POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION AND RESOCIALIZATION OF AMERICAN YOUTH AND YOUNG ADULTS: THE PROCESS OF LEARNING, UNLEARNING, AND RELEARNING POLITICAL NORMS, VALUES, ATTITUDES, AND BEHAVIORS

by

Rand Leslie Kannenberg

B.A., University of Colorado at Denver, 1982

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Colorado in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts Department of Sociology 1984

Copyright ©1984 by Rand Leslie Kannenberg All rights reserved.
This thesis for the Master of Arts degree by
Rand Leslie Kannenberg
has been approved for the
Department of
Sociology
by

___________________________
Richard H. Ogles

___________________________
Michael S. Cummings

___________________________
Date
Kannenberg, Rand Leslie (M.A., Sociology)

Political Socialization and Resocialization of American Youth and Young Adults: The Process of Learning, Unlearning, and Relearning Political Norms, Values, Attitudes, and Behaviors

Thesis directed by Professor Richard H. Ogles

One of the major aspects of the research was to investigate the relationship between school or level of education (i.e., formal institutions of instruction) and the source of influence on one's political attitudes and behaviors. A basic assumption of the study was that college/university students may be "liberated" from what was previously taught and learned in the family and school as a result of consciousness raising (by way of both theory and practice). Accordingly, a general hypothesis was that college/university students are more likely than high school students to have lower degrees of support for, or conformity to, conventional norms and values as transmitted by parents and teachers. The paper introduces an alternative approach to the topics of political socialization and resocialization - the "interaction" model, which takes into consideration not only environmental circumstances such as new events or experiences, but also character structure (e.g., dogmatism or closed-mindedness). Data was collected
from Wheat Ridge High School, Wheat Ridge, Colorado, and the University of Colorado at Denver.
DEDICATION

To Mom, Dad, and Tricia.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Most of all, I am very grateful for having had the unconditional support of Tricia, my loving wife and partner. She made it possible to continue when it seemed out of the question. In addition, I am indebted to both Dick Ogles and Mike Cummings, who as chair and member of my committee respectively, guided me with great insight as well as patience and trust. Dick, especially has become much more than simply a faculty advisor. He is now a special friend, and stands far above the rest. Finally, I appreciate the cooperation of the students at Wheat Ridge High School and the University of Colorado at Denver who allowed me to study their thoughts and actions about politics and society.
# CONTENTS

## CHAPTER

### I. INTRODUCTION

- Review of the Literature ........................................ 5
- Persistence-Beyond-Childhood Model ................................. 5
- Constant Change Model ............................................. 6
- Generations Model ................................................... 7
- Statement of the Problem ........................................... 15

### II. GATHERING OF THE DATA

- The Instrument ..................................................... 24
- The Pretest ......................................................... 27
- The Sample .......................................................... 28
- University of Colorado at Denver .................................. 28
- Wheat Ridge High School ........................................... 31
- Collection of the Data .............................................. 33

### III. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

- Presentation of the Findings ......................................... 35
- Interpretation of the Findings ....................................... 53

### IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

- ................................................................. 55

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ................................................................. 68
APPENDIX

A. PERSONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION ... 73
B. QUESTIONNAIRE ... 84
C. LETTER FROM CAROLYN H. SIMMONS ... 90
D. HUMAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE REVIEW ... 91
E. LETTER TO CAROL A. WILSON ... 93
F. MEMO REGARDING KANNENBERG'S SURVEY ... 94
G. LETTER TO UCD INSTRUCTORS ... 95
H. SCHEDULING FORM ... 96
I. THANK YOU LETTER TO WRHS AND UCD FACULTY ... 97
### TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>Source of greatest influence on present political attitudes and behaviors by school (condensed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>Source of greatest influence on present political attitudes and behaviors by school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>Degree of change in personal political attitudes and behaviors by school (condensed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Degree of change in personal political attitudes and behaviors by school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Answer to question, &quot;Does college provide more or less than the family and secondary schools in terms of different perspectives about government and politics?&quot; by school (condensed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>Answer to question, &quot;Does college provide more or less than the family and secondary schools in terms of different perspectives about government and politics?&quot; by school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>Respondent's and parent(s)' political affiliation, political label and strength, political position, and desired form of societal or political-economic organization by school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>Degree of dogmatism (or closed-mindedness) by school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>Measure of dogmatism by school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10</td>
<td>Political direction of support for person/issue concepts by school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11</td>
<td>Measure of political direction of support for person/issue concepts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURES

