of the Catholic schools' lack of contemporary relevance is correct, then students develop a siege mentality which pushes them ever deeper into what might be called a "Catholic ghetto." If this is the case with Jesuit secondary education, the Jesuits will not have succeeded in imparting their philosophy of education to their students unless they prepare the boys with the critical understanding of the pluralistic world around them. Thus the present

study is concerned with learning whether Jesuit teachers helped their students to develop a better understanding regarding people of other religions.

In the four schools an average of seventy-eight percent of the students relate that their Jesuit teachers did attempt to develop better understanding of other religions. Fifteen percent of the students reported this attempt occurred only rarely. Six percent of the students said the Jesuits never attempted to develop this better understanding in them. The data indicate, then, that the Jesuits did make an effort to inculcate some positive values in this attitudinal area.

TABLE 25. --Four school comparative response to question whether Jesuits tried to help develop better understanding regarding people of other religions.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. Often	24.9	35.7	35.7	41.9	33.2
2. Sometimes	47.3	46.9	42.4	37.6	44.7
3. Rarely	20.9	12.5	13.1	11.8	15.2
4. Never	6.2	4.5	6.9	6.3	5.8
5. Does not apply	0.7	0.5	1.8	2.4	1.1
Number	867	891	566	415	2739

Turning to the school-by-school breakdown on this question (Table 26), we see that Ignatius, University of Detroit High, and St. John's all verify the hypothesis; Walsh runs contrary to it. The fact that of the four schools Walsh has the highest percentage of students who are not Catholic makes the results of this question more interesting. It would be expected that these students would be an aid in helping to develop better understanding regarding people of other religions.

ATTITUDES TOWARD RACE

Another of the areas in which Jesuit high school students would be expected to form a positive social attitude is the problem of race. Since the enrollments of the four schools are predominantly Caucasian, it is all the more necessary that this attitude be investigated as an indicator of the students' over-all social attitudes and values. As background for the data to be presented here results of the 1966 Fichter study involving Ignatius and University of Detroit High provide interest.

Fichter inquired about the extent to which the school gave freshmen and seniors better racial attitudes. His data indicate a denial of the present research hypothesis at both schools which follow the national average of his sample (Table 27).

Fichter was able to specify the racial attitudes more precisely than the present study. As a result he inquired about student attitudes on integrated housing, which are a further confirmation of the over-all attitude toward race already established (Table 28). Again Fichter's data are away from the expectations of the present research hypothesis.

TABLE 26. —Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question whether Jesuits tried to help develop better understanding regarding people of other religions.

	Ignatius		U. of D.		St. John's		Walsh	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.
1. Often	28.1	19.8	40.7	24.5	32.3	37.2	39.4	42.1
2. Sometimes	46.5	48.4	45.1	53.7	54.2	31.7	39.4	31.6
3. Rarely	20.3	21.0	9.7	11.7	8.3	17.1	13.1	13.2
4. Never	3.7	9.6	3.9	9.0	4.2	12.2	5.8	5.8
5. Does not apply	1.4	1.3	0.4	1.1	1.0	1.8	2.2	2.2
Number	217	157	226	188	192	164	137	114

TABLE 27. —Fichter-Gannon comparative analysis on extent to which school gave freshmen and seniors better racial attitudes at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High with national average.

	Ignatius		U. of D. High		National	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.
1. Given very much	8.0	35.0	23.0	25.0	20.0	25.0
2. Given somewhat	31.0	33.0	21.0	29.0	28.0	29.0
3. Given more or less	16.0	17.0	18.0	14.0	13.0	18.0
4. Given very little	17.0	5.0	8.0	12.0	12.0	10.0
5. Given hardly at all	28.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	22.0	17.0

TABLE 28. —Fichter-Gannon comparative analysis on freshmen and senior attitudes toward laws for integrated housing at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High with national average.

	Ignatius		U. of D. High		National	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.
1. Approve them	30.0	37.0	23.0	28.0	39.0	36.0
2. Disapprove them	51.0	40.0	50.0	44.0	40.0	38.0
3. Neutral about them	11.0	16.0	20.0	23.0	15.0	18.0
4. Do not know	6.0	6.0	7.0	5.0	6.0	8.0

TABLE 29. —Fichter-Gannon comparative analysis of attitudes of freshmen and seniors toward the Negro Civil Rights Movement at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High with national average.

	Ignatius		U. of D. High		National	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.
1. Approve it	48.0	45.0	52.0	48.0	55.0	51.0
2. Disapprove it	35.0	21.0	23.0	32.0	27.0	28.0
3. Neutral about it	13.0	31.0	20.0	17.0	16.0	18.0
4. Do not know	4.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	3.0

At both schools there is at least a five percent drop in approval from freshmen to senior year and an eleven percent increase in disapproval at Ignatius and six percent increase at University of Detroit.

When questioned about the Negro Civil Rights movement at that time (1965-66) students at University of Detroit responded according to the present research hypothesis while Ignatius students, following their

pattern show a greater increase in disapproval rather than approval (Table 29).

Students at both schools showed themselves more approving of racially integrated schools when Fichter inquired about that. The data (Table 30) indicates that in this area the hypothesis of the present study is confirmed with the seniors showing attitudinal development as expected by the schools. Fichter's own judgment on the results obtained indicated that he questioned whether the moral values underlying these attitudes were understood and explained by the faculty in the Jesuit high schools across the nation.⁷⁴

TABLE 30. --Fichter-Gannon comparative analysis of attitudes of freshmen and seniors toward racially integrated schools at St. Ignatius and University of Detroit High with national average.

	Ignatius		U. of D. High		National	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.
1. Approve them	54.0	49.0	66.0	59.0	64.0	52.0
2. Disapprove them	21.0	24.0	17.0	19.0	18.0	25.0
3. Neutral about them	24.0	20.0	14.0	19.0	15.0	18.0
4. Do not know	1.0	7.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	5.0

Subsequent to the Fichter study Cleveland experienced the Hough riots in the summer of 1966 and Detroit the catastrophic riots of the summer of 1967. The schools also had the benefit of the Fichter data which

⁷⁴ Fichter, Send Us a Boy...

indicated an unfavorable attitude from what the schools would expect of their students. All of these factors enter into an understanding of the present research findings.

