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PREFACE

An Institute in Guidance in Socio-Economic Problems was conducted during the summer of nineteen hundred and fifty three at John Carroll University in Cleveland, Ohio. This Institute, believed to be the first of its kind in the country, was a unique partnership between education and industry designed to couple social and economic theory received in the classroom with the practical applications seen in plant tours. The administrators of the university assigned the planning and operation of the institute to the sociology department with Reverend Joseph J. Henninger, S.J., named as director. Doctor Joseph E. Bender, another member of the department was assigned to prepare an outline of the text. The writer's assignment was arrangement of field trips, luncheons, contact with the speakers for luncheons and field trips and to act as liaison between the institute and other divisions of the university. The writer lectured twice to the members of the institute, once in an opening lecture and once in summary. Each lecture, luncheon and field trip was attended by the writer, a running record kept and contact maintained between the university and the cooperating companies during the term of the institute.

Chapter three is based primarily on the results of two
surveys, one conducted by The Public Opinion Index for Industry, Opinion Research Corporation, Princeton, New Jersey, and a personal survey by the writer. Two indices of the Opinion Research Corporation are used, first, *An Evaluation of the John Carroll University Institute in Socio-Economic Problems*, and second, *Company-Educator Seminars*. The latter is a survey of eleven, company-sponsored, summer programs, one of which was the John Carroll program. This survey shows what the former one indicates in comparison with the other ten programs. However, the Carroll program and one other are the only ones whose participants were high school teachers. The remaining programs were designed for teachers on the college level.

Materials contained in these indices are marked by the Research Corporation, "Confidential-Not for publication...for use of clients only." However special permission has been granted the writer to use some of this material for part of the content of this thesis. The permission follows:

John Carroll University has requested permission to borrow 46 survey questionnaires for more detailed study, with the possibility of utilizing the survey material as a basis for a student research project.

Opinion Research Corporation has granted this permission, and will forward the questionnaire at the completion of our study.

In order to fulfill our guarantee of respondent anonymity, however, background information that might identify indi-
individual respondents will be deleted from the questionnaires.*
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In nineteen hundred and fifty, during an informal discussion, a small group of business men suggested to The Very Reverend Frederick E. Welfle, S.J., President of John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio, the possibility of mutual assistance between industry and the university. It was in this suggestion that the germ idea of an Institute in Socio-Economic problems was conceived. At first the idea seemed to have great potentialities, however the chasm between potency and actuality proved to be a most difficult hurdle. John Carroll University is one of twenty seven institutions of higher learning operated by the Jesuit Fathers in the United States. In these universities is found a unique system of education based on scholastic philosophy. It was because of the history and fame of this type of education that Cleveland industry believed John Carroll University had something special to offer.

The concept of a cooperative endeavor by industry and a Catholic university was indeed attractive. However, in later discussions it became apparent that presenting a program agreeable to both groups would not be an easy task. A presentation was pre-
pared and offered to the interested industrial group. From that point on the idea began to weaken. Various reasons precipitated the downfall of the initial efforts; first, the program was too pretentious, secondly, an adequate text book could not be obtained and finally, personnel to prepare a suitable text book were not available. Conferences and discussions continued throughout the following year in attempts to overcome the above obstacles. In December of nineteen hundred and fifty two, an experimental edition of a new text book titled, Democratic Living, was published by the Loyola University Press, Chicago, Illinois. This book was carefully studied by Reverend Edward C. McCue, S.J., Vice-President and Dean of John Carroll University. In view of the fact that the book was a composite work of four outstanding Jesuit scholars in socio-economic problems, Father McCue believed that here at last was an answer to one of the major problems in presenting a workable program.

The task of planning and operating the program was offered to the Sociology Department, which is under the direction of Reverend Joseph J. Henninger, S.J. Activity began at once, tentative programs were drawn, daily conferences were held and counsel sought from all possible areas. Gradually a program evolved and a presentation was made to the interested industrial groups. Mr. Thomas F. Dolan, President of the Dobeckmun Company, and Mr. Edward Bauerfine, Director of Public Relations of Republic
Steel Corporation, approved the presentation. Within a few months seven Cleveland industrial and commercial firms had indicated their willingness to participate in the underwriting of the program. Cooperation came from Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Clevite Corporation, Higbee Company, Republic Steel Corporation, Sears Roebuck Company, Sherwin Williams Company and Thompson Products Corporation. The venture was named John Carroll University's Guidance Institute in Socio-Economic Problems.

Time proved to be a most important element since the program was destined to begin June sixteenth, nineteen hundred and fifty three. Preparations of brochures for potential students as well as arrangements for weekly luncheons, field trips, and transportation were planned. Due to the excellent cooperation from the men in industry, from the administrators of the university and other departments in the college of Arts and Science, the institute became a reality on the date planned. Thus from informal discussions to specifics, to selection of textbook material, to definite plans on lectures and field trips, thence to minor details, until at last the operation swung into actuality.

Aims. This paper is intended to present a systematic analysis of the planning and operation of a Guidance Institute in socio-economic problems sponsored by Cleveland industry and business and John Carroll University. Following this analysis an evaluation of the results of the institute will be made. The
basis for the study consists of two surveys, one by the Opinion Research Corporation of America and the other, a personal survey by the writer. It is hoped that the paper will clearly demonstrate that certain desirable values can be achieved from the successful planning and operation of such an institute by industry and education. Further, recommendations will be made concerning the importance and necessity for continuance of such programs in the future. Finally as an overall aim, proof will be given that such an endeavor is worthwhile, that it can be accomplished and to point the way for similar programs.