FIGURE

1-1  Basic Theoretical Schematic Analysis of the Problem .................................. 23

3-1  C Scale (Closed-Mindedness) ......................................................... 46

3-2  Semantic Differential Scales ......................................................... 47
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study concerns itself with the field of political sociology, especially the area of political socialization and, in particular, the phenomenon of political resocialization. Other topics of discussion include the teaching and learning of rules; the political economy of schooling; schooling as cultural transmission; education, law, and politics; and the contradictions in higher education. Political sociology may be defined as "... the examination of the links between politics and society, between social structures and political structures, and between social behaviour and political behaviour" (Rush and Althoff, 1971:3). This "... definition of political sociology suggests its principal role - to explain the connection between social and political phenomena" (Ibid., 189). Classical social theorists such as Marx, Weber, and Durkheim, all of whom were diversely interested in the questions of
power and authority, heavily influenced the subject. Nonetheless, contemporary political sociology is not necessarily a subfield of either sociology or political science. "A genuine political sociology would be an interdisciplinary hybrid that would 'combine social and political explanatory variables, i.e., the inputs suggested by the sociologist with the inputs suggested by the political scientists'" (Wasburn, 1982:123). As compared to 'the sociology of politics' which is a distinct subfield of sociology alone, political sociology receives contributions of a wide variety from anthropology, economics, history, political science, and sociology.

An alternative "definition," however, might be the political economy of state and society. This would allow for greater discussion of exploitation and class struggle, both of which were emphasized by Marx and others from the conflict perspective. Such a characterization would also provide for an easier analysis of the basic contradictions in our political-economic system.

Scholarly work in the scientific study of political socialization, notably within the discipline of sociology (but in the other social sciences as well), emphasizes "... how group standards are passed on to
individual members" (Dawson and Prewitt, 1969:10). Essentially, "political socialization is a special form of the more general phenomenon of socialization" (Ibid., 15). Stated in more precise terms,

Political socialization refers to the process by which people learn to adapt the norms, values, attitudes, and behaviors accepted and practiced by the ongoing system. Such learning, however, involves much more than the acquisition of the appropriate knowledge of a society's political norms and more than the blind performance of appropriate political acts; it also assumes that the individual internalizes them - that to him [or her] they appear to be right, just and moral. (Sigel and Hoskin, 1977:191)

Social role analysis, as well as the writings of both Cooley and Mead, are prominent in this area.

A more inclusive definition should also address the issue of "consciousness raising." In addition, emphasis must be placed on how and why norms and values change, as well as the forces which underlie this process.

Political resocialization takes place when individuals (children, adolescents, and adults), voluntarily or involuntarily unlearn (i.e., are 'desocialized' by others or themselves) and relearn political norms, values, attitudes, and behaviors in accordance with newly assigned or acquired statuses and roles.

Members of particular social groups or society at large
modify their attitudes and behaviors to fit those of
their reference groups (both in and out-groups), in some
cases for the simple reason of wanting to be accepted by
peers and others (Federico and Schwartz, 1983:335).