Considering the present research project again we turn to the four-school report to the query of whether Jesuits tried to help the students develop a better understanding regarding people of other races (Table 31). While eighty-two percent of the students affirmed Jesuit effort in this area, thirteen percent indicated Jesuits rarely tried, and five percent said they made no effort. Thus, the Jesuit faculties did try to inculcate some positive attitudes in this area. This finding is in sharp contrast to the Fichter data (Table 27).

TABLE 31. --Four school comparative response to question whether Jesuits tried to help you develop better understanding regarding people of other races.

	Ignatius	U. of D.	St. John's	Walsh	Totals
1. Often	40.9	39.6	47.5	51.7	43.5
2. Sometimes	41.5	41.9	34.3	33.7	38.9
3. Rarely	12.8	14.9	11.7	10.3	12.9
4. Never	4.8	3.6	6.5	4.3	4.7
Number	869	895	566	416	2746

Turning to the breakdown for each of the schools (Table 31), the statistics indicate that the Jesuits often helped the students to develop better interracial understanding. Here the responses of the upperclassmen

TABLE 32. --Four school comparative response by top and bottom class to question whether Jesuits tried to help you develop better understanding regarding people of other races.

	Ignatius		U. of D.		St. John's		Walsh	
	Sen.	Fr.	Sen.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.	Jun.	Fr.
1. Often	50.0	31.5	49.1	35.6	58.5	34.6	62.0	42.6
2. Sometimes	39.5	37.7	38.1	39.8	32.8	31.5	29.2	33.9
3. Rarely	8.7	18.9	10.2	16.8	5.6	19.8	8.0	15.7
4. Never	1.8	11.9	2.7	7.9	3.1	14.2	0.7	7.8
Number	218	159	226	191	195	162	137	115

at St. John's and especially at Walsh indicate an even stronger support of this conclusion than the other two schools. Again there is a sharp contrast with the Fichter data indicating that even in a short period of two years student values do change. Certainly the background of race relations in the two cities must be considered as uppermost in evaluating the data. Cleveland's complaisance in the face of deteriorating conditions in its ghetto and the lack of communication between the white power structure and the black community are certainly reflected in the earlier Ignatius statistics. Likewise, Detroit's seemingly model race relations contributed to a smugness in awareness and sympathy to the actual situation, all of which are reflected in the University of Detroit High student attitudes.

Perhaps the foregoing explains the fact that the schools, in the estimation of the students, have now become a stronger force in

developing positive interracial understanding. Thus it is obvious that the Jesuit faculties of the participating schools are not only fulfilling their philosophy of education, but they are also successful in imparting this to the students. Further, it is evident that the longer the students experience Jesuit education, the more they develop in their social attitudes. The difference between the Fichter data and the present data also points to the possibility of the Jesuits' being potent agents of socialization. The difference in student attitudes within a two year period argues to the adaptability of the Jesuit faculty. This adaptability for socializing agents is important in a period of social change such as we are experiencing today if they are to be significantly relevant to the young people with whom they are associated.

To summarize the data of this chapter, the following conclusions can be stated in brief form:

(1) Jesuits do communicate the social teachings of the Church in their religion classes; corresponding to the length of time the students experience this aspect of Jesuit education there is evidence of a development in their recognition of the content of these values.

(2) Jesuits do not communicate the social teachings of the Church in other classes outside of religion; thus there is no verification of the study's hypothesis in this area. This finding takes on more importance in view of the possibilities within the Jesuit high school curriculum for legitimate discussion of the Church's social teachings.

(3) While the research hypothesis is more solidly verified at the

two new schools than at the two established schools, it is obvious from the data that students do believe their Jesuit teachers made an effort to communicate social values.

(4) Students report conflict between social values held before attending a Jesuit high school and those their Jesuit teachers attempted to communicate. But the data also reveal a development in social values the longer the students are enrolled in a Jesuit high school.

(5) According to the students' responses, Jesuits do not give emphasis to materialistic values nor do they stress individualism more than social responsibility. This finding is confirmed at all of the schools except Walsh.

(6) The students feel that their Jesuit teachers do try to help them understand people of other religions. Again the research hypothesis is confirmed at all of the schools except Walsh.

(7) Jesuits also appear to help their students to better understand people of other races. The research hypothesis is overwhelmingly verified at all of the schools.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the basic hypothesis of the present study, Jesuit effectiveness is related to the social attitudes of students insofar as the students have experienced more or less of Jesuit education. At this point in our investigation it will be helpful to discuss the research results previously presented in terms of the theoretical framework of the study-- the process of secondary socialization and then to discuss some of the implications of our findings.

As the preceding chapters have indicated, Jesuits do communicate the social teachings of the Church in their religion classes. This, of course, was expected and the response of the students in all four high schools confirmed it. Moreover, the data also demonstrated that the students became more aware of the teachings the longer they were exposed to Jesuit education. Clearly, if Jesuits did not succeed in this fundamental aspect of social education, then the intellectual foundation upon which the students' social values are built would be lacking and the consequent expectation of Jesuit influence in the area of social values would be minimal.

The second topic of investigation concerned the degree to which

the social teachings of the Church were stressed in classes other than religion. Here little evidence of such emphasis was found in any of the four schools studied. It might be objected that the Church's social teachings belong only in the religion class and nowhere else. Yet such an objection would have run counter to the stated educational philosophy of the Jesuit high schools and the documents of the recent Fathers Superior of the Society of Jesus.

In general Jesuit high schools stress a liberal arts curriculum based primarily on the study of language, literature, history and mathematics. Every student, in the course of his high school education, will have completed at least four English language and literature courses and at least three World History and American History courses. In addition, most students are required to take from two to four years of a foreign language and three years of mathematics. This heavy emphasis on language arts stems from a belief that such study is the primary ingredient in a humane education. Within the context of this type of curriculum background and the educational philosophy underpinning it, one would expect the research hypothesis to be verified. Certainly by senior year students exposed to this kind of curriculum, should be able to recognize social teachings if they had been presented.