Ten other cooperative programs among industrial and educational institutions were carried on simultaneously with this program. In order to indicate the trend of such endeavors, a comparative outline of the ten similar programs is therefore included in appendix I. The unique feature of the Carroll program was that it was especially designed for Catholic high school teachers, counselors and principals.

CHAPTER II

PLANNING AND OPERATION

After the Sociology Department received the directive from the University administration to conduct its Institute in Socio-Economic Problems, the first steps were the preparation of the brochure on the selection of fellows, the making of a budget, acquisition of lecturers, and publicity. This entailed trips by one or more of the department members to Boston, New York, St. Louis and Milwaukee.

Objectives. Objectives of the program were to provide Catholic school teachers with a practical knowledge of working conditions in the plants where many of their students will eventually go to work; to give teachers a clearer picture of Christian principles of behavior as related to actual recruitment, employment practices and human relationships in American industry today.

Scope. The program covered five weeks of intensive work covering three types of activity: study of Christian socio-economic problems, field trips to study employee relations and informal meetings with executives. The study of Christian socio-economic problems was conducted by four outstanding Jesuit sociologists and economists. These four men delivered a series of
twenty lectures focusing on Christian socio-economic principles and their relationship to the American social-economic system. During the field trips, participants visited nine different Cleveland companies to investigate job opportunities, wage rates, working conditions and labor-management relations. Teachers toured plant facilities and met and talked with top executives and personnel officers, and, in some instances union representatives. Weekly luncheons with Cleveland executives permitted informal discussion usually centering on the student guidance interests of participating teachers.

Admission Requirements. The institute was open to teachers who satisfied the following prerequisites: (1) professional preparation for high school teaching; (2) classroom experience; (3) permission of the director of the graduate division. Attendance was limited to fifty selected fellows.

Scholarships. Fifty all expense scholarships were contributed by seven leading Cleveland businesses and industries, viz., the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., the Higbee Co., the Republic Steel Corp., Sears Roebuck & Co., the Sherwin Williams Co., Thompson Products Inc., and the Clevite Corp. Each scholarship was worth $145 to the student. Items of expense covered by each grant are shown in Table I.
### TABLE I

**SCHOLARSHIP EXPENSE BREAKDOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration fee</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship grant</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily transportation</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals at the University</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class notes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class materials</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$145.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each student received fifty-eight dollars for the scholarship grant to cover living expenses and eleven dollars for daily transportation to John Carroll University. These funds were given to the student in cash.

**Administration.** Administrative officers of the John Carroll Institute were as follows: The Very Reverend Frederick E. Welfle, S.J., Ph.D., President of John Carroll University; Reverend Edward C. McCue, S.J., Ph.D., Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Vice-President of the University; Reverend Henry F. Birkenhauer, S.J., Ph.D., Director of the Graduate Division; Reverend Joseph J. Henninger, S.J., A.M., Director of the
Sociology Department, Director of the Summer Institute; Joseph E. Bender, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Sociology, Assistant Director of the Summer Institute; John J. Connelly, A.M., Assistant Professor of Sociology, Assistant Director of the Summer Institute.

Faculty. Four visiting lecturers were the faculty members of the institute. The four professors are members of the Institute of Social Order at St. Louis University, each, an expert in one of the socio-economic fields and a co-author of the test used. The four include: Reverend Philip S. Land, S.J., Ph.D. of St. Louis whose special field is economics; Reverend Mortimer H. Gavin, S.J., Ph.D. of Boston and St. Louis, a specialist in labor relations; Reverend John L. Thomas, S.J., Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, a recognized authority in family relations and in human relations industry; and Reverend Leo C. Brown, S.J., Ph.D. who studied at Harvard University, a specialist in industrial relations and a well known arbitrator.

Students. It was decided by the university, together with business, that the fellows were to be teachers in Catholic secondary schools in the Cleveland area. The reason for this decision was to give these teachers an opportunity to reach in high school those who go directly into local industry. A majority of the pupils of the high schools in Cleveland and environs become workers in industry immediately upon graduation. Student
distributions in age, classification and degree are shown in Table II.

### TABLE II

**STUDENT DISTRIBUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>under 30</td>
<td>priests 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>brothers 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Litt.</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>laymen 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.E.</td>
<td>over 50</td>
<td>sisters 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>laywomen 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.T.B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These teachers have close contact with many students. They listed a total of 8,545 students in their last year's classes, or an average of 186 per teacher. Findings concerning these pupils are given in Table III.

2 The above Table was compiled by the writer from information secured through a questionnaire.
### TABLE III
PROPORTION OF PUPILS IN SCHOOLS
OF
INSTITUTE MEMBERS 1952-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Number enrolled in institute member schools</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>11,721</td>
<td>6,240</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>11,165</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie, Pa.</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, R.I.</td>
<td>9,003</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indicated number of students shown in Table III were in schools of the diocese and in schools where institute fellows taught. Of the 16,469 enrolled in all the schools, 8,546, or 52 per cent of the total, were actually taught by institute members during the year.

---

3 Data for this Table were gathered by the writer through questionnaire and other sources.
Publicity. Publicity called for brochures being sent to the participating businesses and also to the groups from whom the students were to be selected, containing criteria for selection and restrictions. Various publicity channels carried the news of the institute. The public press gave advance notices and weekly descriptions of the program as it progressed including general news coverage and statements made by both lecturers and executives. One of the lecturers was interviewed by news commentator Dorothy Fuldheim on her television program. Diocesan publications throughout the country gave extensive coverage and wire services, chiefly that of the King Features Syndicate, reproduced pictures for national printing.

The following is one of the editorials which appeared in the local press.