In a study that spanned over 20 years, psychologist
T. M. Newcomb found that reference groups can have
a lasting effect on attitudes and beliefs (Newcomb,
1943, 1963). In 1935, Newcomb sent questionnaires
to students at Bennington College who at that time
were typically young women from wealthy north­
eastern families. He found that while first-year
students tended to reflect their families' conser­
vantive political views, juniors and seniors were
much closer in attitudes to their liberal profes­
sors. When Newcomb followed the 1935 students
through their college careers, he found that with
each year their attitudes moved a little further to
the political left. He concluded that conservatism
was 'out' at Bennington in that period: the woman
who expressed liberal ideas was applauded by both
faculty and prestigious older women, so many did.
Interestingly, these women did not revert to their
former views after they graduated. Even after 20
years, their attitudes and beliefs remained the
same. (Ibid.)

One might also conjecture that such changes are
due not only to conformity to a new "reference group"
but that these young women at Bennington probably also
developed some independence of thought and conviction.
That is to say, this kind of process reflects the inter­
action of an individual's personal orientation with new
ideas, values, etc. such that they are not only more
independent from their "families of orientation," but
are also less dependent on the liberal professors for
the further development of their beliefs and values than
they were initially on their parents.

Review of the Literature

With the exception of Newcomb's investigation of reference groups and their influence at the college/university level and a select few other rare projects, research in the field of political socialization is, for the most part, limited to the study of young children and adolescents (Sigel and Hoskin, 1977:259). "Political socialization during adult life has not been the subject of much study..." (Rush and Althoff, 1971:45). Consequently, "there does not exist as yet a theory of adult political socialization, although three different approaches to the topic - three models - can be detected" (Sigel and Hoskin, 1977:261). At extreme ends of the theoretical spectrum are the "persistence-beyond-childhood" and the "constant change" models. An intermediate theoretical position is the "generations" model.

Persistence-Beyond-Childhood Model. The most common assumption stresses the importance of early patterns (Dawson and Prewitt, 1969; Easton and Dennis, 1969; Davies, 1965; Adorno et al., 1950; Stagner, 1954) and suggests "... that attitudes learned early are the most enduring and hence are fair predictors of adult
stances" (Sigel and Hoskin, 1977:262). This approach accentuates the role of parents as political socializing agents. As put forth by Langton (1969:21), the nuclear family in Western society is the first social group to which an individual belongs as well as the first socializing agency in his or her life. Hess and Torney (1967:95-97), state positively that parents participate in the process of political socialization in three ways: first of all, by transmitting political attitudes of the family as well as some differences of opinion to be found about the community in which they live; secondly, by presenting political examples that children may emulate (e.g., party affiliation, voting patterns, etc.); and thirdly, by providing experience in a hierarchic social system (i.e., these familial relationships are later generalized to political objects).

Constant Change Model. "This model . . . while not excluding childhood socialization, argues that adulthood brings the organism into contact with new experiences (new settings, novel events, new responsibilities, changes in biological and social status) which have a powerful socializing impact on the individual" (Sigel and Hoskin, 1977:262). In other words, the knowledge, values and attitudes acquired during childhood and adolescence will be measured against the experience of adult life: they may be rein-
forced, undermined or modified by that experience; to suggest otherwise is to suggest a static political behaviour. If the processes of adult socialization tend to reinforce those of childhood and adolescence, the degree of change may be limited to that of increasing conservatism with age, but where conflict occurs, then radical changes in political behaviour may result: such conflict may have its roots in early political socialization, but it may also be attributable to the experiences of later socialization. (Rush and Althoff, 1917:47)

The family is in no way the sole agent of political socialization. Almond and Verba (1963) found that an important relationship exists between level of education and political attitudes and behaviors. In essence, an increase in the former makes more likely a higher level of awareness regarding, and involvement in, politics and government. A large number of other studies on education and electoral patterns specifically, have found a correlation between these two variables as well. Basically, a college/university graduate is more inclined to vote than someone who terminated schooling at or before the high school level (see Verba, Nie & Kim, 1978).

Generations Model. The generations model stresses external stimuli as the determining factor of influence.