This question is significant. One of the most severe problems facing religious groups generally is the near compartmentalization of belief and practice linked to a legalistic type of exclusively Sunday observance. With the context of such a separation, religious principles are not seen as

relevant to the work-a-day world of modern man. The data of the present study demonstrate a parallel compartmentalization in the Jesuit educators' approach to inculcating social values. If the social teachings of the Church are confined to the religion course and are not shown to be otherwise relevant and hence not discussed in other classes, their influence and importance on the student's overall formations seem to be minimized. Moreover, if this type of influence is not provided outside of religion classes the rationale behind the school's purpose is seriously questionable. Obviously these questions raise issues beyond the scope of this study; at the same time, however, they do point to areas which the participating schools might want to investigate further.

There is no doubt that students recognize that their Jesuit teachers try to communicate a set of Christian social values. Though the research hypothesis is not solidly verified at the two established schools, it is important that ninety percent of the students do recognize Jesuit effort (if not success) in this area. At the two new schools the research hypothesis is more conclusively demonstrated and the aspect of growth in the students' social awareness is more evident. As it was indicated earlier, the apparent reasons for a difference between the old and the new schools seem to be the newness of the schools, the lack of past traditions, and their geographic locations. Thus when one considers the over-all effectiveness of Jesuits as socializing agents, the fact that there is a substantial affirmation of Jesuit effort in communicating social values indicates both the recognition by the students of Jesuit influence and the

degree of their teachers' possible effectiveness.

It is legitimate to ask whether or not these results compensate for the apparent failure to teach the Church's social doctrine in classes other than religion. As long as the Jesuits' attempt to communicate social values is recognized, does it matter in which classes this takes place? One could make an argument for such compensation were it not for the fact an explicit social consciousness must permeate the curriculum if it is to comply with the philosophy of education and the perceived needs of the students as these are articulated in the stated objectives of the schools.

A related and equally important question is whether the set of social values inculcated in these schools is any different from the values which the students held before they were exposed to Jesuit education. Within this context, we attempted to probe any possible conflicts between the values which students brought with them to high school and those which they were taught. The data reveals that the students developed more sharply defined social attitudes as they progressed through their high school years. Were their newly acquired values no different there would be little reason for Jesuit effort in this area. Further, the fact that the data shows a change in attitudes is another indication of Jesuits effectively functioning as socializing agents in the value formation of their students.

Regarding the emphases which Jesuits place on the values they impart, we attempted to test the criticism that Jesuits were excessively materialistic in the attitudes they impart. The data indicated that the students do not make this indictment of their Jesuit teachers. Further, there is evidence of a growth in appreciation of what the Jesuit teachers

do value in regard to the balanced use of material goods.

Another criticism sometimes heard of Jesuit education is their stress of individualism versus social responsibility. Like the previous inquiry, if this indictment were verified there would be gross inconsistency between what the Jesuit teachers officially claim to teach and the values which they actually communicate to their students. The data reveal, however, that students do not believe Jesuit teachers stress individualism as opposed to social responsibility. Again the research hypothesis is verified except at Walsh. It would seem, then that the Jesuits in high school work are potentially strong socializing agents who could well be important forces in educating young men to social responsibility. In a day when student revolt is so emphasized on college campuses, when student disillusionment seems to be exploited by the mass media and students are accused of "dropping out" of society, this potential socializing ability is important in considering the complexus of problems related to social values.

The exception of Walsh to this pattern cannot at this time be fully explained. It seems likely that part of the explanation lies in the lack of familiarity with Jesuit tradition in contrast to the other three schools where Jesuit tradition is much longer established. Jesuit teachers at Walsh report that in the first years of the school there has been a struggle in gaining acceptance by both parents and students of the goals of a college preparatory curriculum and the consequent hard work demanded. Students often express the desire for less work which they believe would be demanded of them at other schools in the area. Beyond this the data

presently available do not provide any more suggestions about Walsh's deviation.

In the age of ecumenism it is important that Jesuit high school students be open to people of other religions. According to the present data Jesuit teachers are reported to help in this area and the research hypothesis is thus verified at all of the schools. Certainly if Jesuit students were not open to people of other religions they would be poorly socialized in our pluralistic society. Social values about the use of material goods and social responsibility, based on the Church's social doctrine, would also be empty and meaningless if they were not accompanied by a true openness and understanding of people who do not share the same religious belief.

Again, Walsh's exception to the general pattern is not easily explained on the basis of the data at hand. As pointed out above, there is the possibility that the presence of more non-Catholics at Walsh than at the other three schools might generate inhibitions toward discussing inter-faith problems. Further, because Walsh is so far removed from an urban complex, the ability for easy exchange between religious groups is difficult and almost prohibitive. Until Walsh becomes better known in the area, inter-faith exchanges, which seem necessary to reinforce the classroom doctrinal expositions, will be more limited than at the other three schools.

The importance of interracial understanding in 1968 needs no justification. Each of the four schools is located in an area which has known serious racial misunderstanding--from the utterly devastating Detroit

riot of 1967, the Cleveland riots of 1966 and 1968, the Toledo skirmishes of 1967, to the Cuyahoga Falls-Akron area civil disorders of 1968--so that racial problems are nothing new to the students in these four schools. It is encouraging, therefore, that the data reveal that the Jesuit staff has helped the students to better interracial understanding and that there is growth in this understanding through the years in high school.

In summary, then, there is only one area of social values in which both the desired positive response and research hypothesis were not evident--the attempt to impart social values in classes other than religion. This is an area which, as pointed out above, deserves further investigation and which bears very heavily on the role of Jesuits as socializing agents.