Seven of Cleveland's major industrial and commercial concerns are joining with John Carroll University in a significant marriage of the working world with the teaching profession. This program is designed to sharpen the secondary school teacher's understanding of American business, its recruitment of personnel, employment practices and human relationships. Business and industry too often are remote from classroom theory. Through twice weekly plant inspection tours and discussions and luncheons with industrial leaders, the teachers cannot but broaden the conceptions of that seventy per cent of high school graduates who do not go on to college, but are responsible for operation of the nation's industrial plants and businesses. 4

4 Cleveland News, Carroll and Industry Co-ordinate Views, June 11, 1953, editorial.
Registration. Student candidates were directed to register for Education 240, Guidance in Socio-Economic Problems and were to receive graduate credit for three semester hours. These credits when received could be used towards a graduate program at John Carroll University or transferred to another graduate school. Of some sixty-five applicants forty-seven scholarships were awarded by the graduate division. A major reason for not awarding the full fifty scholarships was a lack of acceptable academic qualification on the part of the balance of the applicants.

Classroom Lectures. John Carroll University's Institute in Socio-Economic Problems commenced on Wednesday, June sixteenth, nineteen hundred and fifty three. Members of the institute were welcomed by the Director and the writer at nine forty on the morning of the opening session. Content, finances, procedures and requirements were explained. Textbooks, class materials and monies were distributed. The remainder of the period was used in discussion of such matters as housing facilities, transportation and recreational facilities which would be available through the university and outside agencies in the Cleveland area.

On Thursday morning the first formal lecture, titled, Historical Growth and Development of Industry in the United States, was delivered by Reverend Joseph J. Henninger, S.J., Director of the Institute. On the following day this writer lectured on the
import and meaning of the two papal encyclicals, *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*.

Reverend Philip S. Land, S.J., was the first of the four guest lecturers of the institute. Father Land's general topic may be described as *Principles of Organization* and included the following subject matter:

6-21-54 The Catholic Approach to Social Problems The Meaning of Economics
6-22-54 The Conditions of Economy Society and the Person
6-23-54 The Goals of a Good Economic System Private Property
6-24-54 Distribution of the National Income Wage Justice
6-25-54 Warring Camps or Cooperating Partners Economic Communities

Lecture periods were ninety minutes in duration of which approximately twenty minutes were devoted to discussion and question period.

Reverend Mortimer H. Gavin, S.J., the second guest lecturer, had as a general topic, *Labor-Management Relations*, which included the following subject matter:

6-28-54 The Work Force
6-29-54 Attitudes and Perspectives An Historical Briefing
6-30-54 The Social Backgrounds of Unionism The Growth of Unionism in America
During the third week of the institute Reverend John L. Thomas, S.J., gave the lectures, his general topic being, **Social Security**, including the following subjects:

- **7-5-53** Economic Insecurity and the Welfare State
- **7-6-53** Unemployment Insurance
  - Old-Age and Survivors Insurance
- **7-7-53** Public Assistance and Children's Services
  - Workman's Compensation
- **7-8-53** Health Insurance
  - Who are the Needy
- **7-9-53** The Welfare State
  - The Welfare Functions of the State

Following Father Thomas was Reverend Leo C. Brown, S.J., whose general topic was **Special Problems**, and included the following:

- **7-12-53** The National Labor Relations Board
- **7-13-53** The Taft-Hartley Act
- **7-14-53** Arbitration, Conciliation, Mediation

On the following day of the above week, the Director of the Institute offered a summary of the course including a statistical survey of job opportunities existing at that time in the greater Cleveland area. During the class period on the next day this writer offered a general discussion period for one half of the
period. The balance of this period was devoted to the questionnaire designed by the writer and upon which many of the conclusions and findings of this paper are founded. On Monday, July nineteen, nineteen hundred and fifty three, the final class period was given to the Opinion Research Corporation, Princeton, New Jersey, in order to conduct a survey of the course for industry. On the following day the members of the institute took the required examination for the course.

Field Trips. In order to meet the objective of practicality, eight field trips were planned for the members of the institute. Therefore field trips were scheduled on four Tuesdays and four Thursdays. A chartered bus left the university on these days at one o'clock in the afternoon bearing the members to the particular industry or business to be visited and returned to the campus at five o'clock in the evening. The companies were asked; to conduct a tour through their plant or offices; to inform the students about job opportunities; to explain qualifications the company requires in workers, and to present problems peculiar to the management of business and industry. Also the cooperating companies were asked to distribute to class members, annual reports, charts and pamphlets which they have printed for their employees, so that the teacher-student will be better able to guide their high school students. Table IV presents a list of the industries and businesses visited by the group and the particular area of interest.
### TABLE IV

**FIELD TRIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-22-53</td>
<td>Republic Steel Corp.</td>
<td>Office work and machines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-24-53</td>
<td>Higbee Company</td>
<td>Retailing operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-29-53</td>
<td>Thompson Products</td>
<td>Machine specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1-53</td>
<td>General Electric</td>
<td>Manufacturing of Lamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-6-53</td>
<td>Ohio State Employment</td>
<td>Government Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-53</td>
<td>Sherwin Williams Co.</td>
<td>Manufacturing of paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-13-53</td>
<td>Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.</td>
<td>Public Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-15-53</td>
<td>Republic Strip Mill</td>
<td>Production of steel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional field trip was scheduled to the Chevrolet plant of the General Motors Corporation in Cleveland on July sixteenth. This was a voluntary trip for the students however the great majority of them attended.

The planning of the field trips involved numerous conferences with company executives concerning routing through the plants and offices, appointment of appropriate guides, timing of the tours, and finally areas of discussion by company representatives following the visits through the plants.