Such an approach accords events and changed settings a significant role in shaping attitudes by specifying that events and experiences will be interpreted differentially among age cohorts who share internal consistency in terms of educational
trends, age at which political events took place, and subsequent peer influence in response to those events (Lane and Sears, 1964; Carlsson and Karlsson, 1970; Inglehart, 1971). (Sigel and Hoskin, 1977:262)

Actually, the generations model appears to be no more than a "specification" of the constant change model. For this reason, a fourth theme should be introduced at this point. It combines both the generations and constant change models and explicitly invokes the phenomenon of interaction between internal and external processes in contrast to simply calling attention to experiences. It must be recognized that people are not automatically influenced by the stimuli in their environment. Instead, it is the manner in which the individual interacts with his or her social and physical space that determines how he or she will interpret the various political events and thus, why attitudes and behaviors may or may not be changed in respect to both direction and content.

As will be discussed at greater length in the pages to follow, American families and schools teach children to respect the President, the Presidency, police officers, and other such symbols or objects of authority. Furthermore, Easton and Dennis (1969) explain the processes of informal or primary political socialization (which takes place in the family and peer
groups without the subject being aware of it) and formal or secondary political socialization (which takes place in school and is obvious to the subject) and the intended outcome of support for the U.S. political system. For the most part, children are successfully trained to be dogmatic or closed-minded if and when a person or issue could in any way be seen as a threat against the political stability of their society.

In order to investigate the influence of closed-mindedness in this study a shortened version of the C Scale for Closed-Mindedness (Cummings, 1974; University of Colorado Attitude Survey, 1976) is used as a "generic" measure of dogmatism. Whereas the F Scale tends to measure right-wing closure and the D Scale tends to measure unconventional closure (both right and left), the C Scale was designed to serve as a reliable and valid measure of the generic phenomenon. Consequently, the C Scale is the first measure of generic dogmatism that is not biased in a particular "political" direction (e.g., in the direction of fascism as is the F Scale, or like the D Scale, towards communism) (Ibid., 44-54). It was also desired to obtain a measure of conservatism as distinct from dogmatism in the above sense. Therefore, the semantic differential (Osgood, et al., 1957) is used in this study as an instrument to
measure conservatism (i.e., support for conventional person and issue concepts). "Because socialization processes favor system-maintaining beliefs and attitudes, the unquestioning citizen is more likely to be dogmatically conservative than dogmatically progressive" (Cummings, 1974:77). However, the relationship between dogmatism and conservatism is not perfect (see Cummings, 1974:77ff).

In addition to the family and school, peer groups play a significant role in socialization. Dawson and Prewitt (1969:130-131), indicate that late adolescent and adult peer group political socialization usually supplements previously formed political orientations for changes in social position. Nevertheless, they also point out that new peer groups (fellow students, workers, and/or neighbors, etc.) may be capable of altering earlier political learning (especially if it was inadequate). However, most of the literature on desocialization and resocialization focuses on youth who grew up in subcultures (or even foreign societies) and as adults had to adapt to the mainstream (see Riley, Foner, Hess & Toby, 1969). Further, the majority of the research in this area concentrates on the negative experiences involved in group-induced desocialization and resocialization (e.g., POW's and "brainwashing;" Schein, 1956; Se-
gal, 1957). Discussion of formal organizations and socialization in the literature is restricted to total institutions such as prisons, mental hospitals, and the military, all of which exercise full control over their members, and is confined to the process of involuntary resocialization (the means of which often involve force).