The guiding theory in this study has been the concept of the Jesuit teachers as agents of secondary socialization. It was felt that the ability of teachers in high school education to perform as significant socializing agents has been both underplayed in the literature and often overlooked in previous sociological research. This research project, then, focused on the Jesuits as socializing agents in the area of social attitudes. It was believed that if it could be demonstrated that the Jesuit teachers did affect students' beliefs on social matters and if those beliefs changed or improved in the course of a student's high school education, the basis for Jesuit high school teachers as socializing agents would be made. From the data as presented in this study, it is apparent that Jesuit teachers did make a significant effort in the areas outlined and that they did have an effect on the students. The actual lived value

system of the high schools studied corresponds to the officially proclaimed philosophy of education as found in both Jesuit documents and in the decrees of Vatican II. Thus the Jesuit instructors have been faithful both to their own tradition and to their obligation as official representatives of the Catholic Church.

The direction of students in terms of social attitudes was seen to be more relevant in that many students did report a conflict between their value systems they held before entering high school and those they encountered in their Jesuit teachers. This demonstrates not only the possibility but the necessity for Jesuits to function in this manner since it can be assumed as demonstrated that they are faithfully teaching the Church's social doctrine.

In conclusion, the present research demonstrates that students in these Jesuit schools would most likely not fit the sketch of either Mary Perkins Ryan who believes that Catholic school products receive a siege mentality nor that of James B. Conant who believes that private education is divisive of the American system. According to the modern criteria of preparing students for the society-at-large into which they must fit, these Jesuit schools are generally doing their job. As far as carrying out the goals of a sectarian institution, at least in the area of social values, these schools can also claim success. Such success, even though limited, does seem to argue to the possibility of parallel effectiveness in other areas vital to the school's defined goals.

APPENDIX I

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The following pages of this appendix contain specimens of the questionnaire administered to the high school students in the four schools participating in the study.

JESUIT EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

High School Students

DIRECTIONS: Please write the appropriate number for your answer in front of the question number. e.g.:
3 92. Ceruleite is:
1. Red
2. Yellow
3. Blue
4. Orange

NOTE: Both Parts A and B begin with #7 for purposes of tabulation and analysis.

PART A

7. What Jesuit high school do you attend?
1. St. Ignatius, Cleveland
2. University of Detroit High
3. St. John's, Toledo
4. Walsh Jesuit High
8. In what year will you graduate?
1. 1968
2. 1969
3. 1970
4. 1971
9. What is your over-all academic average?
1. 95 or above
2. 94-90
3. 89-85
4. 84-80
5. 79-75
6. 74-70
7. 69 or below
8. Don't know
10. What type of elementary schooling did you have?
1. All Catholic
2. Mainly Catholic, some public
3. Half Catholic, half public
4. Mainly public, some Catholic
5. All public
6. Other

11. What is your present religious preference?
1. Catholic
2. Protestant
3. Orthodox
4. Jewish
5. Other
12. To what race do you belong?
1. Caucasian (white)
2. Negro (black)
3. Other
13. Where do you presently live?
1. City proper
2. Suburb
3. Town
4. Rural area
14. Which of the following best describes your father's occupation? (If retired or deceased, what was his usual occupation?)
1. Professional
2. Manager or proprietor of a business employing 25 or more
3. Manager or proprietor of a business employing less than 25
4. Sales or clerical work
5. Skilled craftsman or foreman
6. Service worker for a business or profession
7. Protective service: fire, police, security, armed service
8. Semi-skilled worker or machine operator
9. Unskilled worker or common laborer
10. Other; please specify: _____

* * *

- 15-16. How far did your parents go in their schooling?
1. Eighth grade or less
 2. Some high school
 3. High school graduate
 4. Some education beyond high school
 5. College graduate
 6. Graduate or professional degree beyond Bachelor's

___ 15. How far did your father go in school?

___ 16. How far did your mother go in school?

* * *

___ 17. In what religious tradition were your parents raised?

1. Both Catholic
2. Both non-Catholic
3. Mother Catholic, father non-Catholic
4. Father Catholic, mother non-Catholic

___ 18. What is the present religious preference of your parents?

1. Both Catholics
2. Both non-Catholics
3. Mother Catholic, father non-Catholic
4. Father Catholic, mother non-Catholic

NOW HERE ARE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE.

___ 19. When the decision was made that you would come to a Jesuit high school, whose decision was it?

1. Parental decision only
2. Agreement of myself and my parents
3. Mainly my own idea
4. Other

* * *

20-21. The following are often given as reasons for choosing a high school:

1. School's prestige in the city
2. Academic program
3. Athletic reputation
4. Friends were going there
5. It was a family tradition
6. It was a Catholic school
7. It was a Jesuit school
8. Its convenient location
9. Other
10. I did not concur in the choice

___ 20. Which one of the above reasons primarily motivated your choice?

___ 21. Which one of the above reasons secondarily motivated your choice?

* * *

___ 22. If you were starting over in high school and you had your own free choice, which one of the following would you choose?

1. The same school
2. Another Jesuit high school
3. Another boys' Catholic high school
4. A Catholic coed high school
5. A private high school
6. A public high school

___ 23. How would you rank the overall education offered to you at your high school so far?

1. Excellent
2. Above average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Poor

___ 24. In what context have you experienced your most personally profitable contact with Jesuits?

1. In the classroom
2. Athletics
3. Non-athletic extracurriculars
4. Confessional
5. Counseling
6. Casual contacts
7. Disciplinary situations
8. Administration
9. Other

25. In what context have you experienced your least personally profitable contact with Jesuits?

1. In the classroom
2. Athletics
3. Non-athletic extracurriculars
4. Confessional
5. Counseling
6. Casual contacts
7. Disciplinary situations
8. Administration
9. Other

26. Which is most interesting to you of the following subjects at this school?

1. Modern language
2. Social studies, history
3. Classical languages
4. Religion
5. Mathematics
6. English
7. Speech
8. Science

27. In which of the following subjects have you had the most interesting teachers?

1. Modern language
2. Social studies, history
3. Classical languages
4. Religion
5. Mathematics
6. English
7. Speech
8. Science

28. Has the sex education given at your school been appropriate to your needs?

1. Very appropriate
2. Somewhat
3. Slightly
4. Not at all

29. Do your Jesuit instructors encourage you to think creatively or to express your own ideas on a topic?

1. Most do
2. Some
3. A few
4. One or two
5. Not one does

30. To what extent do the Jesuits help you to think for yourself?

1. Much
2. Some
3. Little
4. Not at all

31. Do you think that the Jesuits are challenging you to reach your academic potential?

1. Most
2. Some
3. A few
4. One or two
5. None at all

32. Are you active in any extracurricular organizations or projects?

1. One activity
2. Two or three
3. More than three
4. None

33. Do you think that Jesuit moderators of extracurricular activities promote leadership in students as much as possible?