Table V gives the list of topics drawn up by the Di-
rectors of the Institute for discussion by company executives. Most of the personnel managers and other executives participating in the discussion periods adhered closely to the requested areas of discussion.

TABLE V
DISCUSSION AREAS BY PLANT PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Opportunities</th>
<th>In-training and Out-training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Qualifications</td>
<td>Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Scales</td>
<td>Unionization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Problems of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>Recreational Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Briefing on Field Trips. Prior to each field trip at the close of the morning lecture, the writer briefed the students on the nature and function of the business or industry to be visited that day. In the majority of cases valuable information was gained for these briefing sessions during the initial planning conferences with company executives. Specific aspects were noted for student attention, particularly potential problem areas in various types of jobs.

Student Conferences. Conference periods with the visiting lecturers were scheduled daily following the classroom period until noontime, and by appointment on Mondays and Fridays from one thirty until four in the afternoon. Appointments with the Directors of the Institute for students whose guidance interests
lay outside the industries scheduled for visitation were arranged.

Luncheons. On four consecutive Wednesdays during the institute, a luncheon was held in the main dining hall at the university. The purpose of these luncheons was to provide the student with an opportunity to meet with an industrial executive and discuss informally mutual problems. At each luncheon excepting the last a brief talk was presented by a selected representative of one of the cooperating companies. The Very Reverend Frederick E. Welfle, S.J., President of John Carroll University, gave the final discourse at the last luncheon.

Requirements. Students of the institute were required to write a report on one field trip. Since eight regularly scheduled plant visits were made, the class was divided into seven groups of six students and one group of five. Each group was then assigned to a particular field trip for their individual reports. As the reports were completed by the students, members of the Sociology Department amalgamated the several reports for each field trip into one comprehensive report which was then mimeographed and returned to the entire class. Other requirements included regular attendance at lectures and field trips, and a passing grade in the comprehensive final examination.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

This chapter is concerned with the results of the two surveys made of the Guidance Institute at John Carroll University. The writer's questionnaire consisted of two series of six questions, the first series dealing with the classroom lectures while the second dealt with field trips and executives presentations. Four copies of the questionnaire were given to the students, one for each phase of the program, thereby allowing an analysis of each phase by the individual student. One question on overall appraisal was also included, seeking personal reactions to the program as a whole. All forty seven members of the institute participated in this survey.

Opinion Research Corporation of America, Princeton, New Jersey, requested permission from John Carroll University to test the effectiveness of the institute. This permission was granted and on one of the closing days of the program a representative of Opinion Research Corporation administered a questionnaire to the members. This survey sought primarily to gain an overall appraisal of the program and also to demonstrate areas of strength and weakness within general features of the program. Participating in this
survey were forty six members of the institute. Copies of the writer's questionnaire and that of the Opinion Research Corporation may be found in appendices II and III, respectively.

Institute Survey. Following is a statistical analysis of the program based on the writer's survey. With the exception of the last question, which was a request for overall appraisal of the program, the responses to each question asked have been tabulated. The first six tables refer to classroom lectures and the last five to field trips and executive discussions.

**TABLE VI**

**WAS THE MATERIAL COVERED IN THE CLASSROOM LECTURES INTERESTING TO YOU?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Very Much So</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>33*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that 100% found material interesting.*
### TABLE VII
WILL THE MATERIAL COVERED IN THE CLASSROOM LECTURES BE OF USE TO YOU IN YOUR WORK?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Very Much So.</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VIII
HOW WELL DID THE LECTURERS COVER THEIR MATERIAL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>Quite Well</th>
<th>Not Well</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that Phase III consistently scores highest*
TABLE IX

DO YOU THINK THAT THE LECTURERS ALLOWED ENOUGH TIME FOR QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE X

WERE YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED SATISFACTORILY?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>183*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that better than ninety seven per cent believed their questions were answered satisfactorily.
TABLE XI

DO YOU THINK THAT NOW YOU ARE BETTER ABLE TO READ ON THESE TOPICS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>Moderately Better</th>
<th>No Better</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plant Visits and Executive Talks.

TABLE XII

WERE THEY INTERESTING TO YOU?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Very Much So</th>
<th>Moderately So</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note the appeal of Phase II on this aspect of program.
TABLE XIII
WERE THEY WORTH THE TIME THAT WAS SPENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Very Much So</th>
<th>Moderately So</th>
<th>Questionable</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 188, 138, 36, 12, 2

TABLE XIV
CAN YOU USE THIS EXPERIENCE AND INFORMATION IN YOUR WORK?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Very Much So</th>
<th>Moderately So</th>
<th>Questionable</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 188, 107, 67, 10, 5
### TABLE XV

**DO YOU HAVE A BETTER INSIGHT INTO INDUSTRY AND BUSINESS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>Moderately So</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>188</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XVI

**DID COMPANY REPRESENTATIVES GIVE FRANK AND OPEN EXPLANATIONS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Very Much So</th>
<th>Moderately So</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>188</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final question on the survey administered by the writer requesting a general appraisal by the student-teacher of the entire program, demonstrated unanimous approval.

Two Surveys Compared. Results of the student-teacher reaction to the program as a whole shown by the writer's study compare very closely with the results obtained by Opinion Research Corporation in its survey, as may be seen by the following:

Teachers are unanimous in their endorsement of the John Carroll University Program. On three tests of overall reaction to the program, there is not a single dissenting voice.

Taking all things together, would you say your impression (of the program) is favorable or unfavorable?

Favorable, say all 46

Do you think companies should be encouraged to sponsor more programs of this kind or not?

Yes, say all 46

Would you personally recommend this program to interested colleagues of yours or wouldn't you?