Carnoy (1974:321), suggests that "formal schooling is part and parcel of the characteristics of capitalist growth." As defined by Dawson and Prewitt (1969:144), "we reserve the word 'schooling' for the more or less conscious attempt by an older generation to instruct the young specifically through a set of institutions set aside for that purpose." The educational system of twentieth-century America is an instrument of the state, designed to maintain and reproduce the dominant norms, values, and social relations clearly reflected by the needs and wants of the owners and managers of capital. Schools perpetuate inequality and injustice amongst workers and poor people. Goffman (1963) talked about how so-called "normals" stigmatize poor individuals and families as "not quite human." Those poverty children who are constantly being labeled as "different" or even "worse" by both peers and teachers (as well as other school officials), are likely
to accept such roles. Moreover, certain children are encouraged to achieve while others are left to fail. "Marxist historians and sociologists today interpret mass schooling (including the early Sunday schools) as an ideological assault on the working class: a massive act of cultural aggression by the capitalist bourgeoisie" (Musgrove, 1979:76).

With few exceptions, all children must attend formal institutions of instruction until a certain age or point in time. In most cases, private schools discriminate against those families which cannot afford the high costs of tuition and fees. Likewise, "at-home" training is reserved for the few parents who have the necessary funds and the required credentials or equivalent coursework completed. Also, the curriculum is usually as restrictive as what is used in the public schools and any alternatives must be approved by at least one bureaucratic agent or agency. Essentially then,

There is only one way to grow up in America if one wants to eat regularly, to be warm, and not to be harassed by the police. For the vast majority there is only one place to go to school, and that place is the same nearly everywhere. There is one city, one mode of production, one road to power. And there is little freedom. (Katz, 1975:3)

Already mentioned was the fact that like the family, the school plays an important role in the pro-
cess of socialization. It is not this function that is being questioned. Instead, the greatest fault of these institutions is that they do not allow a variety of attitudes regarding behavior, and the strict rules of conduct to be found in both the family and school only inhibit the human experience. "As soon as we bring children together in large groups, rules become necessary. . . . And, as we enforce these rules, we are bringing home the messages, 'You should do what I tell you,' or, more generally, 'You should do what people in authority tell you to do'" (Webb, 1981:94). "The beginning school child learns that obedience to authority is as necessary for success as is conquering the new math" (Dawson and Prewitt, 1969:143-144). This plain fact has serious implications. For example, there is evidence that school teachers punish (and reward) their students by improper use of grades. "Some research data indicate that grades are often more closely correlated with students' conformity to classroom behavior standards than to their academic competency" (Boocock, 1980:161).

Because schools promote compliance to rules, creative intelligence and analytical ability, or critical study in general, is seldom encouraged. Even those students who receive high scores on the assessment devices meant to measure both creativity and intelligence
are given little opportunity to develop proficiency in analytical skills. Written and oral expression at the primary/secondary level is almost always censored. Ordinarily, it is not until a bright student enters college that he or she is given at least some freedom to investigate subject matter that may very well deviate from the status quo. Rational thought beyond simple means-end planning or organizational competence is for the most part a newly gained experience for incoming college students, especially those in the arts and humanities and the social sciences. A portrait of a war-torn village or a detailed essay about a revolutionary soldier is rarely observed in the traditional high school classroom where teachers fear being suspended or fired for any controversy whatsoever. A term project in favor of communism is unlikely to be prepared by a student who does not have access to different ideas (e.g., the reading and viewing of certain books and movies is simply prohibited).

The intended structures and functions of educational systems are heavily influenced by the dominant theory of human nature. Hobbes, like many of his fellow political philosophers of early time, felt strongly that without rigorous regulations there would result a so-called "war of all against all." Durkheim, too, had a
"negative" view of human nature. His "... school of thought is suspicious of human freedom, believing that human beings must be protected from their own capacity for evil.... This is a popular belief in America, and it holds that only the restraints of civil society cause bad people to behave like good ones" (Webb, 1981:35-47). However, most if not all social behavior is learned. With this in mind, it is difficult to imagine what would cause a person to be born with either "good" or "bad" behavioral traits. What must be fully realized is that teachers (and parents also) "teach by example," and their behaviors (as well as attitudes, if expressed) are imitated by surrounding children. Accordingly, obedient teachers and obedient parents are more likely to have law-abiding students and children respectively. Likewise, children can be taught how and why to question authority. School boards are well aware of this possibility. Radical teachers at the primary/secondary level are forced to suppress their ideologies, while conventional teachers are encouraged to indoctrinate students into conformist ideologies.