1. Most do
2. Some
3. Few
4. One or two
5. Not one does
6. I don't know

34. Do you think the student government has the chance to exercise as much responsibility as it should have?

1. Yes
2. No
3. No opinion

IF YOUR PRESENT RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE IS NOT CATHOLIC, PLEASE SKIP TO Question 49.

- 35. What do you think of the idea of obligatory Mass attendance at least once a week in high school?
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. No opinion
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree

- 36. Does the liturgy as practiced at your high school help you better to understand the recent liturgical changes?
 1. Much
 2. Some
 3. Little
 4. Not at all

- 37. Do you feel the content of your high school religion courses in terms of topics is relevant to you as an adolescent?
 1. Yes
 2. No

- 38. How would you rate your high school religion classes in terms of the quality of the teaching?
 1. Excellent
 2. Good
 3. Fair
 4. Poor

- 39. How much attention have the teachings of the Church regarding social responsibility received in your religion classes?
 1. Much
 2. Some
 3. Little
 4. No attention

- 40. How much attention have the teachings of the Church regarding social responsibility received in your other classes?
 1. Much
 2. Some
 3. Little
 4. No attention

- 41. Do Jesuits encourage you by example, counseling, or in any other way, to frequent the Sacraments?
 1. Frequently
 2. Occasionally
 3. Never

- 42. In the last year how often have you received Holy Communion?
 1. Almost daily
 2. Weekly
 3. About once a month
 4. Once or twice a year
 5. Did not receive within the last year

- 43. Have the yearly retreats been occasions of strong religious motivation?
 1. Every time
 2. Twice
 3. Once
 4. Never

- 44. Do you belong to any extracurricular group at school which focuses on religious or apostolic activities?
 1. Yes
 2. No

* * *

- 45-47. How do Jesuits in your school generally present the topics below to you? Please answer according to this scale:
 1. They encourage positive thinking
 2. They haven't talked about this subject
 3. They have been overly critical
 4. I have no recollection

- 45. Diocesan officials
- 46. Other Catholic high schools
- 47. Parish life

48. Do local pastors and religious have the responsibility to make known to their people the social teachings of the Church?
1. Yes
 2. No

* * *

NOW SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR CONTACTS WITH JESUITS

49. How many Jesuits would you say have taught you so far?
1. 1-3
 2. 4-6
 3. 7-9
 4. 10-12
 5. 13-15
 6. More than 15

50. Have you had:
1. Too many Jesuit teachers
 2. Enough Jesuit teachers
 3. Too few Jesuit teachers

51. Up to this point has any Jesuit here shown a personal interest in you?
1. Yes
 2. No

52. Would you say that the priests, the scholastics, or the lay teachers at your high school have the best understanding of youth and its problems?
1. Lay teachers
 2. Scholastics
 3. Priests
 4. Lay teachers and scholastics
 5. Lay teachers and priests
 6. Scholastics and priests
 7. All three equally
 8. No opinion

53. Do you think the Jesuits at your school make themselves available for personal counseling?
1. All
 2. Most
 3. Some
 4. Few
 5. One or two
 6. None

54. Is there a specific Jesuit to whom you would go to discuss a personal problem?
1. Yes
 2. No

55. Is the counseling in regard to choosing and pursuing courses in high school sufficient?
1. Yes
 2. No

56. Do you feel free to discuss non-academic matters with Jesuits outside of class time?
1. Most
 2. Some
 3. Few
 4. One or two
 5. None

57. How would you evaluate casual contacts with most Jesuits at your high school, e.g., passing them in the corridor, meeting them outside of the school?
1. They are friendly and easy to meet
 2. They are unfriendly
 3. They are unaware of people around them

58. Do you think that the lay faculty and the Jesuits share the same goals for their students?
1. There is thorough agreement
 2. For the most part
 3. Only in a few matters
 4. No agreement
 5. Don't know

59. Do you think a Jesuit in a class other than religion has a unique contribution to make, that is, is he any different from a layman in that class?
1. Yes
 2. No

If he is different, please explain: _____

60. Do you feel that a brief prayer before class is a desirable religious practice?

1. Yes
2. No

61. Do Jesuits begin class with a prayer?

1. All
2. Many
3. Some
4. Few
5. One or two
6. None at all

62. Do you feel your Jesuit teachers are competent in their assigned teaching jobs (outside of religion courses, which you have been asked about above)?

1. All
2. Most
3. Some
4. Few
5. One or two
6. None at all

63. How often are most Jesuits prepared for class?

1. Always
2. Usually
3. Sometimes
4. Rarely
5. Never

64. How many Jesuits allow you to disagree with them in class?

1. Almost all
2. Most
3. Some
4. Few
5. One or two
6. None at all

65. Do Jesuits show favoritism toward some students?

1. Much
2. Some
3. Little
4. None at all

66. Do you think you have ever been treated unfairly by a Jesuit at your school?

1. By three or more
2. By two
3. By one
4. By none

PART B

IF YOUR RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE IS NOT CATHOLIC,
PLEASE SKIP TO Question 13.