Yes, say all 465

Criticisms and Suggestions. From the above replies one might be inclined to infer that the program as a whole was near perfection. However, although the overall reactions of the group were most favorable, many justifiable criticisms and constructive suggestions were offered concerning various aspects of the program.

In the comparative analysis between the phases it was noted that the clear, factual lecture was most stimulating. The lecturer's poise and delivery greatly influenced the participant's attitude towards his respective phase of the institute. Also in the comparative analysis could be seen just which of the executives were thought to be most fair-minded and also most cordial to the group. The Tapco Division of Thompson Products Inc. repeatedly came in for most favorable comment because they gave their union president a chance to talk, a prominent place on their program and invited him to the dinner which the company sponsored at their plant for the entire group.

Constructive criticisms include; more time for questions both after formal classroom lectures and after talks by executives during the tours; a more specific briefing before each trip to increase significance of plant organization or machinery; no hedging on questions asked of executives. Although there was little of it what there was, was noticed. Typical comments on this type of executive were:

There were a few who side tracked questions. I debate as to whether they didn't know the answers or didn't care to discuss the questions.

Some executives brought out only the good. They should tell where they fail at times, how they are trying to solve their problems. We'll respect them for it. 6

Opinion Research Survey. Table XVII shows how classroom

6 Ibid., 13, 21.
lectures and plant visits stand out as most valuable when teachers were asked to appraise different aspects of the John Carroll program. From the rating given in the following table it would seem that the great majority of the group found something of value in the entire program.

### TABLE XVII

**STUDENT RATING OF PROGRAM IN TERMS OF PERSONAL VALUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly Valuable</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Only Fair</th>
<th>Not Worth the Time</th>
<th>Other Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Lectures</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to business establishments</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks by executives at plants</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person to person talks with executives</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of employee relations at companies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyzing the above table it appears that the last three items might be considered areas of weakness in the program. Partial explanation might be found in that none of the groups involved had experience with such an undertaking previously.

7 Ibid., 18.
Participants were asked, "When you decided to take part in this program what did you hope to get out of it?" That they visualized the program as an opportunity to broaden their background is evidenced by their replies.

**TABLE XVIII**

**STUDENT EXPECTATIONS**

| Assistance in Vocational Guidance: "Material to be helpful in student guidance... see what industry expects of students... it's hard to prepare students without first-hand knowledge... help in guidance of youth under our care." | 22 |
| Knowledge of Labor-Management Problems: "The employer-employer relationships that exist today... better understanding of both management and labor--their aims, methods... more detailed picture of problems facing management and labor." | 11 |
| Aids to Better Teaching: "Technical materials for my classes... learn some things that help with my teaching... some new ideas that I could incorporate in my teaching... inside knowledge of industry for classes." | 9 |
| Better Understanding of Socio-Economic Problems: "I wanted to understand the background of the people I educate and guide... about recessions and the welfare state and business trends." | 9 |
| See How Business Operates: "Familiarity with business and industrial operation... the techniques of modern industry." | 9 |

8 Ibid., 5.
From these most frequently mentioned items, it is obvious that the teachers approached the John Carroll Program with a serious purpose—a genuine desire to learn. Whether or not they were satisfied with what they received from the program is shown by the following sample of answers to the question, "Did you get what you wanted from the program?"

Not only did I get what I expected but much more, viz., the principles of economics put into practice.

I got what I expected from the course only on a much wider scale. I never dreamed that so much could be given in five weeks.

What I got, so far surpasses what I expected that there is no comparison between them.

It far over-reached my highest expectations.

I received more than I expected in that I gained a greater confidence in industry as a whole."\(^9\)

---

9 Ibid.

10 Ibid., 6.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

If companies and universities can provide teachers with experience of lasting value, there is every reason to continue and expand such programs as the John Carroll venture of 1953. The question must be answered, how valuable is it? John Carroll university's endeavor is only one year old, thus it would be difficult to measure its lasting value. Is it rash to assume that it is highly valuable because one hundred per cent of the participants answered, "Yes", to the question, "Do you think companies should be encouraged to sponsor more programs of this kind or not?" Ninety-eight per cent appraised the program as highly valuable or good. One hundred per cent of the students would personally recommend this program to their interested colleagues.11

However, from the experience of the university in this endeavor came some valuable guides for achieving the maximum return for time spent. Virtually every participant had at least one constructive suggestion on how the program could be improved.

The following points are a compilation of the findings from the writer's survey.

(1) Short concise executive talks are preferred to long speeches.

(2) Don't over estimate the knowledge and practical experience of the students, particularly the religious.

(3) Allow more time for study and assimilation.

(4) Increase the amount of participation by union leaders.

(5) A more detailed briefing prior to field trips was requested.

(6) Many felt that the size of the groups during the field trips was too large and recommended an ideal size as being five.

(7) Generally it was suggested that more time be allotted for informal discussion, both after classroom lectures and following plant tours.

(8) In some instances it was felt that top executive participation would have added considerably, especially in response to pertinent questions on company policy.

(9) As a whole the students indicated that in such a concentrated program there should be some social activity.

These nine suggestions by the participants were carefully noted by the directors of the institute. They represent the personal reactions of the students and therefore are worthy of attention and study. Both Cleveland industry and John Carroll university studied the results of the two surveys discussed above and concluded that the initial Guidance Institute in Socio-Economic Problems was worthwhile and should be continued. Therefore, on June 16, 1954, John Carroll University will offer fifty
complete scholarships in An Institute in Industrial Sociology.