Statement of the Problem

It has already been made clear that liberal arts schooling at the majority of American colleges and universities somewhat promotes free inquiry and indepen-
dent judgment which to some extent delegitimizes the conventional ideologies previously taught and learned in the family and school (primary/secondary level). Simple exposure to U.S. social problems and the many possibilities for social change (reform or revolution) by way of social science coursework taken, attendance at a variety of radical speaker forums and/or campus held rallies, and so forth, is capable in part of destroying the American "mythology" (Bowles and Gintis, 1976). "Academic emancipation" or freedom from the "mainstream ideology" is an indication of a major contradiction (and one that is inherent) in our system of higher education (see Eriksson, 1983). "Durkheim saw education as a social creation, as the means by which a society assured its own continuity by socializing the young in its own image" (Boocock, 1980:279). However, the college/university is far less successful than the primary and secondary schools in reproducing and maintaining conventional norms, values, attitudes and behaviors.

In fact, Bowles and Gintis suggest three goals of schools which go far beyond reproduction of the present system:

1.) the fostering of social equality;
2.) the promotion of the full development of creative potentials in youth; and
3.) the integration of new generations into the social order.¹

They believe that the present system of doing things (i.e., with "class rule" and "material dependency") should be eliminated and replaced by social democracy, a form of societal organization that they feel will fulfill the goals listed above. As expressed by Bowles and Gintis, the weaknesses of capitalism as they apply to education (and vice versa) make evident the importance of immediate reform or revolution in these areas.

It is hoped that sometime in the near future the individual will become the central concern of our schools and educators. Accordingly, instead of modern day preoccupation with coercive cultural transmission, we should dedicate ourselves to freeing children from the rigid norms and values that prohibit them from recognizing their full potential as human beings as well as participating members of social groups and society (i.e., we should be concerned with meeting both the "personalistic" and "collective" needs of human beings; see Ogles, 1982).

¹Bowles and Gintis recognize the importance of noncoercive "cultural transmission" in any society.
American schools are unable to fully encourage creativity, cooperation, and an understanding and appreciation for self and others due to the political-economic system of which they are now a part. However, at the same time, our system of education is unable to completely stifle American youth and young adults because, in part, of our cultural tradition.

State and corporate elites have expressed considerable alarm over the political implications of the growing number of overeducated workers. Judging from the existing literature, overeducated workers can be expected to exhibit higher levels of job dissatisfaction, increased tendencies toward political leftism, greater political alienation, and a weaker allegiance to the dominant achievement ideology than workers with comparable occupations or level of education. (Burris, 1983:454-67)

This is the second part of the contradiction, and it is just the presence of such incongruities which will dialectically lead to social democracy. The teaching and learning of laws and custom will only become a truly democratic process if and when we replace capitalism with social democracy (or socialism).

A basic assumption of this study is that college/university students (in the liberal arts especially) may be "liberated" from what was previously taught and learned in the family and school (i.e., from the ideology in society as transmitted through most families and primary and secondary schools). The area of focus is primarily on the process of unlearning and relearning
political norms, values, attitudes and behaviors with respect to the status and role of college/university student.

A general hypothesis is that high school students are less likely than college/university students to have political attitudes and behaviors different from parent(s). Alternately, college/university students are politically desocialized and resocialized, therefore making them more likely than high school students to have lower degrees of support for, or conformity to, conventional norms and values. It is precisely this phenomenon that indicates a major contradiction in our system of higher education. Whereas the college/university level is meant to reinforce the existing political/economic system, it also encourages independent judgments regarding alternative forms of societal or political-economic organization as well as differing institutions which are more organized to meet human needs and wants than to profit making. In addition, it is assumed that college/university students become more analytical toward the subject matter they study. Related to this conjecture is the possibility of their becoming more progressive, open to or even supportive of radical change (reform or revolution) in society.