7. Has any Jesuit in your high school ever suggested that you consider a religious or priestly vocation?
1. Yes
 2. No
8. Have you ever considered becoming a Jesuit priest?
1. Never thought of it
 2. I considered it, but not seriously
 3. I considered it seriously
 4. I am still thinking seriously of it
9. Have you ever considered becoming a Jesuit brother?
1. Never thought of it
 2. I considered it, but not seriously
 3. I considered it seriously
 4. I am still thinking seriously of it
10. Are you aware that some Jesuits at your school are Brothers?
1. Yes
 2. No
11. How much contact have you had with Jesuit brothers?
1. Much
 2. Some
 3. Little
 4. No contact
12. Do the Jesuits you know at this school appear to be spiritual men?
1. Almost all
 2. Most
 3. Some
 4. Few
 5. One or two
 6. None
13. Do you get the impression that the Jesuits in your school are happy in their life?
1. Almost all
 2. Most
 3. Some
 4. Few
 5. One or two
 6. None
14. Do you find that Jesuits are critical about the administration's policies in your school?
1. Almost all
 2. Most
 3. Some
 4. Few
 5. One or two
 6. None
15. Do you find most Jesuits to be neat in appearance?
1. Always
 2. Usually
 3. Sometimes
 4. Rarely
 5. Never
16. Some have said that Jesuits eat and drink too well. Others disagree. Do you think that this is so at your high school?
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. No opinion
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
17. Have you been scandalized by any Jesuit's behavior?
1. Frequently
 2. Once or twice
 3. On several occasions
 4. No

HERE ARE A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT DISCIPLINE AND LEISURE TIME.

18. At your high school, do you think there should be:
1. More discipline
 2. Less discipline
 3. About the same amount of discipline
19. Do you think that most Jesuits are willing to give reasons for any school rules or regulations?
1. Yes
 2. No
20. In their dealings with you, how many Jesuits show respect for you as a person?
1. Almost all
 2. Most
 3. Some
 4. Few
 5. One or two
 6. None
21. If you have had business with the principal, do you feel he respected you as a person?
1. Always
 2. Usually
 3. Sometimes
 4. Rarely
 5. Never
 6. No personal contact with him
22. If you have had business with the assistant principal, do you feel that he respected you as a person?
1. Always
 2. Usually
 3. Sometimes
 4. Rarely
 5. Never
 6. No personal contact with him

23. During this calendar year, how often have you seen other boys in your class use crib notes, copy or help someone else out during an exam or test?
1. Almost every time
 2. Often
 3. More than once or twice
 4. Once or twice
 5. Never
24. To what extent do you think there is a "drinking problem" among the boys of your own age at this school?
1. Fairly widespread
 2. A problem with many
 3. A problem with some
 4. Not much of a problem
 5. No problem at all here
25. During this calendar year, how often have you seen any of your classmates reading obviously "sexy" or "girlie" magazines?
1. Often
 2. Several times
 3. Once or twice
 4. Never
26. Have Jesuits helped you to use your leisure time (not time required for studying) profitably rather than wastefully?
1. Much
 2. Some
 3. Little
 4. Not at all

NOW WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT SOCIAL VALUES AND ATTITUDES.

27. Do you feel that the Jesuits try to communicate to you a set of Christian social values?
1. Much
 2. Some
 3. Little
 4. Not at all

28. If the Jesuits have made an effort to communicate these social values to you, were these values in conflict with those you brought with you to high school?
1. Much
 2. Some
 3. Little
 4. Not at all
 5. Jesuits made no effort
29. Some have said that Jesuits in high schools emphasize too much the goal of material success. Others disagree. How do you feel about this?
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. No opinion
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
30. Do you know of any teachers or students here who are active in apostolic work of a social nature?
1. Yes
 2. No
31. Have you been invited to assist in some kind of community or social action work by any Jesuit in high school?
1. Yes
 2. No
32. In the course of a conversation have you ever risked your reputation or popularity by defending a member of a minority group?
1. Yes
 2. No
33. Some people believe that traditional Jesuit education has been very individualistic in its orientation, i.e., it has not emphasized social responsibility. Others disagree. How do you feel about this?
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. No opinion
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
34. Do you have any personal friend who is a Negro?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Does not apply, I am a Negro
35. Do you have a personal friend who belongs to a Christian denomination other than Catholic?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Does not apply, I am a non-Catholic Christian
36. Do you have a personal friend who is a Jew?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Does not apply, I am a Jew
37. How many of the Jesuits you know have shown interest in the social and political problems of the day?
1. Most
 2. Some
 3. Few
 4. One or two
 5. None at all
38. Has any Jesuit at your school promoted your interest in local government?
1. Yes
 2. No
39. Do you think that you, as a citizen, will be able to influence the policies of the federal government?
1. Much
 2. Some
 3. Little
 4. Not at all

* * *

- 40-43. Here are some statements which some people make. What do you think of them? Please respond according to the following scale:
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. No opinion
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree

40. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.

41. People who get ahead in this world usually have to do something dishonest.

42. It's better to ignore present day evils than to go out on a limb to fight them.

43. Nowadays you have to look out for yourself first, rather than worry about others.

* * *

THE FOLLOWING SECTION IS CONCERNED WITH CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

- 44-55. Here are more statements which people make. What do you think of them? Please respond according to the following scale:
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. No opinion
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree

44. Each country should be willing to give up some of its power so that the United Nations could do a better job.

45. The United States should help the poorer nations develop economically.

46. The classification of "conscientious objector" should be continued in our present draft laws.

47. If a man is willing to work, it is now possible for any healthy American man to earn a living wage.

48. Under certain circumstances, the federal government does have a moral responsibility for health care.

49. Dissenters are given too much freedom to express their views in this country.

50. Books written by Communists should not be permitted in public libraries.

51. White people have a moral right to live in an all-white neighborhood if they want to, and Negroes should respect that right.