Changes in the program point up specifically how results and constructive suggestions from the first Institute were used to draw up plans for the second one. The new schedule is less intense, with a definite part of the classroom program given to discussion periods. Instead of four guest lecturers there will be two, allowing for more detailed coverage in the four week series of lectures. Field trips have been reduced to four instead of eight, one each week. These trips have been more carefully planned with a specific briefing prepared for the student. On Thursday at one o'clock representatives of Cleveland industry and business will meet with the student body for informal discussions, followed by a social period at three o'clock. The weekly luncheon held on Wednesday has been dropped, thus giving the student three afternoons free for research, study and assimilation.

A major problem, although not mentioned in either survey by the participants, was that of appropriate housing facilities. It was learned after the institute had started that many potential students had not accepted the scholarships due to this lack. This problem has now been solved by the use of one of the university dormitories to house the nuns.

If industry and education can continue to work harmoniously in cooperative efforts, the chasm between them will be
bridged. The effects of mutual understanding and cooperation between educators and industry are many. Realization that each is important to the other and basic in society, appears to be foremost. Given the opportunity to meet and discuss problems and to see each other at work, seems to produce an appreciation of what each is attempting to accomplish. This knowledge and understanding will be projected into the educator's classes and in turn influence youth. Industry's future employees are now in school. If they are to prepare adequately for their lives as wage-earners and responsible citizens, they must build a foundation on what they learn in school. That the Guidance Institute in Socio-Economic Problems offered by John Carroll University in 1953 was a suitable means for achieving these results by supplying materials and knowledge to the teachers now appears evident. That Cleveland industry and business are interested in promoting such effects is demonstrated by their continued financial support. It is believed, therefore, that while the immediate effects of such a unique effort at cooperation between two such basic segments of society are highly satisfactory, the potentialities for the future are even greater.
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APPENDIX I

COMPARATIVE OUTLINE OF SIMILAR PROGRAMS

DU PONT EDUCATORS CONFERENCE:

Forty educators from a cross section of the nation's colleges have visited the Du Pont Company for a ten day symposium each year since 1950.

To run up the shade on the Du Pont organization, to let educators see for themselves how Du Pont operates, to learn from first hand contact with top executives the principles that guide and motivate the company, were the objectives of the program. In some twenty separate meetings, executives and staff personnel carry on informal discussions with educators in these subject areas:

a. Development, structure and management of a modern corporation
b. Research, production, and sales.
c. How the corporation is financed
d. Public, employee, and community relations
e. Development of management talent
f. Patterns of growth in the Du Pont Company
g. The problem of bigness and monopoly

Meetings start with a brief talk by a company executive, followed by an open discussion for an hour and a half. Field trips to the company's manufacturing and research facilities supplement the discussions.

Questionnaires were mailed to all participating professors. Among the three in four who returned questionnaires...

97% said "highly valuable" or "good".
INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER PROGRAM FOR UNIVERSITY FACULTY MEMBERS

Ten college professors from a variety of major fields of study spent three weeks visiting at International Harvester. Harvester has sponsored a summer program for educators since 1948.

To give college and university people the opportunity to become better acquainted with the Harvester Company and the basic philosophy that determines how it is operated; to allow management the benefit of educator's observations through discussion of problems involved in design, manufacture, and distribution of the company's products were the objectives.

The program is divided into two equal parts. Half the time is given to informal discussion meetings between educators, top management, and staff personnel of the Harvester Company.

Discussion covers:

a. Organizational structures of the company, its major objectives, and operating problems
b. The engineering and manufacturing process
c. Finance, accounting, and inventory
d. Research, distribution, and sales
e. Public and industrial relations

The remaining one and one half weeks are set aside for each professor to do more intensive investigation into any phase of industrial activity related to his own field of interest. At the end of the program, professors are invited to present their reactions to management, together with any observations about company policy and activities they wish to offer.

In a group meeting at the end of the program, all the participants gave their evaluation of the program ... 90% said "highly valuable" or "good."
CHRYSLER CORPORATION'S PROGRAM FOR ECONOMISTS

A two-week conference for a small group of educators from the fields of economics, industrial relations, and business administration; seventeen attended this year. The Chrysler conference program has been in operation since 1948.

To give men who teach business, economics, and industrial relations a better understanding of these areas of interest through study of Chrysler Corporation's philosophy and practices—by offering educators a bird's eye examination of Chrysler Corporation operations, were the objectives. In conference with almost every Chrysler top executive, as well as with ranking staff personnel, educators are provided with information on how the corporation organizes to meet typical problems in these areas:

a. Manufacturing
b. Industrial relations
c. Sales and distribution
d. Administration

Conferences are supplemented with illustrative tours of the plant, engineering and research facilities. Luncheon and dinner meetings provide additional opportunity for informal discussion between executives and educators.

Opinion Research Corporation mailed questionnaires to all participating professors. Among the two in three who had returned questionnaires by the deadline date... 82% appraised the program as "highly valuable."
THE GENERAL ELECTRIC SCIENCE FELLOWSHIPS FOR TEACHERS

Six weeks study for fifty high school science teachers at Union College in Schenectady. This is the ninth summer General Electric has offered fellowships for high school science teachers. Similar programs for high school mathematics and science teachers are also sponsored by General Electric at three other universities.

Immediate aim is to equip and inspire high school teachers to better teach fundamental principles in the physical sciences and show students the important uses they will have for these principles. Longer-range objective is to attract more of the capable students to careers in engineering and science, or in supporting jobs if they don't attend college. The program is divided between:

a. Classroom study at Union College
b. Lectures by top General Electric scientists
c. Field trips to G.E. plants and research installations

Classroom study under Union College faculty includes refresher and advanced courses in physics taking the program for credit. Lecturers and conferences with General Electric scientists and the field trips are designed to give teachers a clearer understanding of how scientific principles are applied in industry.

Evaluations were obtained at a group meeting from all in attendance... 98% rate the program "highly valuable" or "good."
GENERAL ELECTRIC'S PROFESSORS CONFERENCE

Attending the five-week conference this summer at Schenectady were twenty-five professors in various fields of engineering from colleges that provide many General Electric's technical personnel. General Electric has been holding summer conferences with educators since 1922.

To show engineering teachers how college training is utilized in industry and the latest developments in research and engineering were the objectives, and at the same time, to give a picture of General Electric's needs in the field of technical personnel and the character of General Electric as an employer. For three weeks, the professors are free to investigate whatever phases of General Electric operations are of particular interest to them by visiting virtually any of the company's installations. The other two weeks are spent in group meetings with top executives in engineering and research to discuss company policies on:

a. Recruitment
b. Placement
c. Training of engineers

Meetings between (sic) professors and former students are encouraged to provide first hand information about General Electric as an employer.

At a group meeting with an Index staff member, all in attendance filled out a self-administered questionnaire.

All rated the program "highly valuable" or "good."
GENERAL MOTORS' ENGINEERING EDUCATORS CONFERENCE

Started in 1952, this is a two-week program for engineering professors. Twenty-six attended this year. General Motors also encourages its different divisions to hold similar, shorter conferences in their own areas with educators from local colleges.

Broadly, the objective is to develop a better understanding between industry and educators of each other's problems. More specifically, to provide educators the opportunity for a first hand look at some of the technical problems their engineering students will have to tackle, and thus enable the professors to evaluate college engineering training in relation to industry's needs.

First four days are spent (sic) in meetings and discussions with General Motors top executives and conducted tours of company staff installations to give professors a broad perspective of the General Motors organization, its engineering problems in the field of research, product design and production. Each engineer then leaves for a one-week field trip to one of the company's plants for more intensive study of specific operations of special interest to him. In the final two days of the conference, educators meet by themselves to compare notes on the visits, prepare comments and questions for presentation to General Motors executives.

Mail questionnaires were returned by more than eight in ten of the participating professors. The results...

95% voted the program as "highly valuable" or "good."
THE JERSEY ROUNDTABLE

Each year, approximately twenty professors from different disciplines, the majority from the social sciences, visit Standard Oil Company (N.J.) for a three-day conference. Standard also conducts a separate two-week conference on employee relations for educators specifically interested in that phase of business activity. Similar conferences have been held since 1947.

Objectives are: to provide opportunity, through discussion of the economic and social goals, problems, and relationships of the company, for businessmen and educators to examine one another's ideas and values and thus reach a better mutual understanding. Such discussions, the company feels, are helpful in advancing the common interests of industry, education and the public.

The three days are devoted entirely to informal discussion meetings between the educators and about an equal number of Jersey Standard executives. As a basis for discussion at each of the meetings, executives present brief case studies of some specific experiences of the company. Open discussion then follows about the general considerations, principles, and policies involved. Some discussion topics of the 1953 meeting:

   a. American and European concepts of capitalism as related to employee and plant community services
   b. Building a policy on the importation of oil
   c. Government's place in competitive business abroad

Evaluation by the two in three participants who returned mail questionnaires...
A unanimous vote of "highly valuable" or "good".
COLLEGE-BUSINESS EXCHANGE PROGRAM

This year about 120 educators from 101 colleges and universities were given the opportunity for field study in more than 70 different companies. Six weeks is the suggested period of study. The College-Business Exchange Program was organized by the Foundation for Economic Education in 1948. The Foundation serves as liaison in placing educators in individual companies but exercises no control over study within the company.

The objective is to provide a laboratory for those who wish to make an intensive study of business activities. This gives professors a comprehensive picture of various phases of company operations through on-the-spot study of business methods and operations, and offers businessmen more intimate contact with educators, thus increasing their understanding of the academic mind and classroom procedure.

Each firm selects its own candidates and works out the details of its program, taking into account the special interests of the educators involved. Educators often select some very specific problems or phases of company operations for study, rather than focusing on company activities broadly. Investigation is usually done through interviews with top executives, supervisors and other company personnel. Participating companies encourage completely free inquiry into all phases of their operations.

Questionnaires were mailed to 100 of the participants. Two in three responded. Their reaction,

a. A unanimous vote of "highly valuable" or "good."
REPUBLIC STEEL'S ECONOMICS-ACTION-

Six weeks study at Case Institute for fifty college faculty members from the field of economics. Preference is given to professors who have limited contact with business and industry. This program, now in its second year of operation, is organized and conducted by Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland in cooperation with Republic Steel.

On the spot observation of eighteen companies' operations, to illustrate how underlying economic principles affect business and industry; also to provide teaching economists with the opportunity for meetings and discussions with leading economists and top executives from the business world were the objectives.

Four main phases of study are conducted with Case Institute campus as home base:

a. Lectures by leading economists: Six outstanding economists each spent one week at Case in lectures and discussion with the professors on contemporary economic problems.

b. Field trips to business and industry: As a group, participants make conducted tours of eighteen Cleveland and nearby firms, including Republic Steel--each tour illustrating some specific economic problem.

c. Study of communications techniques: Ten minutes are devoted to study of communications problems in industry, with particular emphasis on company training programs for employees.

Discussions with management: Weekly dinner meetings and panel discussions to provide opportunity for exchange of ideas between educators and the business executives.