52. Negroes would be satisfied, if it were not for a few people who stir up trouble.

53. Jews have too much power in the United States.

54. Under some circumstances, working men have a duty to join a union.

55. The power of labor unions today is too great, a threat to our country's welfare.

* * *

56. Do you think Jesuits foster anti-Semitic feelings in your school?

1. Most
2. Some
3. Few
4. One or two
5. None at all

57. Have Jesuits tried to help you develop better understanding regarding people of other religions?
1. Often
 2. Sometimes
 3. Rarely
 4. Never
 5. Does not apply, I am not a Catholic
58. Have Jesuits tried to help you develop better understanding regarding people of other races?
1. Often
 2. Sometimes
 3. Rarely
 4. Never
59. Do you think the Jesuits should be more active in working directly with the poor?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Don't know
60. How would you react if the Jesuits would decide to assign fewer men to their high schools in order to do other work?
1. Very favorably
 2. Favorably
 3. Neutral
 4. Unfavorably
 5. Very unfavorably
61. What one apostolic work, in your estimation should the Jesuits drop which they are presently engaged in? (Apostolic works in which at least one area Jesuit is engaged: universities; high schools; parishes; retreat houses; missions in India, Nepal, and South America; office for Apostleship of Prayer; hospital chaplains; teaching in non-Jesuit universities, writing for publication, promotion of audio-visual media.) Please explain.
62. What one apostolic work, in your estimation, should the Jesuits undertake which they are not presently engaged in? Please explain.
63. Comment, if you wish, on any matter that you think should have been included or expanded in the questionnaire.

Thank you.

APPENDIX II

INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS

The following pages of this appendix contain a specimen of the instructions given to the teachers who proctored the students answering the questionnaire used in this research project.

JESUIT RESEARCH - DETROIT PROVINCE

Jesuit Effectiveness Survey, 1967-68

Dear Teacher:

Thank you for allowing us to use some of your class time for the portion of the Jesuit Effectiveness Survey which is directed to high school students. May we ask your cooperation now in helping to convince your students of the importance of what they are being asked to do during this period. To help everyone understand fairly well what this is about, please read the following paragraphs to your students:

During this period we are asking your cooperation in a very important project undertaken by the Jesuits of the Detroit Province. We would appreciate your responding as carefully as you can to the questionnaire you are about to receive. It is in no sense a test or examination that will affect your standing in this school. In fact, we do not want you to put your name on this questionnaire. We want you to feel as free as possible to give candid answers according to the way you see things.

The subject of this questionnaire is Jesuit effectiveness. You will be asked to give your impressions of the Jesuits you have known so far. Many questions will concern your attitudes and opinions on various subjects that are of importance to us. Even the relatively few questions about your parents are intended to help us interpret your answers to other questions. Every question that you will read has been carefully written and revised with the help of many people, including some high school students like yourselves. We sincerely hope that you will take this task seriously, even if you should come to some questions whose usefulness you don't understand. If you do not take it seriously, we would all be wasting our time. If you do give us your honest answers, then you will be greatly helping the Jesuits of the Detroit Province to make some important decisions in the future.

Now the teacher will distribute the questionnaires to you. Almost all questions have multiple choice answers. Most of you will be able to complete these in 20-25 minutes. If necessary, more time will be given. If you are a freshman or have just transferred to this school this year, you may skip certain numbers which the teacher will write on the board, unless you feel that you are sufficiently acquainted with the Jesuits at this school to answer them. Thank you again for your help.

To the teacher: Please distribute the questionnaires now. You might suggest that those who finish early simply take out a book to read until all until all have finished. Please collect the completed questionnaires all at once in such a way that no one feels that the anonymity of his answers is being threatened. The following page contains some answers to questions that might be asked about interpretation. Thank you.

Questions that may be skipped by freshmen and students who have transferred from another school this year:

Part A, #'s 24-34, 43-47, 52-54, 58-59, 62-64.

Part B, #'s 14-17, 19-20, 23-29, 33, 37-39, 56-59.

Here are some interpretations which students may ask for:

Part A.

#10. A private, non-Catholic elementary school would be classified as "Other."

#'s 11, 18. "Religious preference" is a standard way of asking this question. It prescinds from the question of whether a Protestant is a member of a particular congregation or whether a Catholic is in good standing or practices his faith.

#13. "City proper" means the central city in a standard metropolitan area of 50,000 population or more; e.g., Detroit, Cleveland, Toledo, Akron.

"Town" is separate from such a metropolitan area.

#14. The first answer that applies should be used; e.g., a "sales manager" is classified as "manager."

"Manager" includes all forms of supervision above foreman.

"Service worker" includes such occupations as "TV repairman,"

"IBM programmer, etc.

In case of doubt, answer "Other" and specify.

Part B.

#17. "Scandalized" means being a witness to words or conduct which you feel to have been morally wrong or contrary to an article of Catholic faith.

#24. "Drinking problem" means excessive drinking or in forbidden places or circumstances. It does not refer to drinking alcoholic beverages in moderation at home or in the company of responsible adults.

#30. "Apostolic work of a social nature" means being a witness of Christ through service to others. It does not include the promotion of private devotions.

#56. "Anti-Semitic" means against Jews.

Thanks again. God bless you.

Paul H. Besanceney S.J.

Paul H. Besanceney, S.J.

Province Coordinator

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Abbott, Walter M., S.J. (ed). The Documents of Vatican II, New York: America Press, 1966.
- Allport, Gordon W. Study of Values. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1960.
- Bendix, Reinhard and Lipset, Seymour Martin (eds.) Class, Status and Power. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953.
- Berger, Peter L., and Luckmann, Thomas. The Social Reconstruction of Reality. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1966.
- Bernard, Sister M. The Compatibility of Catholic Schools and Democratic Standards. Washington: Catholic University Press, 1948.
- Brookover, Wilbur B. A Sociology of Education. New York: American Book Company, 1966.
- Broom, Leonard and Selznick, Philip. Sociology. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1963.
- The Christian School -- A New View. Washington: Jesuit Educational Association, 1966.
- Coleman, James S. The Adolescent Society. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.
- Cooley, Charles Horton. Social Organization. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.
- Copley, Frank O. The American High School and the Talented Student. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1961.
- Crow, Lester and Crow, Alice. Adolescent Development and Adjustment. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Documents of the Thirty-First General Congregation. Woodstock, Maryland: Woodstock College Press, 1967.