Participants filled out a self-administered questionnaire at a group meeting during the last week of the program... 91% appraised the program as "highly valuable" or "good."
SWIFT & COMPANY SUMMER PROGRAMS FOR ECONOMISTS

Swift offers two field study programs for economists: one five week session, one of two weeks. The long program is limited to about eight participants, the shorter program to twelve. Swift has offered summer fellowships to economists since 1948. Usual practice is to hold one long session each summer and two of the shorter ones. Sessions are organized and conducted by the company's economist... a unique feature of the program.

Objectives are: to provide economists the opportunity to see how the competitive system works with specific reference to the meat-packing business; to give an integrated, intimate view of how Swift is organized and how it operates.

The program consists almost entirely of group discussions with officers and department heads. Included as vital part are visits to stockyards, trips through the plant and talks with salesmen. Discussions center on economic questions--basic questions of organization and administration, policy formation, factors determining prices, with particular stress on competition in the meat-packing business. Discussions are informal, with open inquiry into all phases of company operations invited.

Questionnaires were mailed to 41 participants of the shorter program in the years 1949, 1950 and 1951--those still associated with colleges and universities. Among the eight in ten who responded...

All appraised their field study at Swift as "highly valuable" or "good."
APPENDIX II

PERSONAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

I. MATERIAL COVERED: (underline choice)

   a. Was the material covered in the classroom lectures interesting to you?
      very much so somewhat very little

   b. Will the material covered in the classroom lectures be of use to you in your work?
      very much so somewhat very little

   c. How well did the lecturers cover their materials?
      very well quite well not well

   d. Do you think that the lecturers allowed enough time for questions and discussion?
      sufficient moderate insufficient

   e. Were your questions answered satisfactorily?
      yes no other

   f. Do you think that now you are better able to read on these topics?
      much better moderately better slightly better

II. PLANT VISITS AND EXECUTIVE TALKS:

   a. Were they interesting to you?
      very much so moderately so not very

   b. Were they worth the time that was spent?
      very much so moderately so questionable

   c. Can you use this information and experience in your work?
      very much so moderately so questionable
d. Do you have a better insight now of business and industry?
   much better   moderately better   slightly better

e. Did company representatives give frank and open explanations?
   very much so   moderately so   not at all

f. Briefly give your personal reactions to the lectures and tours
APPENDIX III

John Carroll University
Institute in
Socio-Economic Problems

YOUR EVALUATION

This year there are under way a number of programs which seek to build mutual understanding between business and education, and provide business leaders with the opportunity to draw upon the insight of educators.

Whether these programs are moving in the right direction, or whether they are worth holding at all are still largely unanswered questions. The experience and judgment of educators participating in these programs are obviously the best source of information on these points.

Leaders in business and education will utilize the research findings from this and a number of similar programs. Thus your opinions can help determine the future course of programs of this type.

Since we are seeking objective information, please feel free to give us your frank and candid opinions. We prefer that the questionnaire be anonymous, so please do not sign your name.

OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION
Princeton, New Jersey
First a few general questions about John Carroll University's Summer Institute in Socio-Economic Problems.

1. Briefly, what is your overall appraisal of the program?

2. Taking all things together, would you say your impression is favorable or unfavorable?

3. How would you appraise the value of this program to you personally?

4. In what ways has it been of value?

5. Would you personally recommend this program to interested colleagues of yours, or wouldn't you?

6. Why or why not?

7. When you decided to take part in this program what did you hope to get out of it?

8. How did what you actually got from the program differ from what you had expected?

9. What in the program did you find most rewarding? Why?

10. What in the program did you find least rewarding? Why?

11. Has this program given you any ideas on course content and teaching methods which you plan to use?

12. If your answer above is "yes," would you please give some examples?

13. Do you feel that programs of this kind help educators to better understand management and their problems?

14. Would you say that these programs help management to better understand educators and their problems?
15. Do you feel that you came away from this program with a better conception of the way business and industry operates?  

16. If your answer above is "yes," would you please give some specific examples?  

17. Suppose you were put in charge of running a program of this type. What changes would you make from the present program? (Give as many suggestions as you like.)  

Now a few questions about the company executives you met—  

18. What are your main impressions of the company executives you met during the program?  

19. From your experience, would you say the executives were well posted on the subjects you discussed, or not?  

20. Did the executives you talked to give satisfactory answers to your questions, or not?  

21. How about exchanging ideas. Did they try to get your views, or didn't they seem to care about hearing them?  

22. You may not have much opportunity to present your views to business executives. As an educator, what points of view would you like to get across to them?  

23. Would you say the company executives you came in contact with had an adequate sense of social responsibility or did they seem lacking in this?  

24. Would you say they evidenced sufficient concern for welfare of employees?
25. Listed below are some of the features of the program you have just completed. Would you please rate each in terms of its value to you personally?

We would also appreciate any suggestions you may have on how each could be improved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly valuable</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Only fair</th>
<th>Not worth the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The classroom lectures</td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Visits to business and industry establishments</td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Study of employee relations at companies</td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Person-to-person talks with company executives</td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Talks by executives at plant visits</td>
<td>1( )</td>
<td>2( )</td>
<td>3( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

Here are four summary questions:

26. How do you feel about the length of the program overall?
   1( ) IT WAS ABOUT RIGHT
   2( ) TOO LONG
   3( ) TOO SHORT
   COMMENT:

27. From your experience, would you say that the financial arrangements for teachers participating in the programs were satisfactory or not?
   1( ) YES, SATISFACTORY
   2( ) NOT SATISFACTORY
   COMMENT:

28. Do you think companies should be encouraged to sponsor more programs of this kind or not?
   1( ) YES
   2( ) NO

29. Why, or why not?

30. Are there any other points about the program not covered in this questionnaire that you'd like to comment on?