- Dohohue, John W., S.J. Jesuit Education. New York: Fordham University Press, 1963.
- Elkin, Frederick. The Child and Society. New York: Random House, 1960.
- Fichter, Joseph H., S.J. Parochial School. Notre Dame: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1958.
- , Send Us a Boy . . . Get Back a Man. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge Center for Social Studies, 1966.
- , Sociology. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Flanagan, John C., Davis, Frederick B., Darly, John T., and others. The American High-School Student. Technical Report to the United States Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 635. Pittsburgh: Project TALENT Office, University of Pittsburgh, 1964.
- Gerth, Hans and Mills, C. Wright. Character and Social Structure. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1954.
- Ginzberg, Eli (ed.) Values and Ideals of American Youth. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.
- Goode, William J. The Family. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Gordon, Calvin Wayne. The Social System of the High School. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.
- Gottlieb, David and Ramsey, Charles. The American Adolescent. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1964.
- Greeley, Andrew M., and Rossi, Peter H. The Education of Catholic Americans. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.
- Grinder, Robert E. (ed.) Studies in Adolescence. New York, Macmillan, 1963.
- Havighurst, Robert J., and Neugarten, Bernice L. Society and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1959.
- Hollingshead, August B. Elmtown's Youth. New York: John Wiley, 1949.
- Jersild, Arthur T. The Psychology of Adolescence. New York: Macmillan, 1957.
- Link, Mark E., S.J. Adolescence is a Bridge. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1967.

- McCluskey, Neil G., S.J. Catholic Education in America: A Documentary History. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.
- , The Catholic Viewpoint on Education. Garden City, New York: Hanover House, 1959.
- Mayer, Martin. The Schools. New York: Harper, 1961.
- Mead, George Herbert. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Mercer, Blaine E., and Carr, Edwin R. Education and the Social Order. New York: Rinehart, 1957.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1949.
- , Broox, Leonard, and Cottrell, L.S., Jr. (eds.) Sociology Today. New York: Basic Books, 1959.
- Moran, Gabriel, F.S.C. Catechesis of Revelation. New York: Herder, 1966.
- Neuwein, Reginald A. (ed.) Catholic Schools in Action. Notre Dame: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.
- Parsons, Talcott (ed.) Theories of Society II. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.
- , and Bales, Robert F. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.
- Peck, Robert F. and Havighurst, Robert J. The Psychology of Character Development. New York: Wiley, 1960.
- Potter, David M. People of Plenty. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Reed, Lorenzo K., S.J. (ed.). Teaching in Jesuit High Schools. New York: Jesuit Educational Association, 1957.
- Riesman, David, Denney, Reuel, and Glazer, Nathan. The Lonely Crowd. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.
- Ryan, Mary Perkins. Are Parochial Schools the Answer? New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo. The American School. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1967.

Shibutani, Tamotsu. Society and Personality. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1967.

Williams, Robin H., Jr. American Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952.

Winch, Robert F., and others. Selected Studies in Marriage and the Family. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

ARTICLES

Allport, Gordon W. "Values and Our Youth," in Robert E. Grinder (ed.) Studies in Adolescence, New York: Macmillan, 1963. 17-27.

Arkin, Henry D. "Moral Philosophy and Education" in Israel Schaeffer (ed.) Philosophy of Education, New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1958. 64-70.

Bressler, H. and Westoff, C.F. "Catholic Education, Economic Values and Achievement," American Journal of Sociology, LXIX (November, 1963), 225-233.

Callahan, Daniel. "The Schools," Commonweal, LXXXI (January 8, 1965), 473-476.

———. "Parochial Education," Commentary, XLVIII (January, 1967), 81-83.

Cross, Robert D. "The Greeley-Rossi Report," Commonweal, LXXXIV (September 16, 1966), 577-579.

Erskine, Hazel. "The Polls: Race Relations," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXVI (Spring, 1962), 137-148.

Farrell, Allan P. "Readers' Survey of the Quarterly," Jesuit Educational Quarterly, VI (March, 1944), 222-231.

Fichter, Joseph H., S.J. "Catholics and High School," America, CVII (September 15, 1962), 718-721.

Fellding, I. "Proposal for the Empirical Study of Values," American Sociological Review, XXX (April, 1965), 223-233.

Greeley, Andrew and Rossi, Peter. "The effects of Catholic Education," Part I, The Critic, XXII (December, 1963-January, 1964), 34-38.

----- Part II, (October-November, 1964), 49-52.

----- Part III, (February-March, 1965), 57-62.

Havighurst, Robert J. "How the Moral Life is Formed," Religious Education, LVII (November-December, 1962), 432-433.

Kagan, Henry Enoch. "Teaching Values to our Children," in Eli Ginzberg (ed.) Values and Ideals of American Youth, New York: Columbia University Press, 1961. 252-270.

King, James A. "Guidance in the Jesuit High School," Jesuit Educational Quarterly, V (June, 1942), 83-88.

Kohn, Melvin L. "Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships," American Journal of Sociology, LXVIII (January, 1963), 471-480.

Schroth, Raymond A. ". . . And Get Back a Man," America, CXV (October 1, 1966), 382-384.

Tyler, Ralph W. "What Should High Schools Accomplish?" The PTA Magazine, LIX (November, 1964), 22-27.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Cannon, Thomas M., S.J. "J.E.A. Survey of Jesuit High School Students Detroit Province Comparative Report." Detroit, 1966. (Mimeographed.)

Greeley, Andrew M. "The Problem of Jesuit Education," paper presented at meeting of Jesuit Educational Association. Chicago, 1966. (Mimeographed.)

Harvanek, Robert F., S.J. "The Profile of the Ideal Jesuit High School Graduate." Los Angeles, 1966. (Mimeographed.)

Janssens, John B., S.J. "On the Significance of Our High Schools." Galloro, Italy, October, 1962. (Mimeographed.)

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by John F. Libens, S.J. has been read and approved by the director of the thesis. Furthermore, the final copies have been examined by the director and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Nov. 11, 1968
Date

Thos. Cannon, S.J.
Signature of Adviser
per Ross P. Schery