The problem also has to do with character
structure (internal composition) and environmental circumstances (external stimuli) related to change (or not) in political attitudes and behaviors. That is, it is assumed that those students who change their political attitudes and behaviors are not as dogmatic as those who do not change, and, furthermore, that those students who do change have a number of outside influences while at the college/university level. Nonetheless, it is hypothesized that the political events and experiences do not influence these students as much as the further development of an ability to analyze those things around them.

Specifically, the six hypotheses of the research are as follows:

1.) The predominant influence on the present political attitudes and behaviors of high school students is from their parents rather than friends, high school teachers, mass media or other influences; in comparison with college students whose parents will have lost their major influence in favor of college teachers and other factors.

2.) The personal political attitudes and behaviors of high school students have changed little or not at all; whereas, college students
have personal political attitudes and behaviors which have already changed (mostly in the liberal/radical direction) somewhat, if not considerably.

3.) High school students are uncertain as to whether college provides more, less, or as much as the family and secondary schools in terms of different perspectives about government and politics; whereas, college students are confident in their opinion that college provides more than the family and secondary schools in terms of "different" (i.e., a wider range of) perspectives about government and politics.

4.) The political affiliations, political labels and strength, political positions, and desired forms of societal or political-economic organization of high school students are much the same as their parents'; however, college students have political affiliations, political labels and strength, political positions, and desired forms of societal or political-economic organization different from (and mostly to the left of) their parents'.

5.) In general, high school students possess higher degrees of dogmatism (or closed-minded-
ness) than do college students, and such dogmatism tends to reinforce conservatism.

6.) High school students regard with favor such conventional person/issue concepts as the FBI, Nuclear Weaponry, and President Reagan, and object to Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., Socialism, and Karl Marx; while on the contrary, college students regard with favor more liberal or radical person/issue concepts such as Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., Socialism, and Karl Marx, and object to the FBI, Nuclear Weaponry, and President Reagan.
Figure 1-1

Basic Theoretical Schematic Analysis of the Problem

A. Causes

1. High School Students
   a.) experiences and events not "different" from family and school
   b.) not politically resocialized

2. College/University Students
   a.) experiences and events "different" from family and school
   b.) politically resocialized

B. Effects

government attitudes and behaviors similar to parent(s) reproduced

ideology in society maintained and analytical ability not well-developed

a high degree of support for or conformity to conventional norms and values reproduced

*(indicators of the contradiction)
CHAPTER II

GATHERING OF THE DATA

The Instrument

It was decided during the earliest stages of the project development that survey research of some type was the appropriate method of data collection. Eventually, this general strategy matured into a specific tactic. A sixty-five item questionnaire, designed uniquely for the particular field study, became the single mechanism for the gathering of the data (see Appendix B).

The instrument was revised a total of three times. The major complaint from thesis committee members around the first draft was length. Therefore, unnecessary or redundant items were either deleted or combined with others of similar intent. Nonetheless, sophisticated techniques such as the C Scale on closed-mindedness, and an evaluative dimension of the semantic differential were considered useful for substantive
reasons and, therefore, were added. It was the second version of the questionnaire which was used for the pretest. Ultimately, wording of specific questions and response categories was improved for the distinct purpose of clarity. In addition, space provided for responses to open-ended questions was increased where needed (see The Pretest).

In accordance with the rules and regulations of the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the Human Rights Research Committee, Graduate School, University of Colorado at Denver, approved the questionnaire under expedited research review. It was subject to the condition that only the "Instructions" be revised. While an informed consent was not required, anonymity was requested by the investigator in order to protect the respondent's right to privacy.

The final version consisted of three parts: "Personal Background Information;" "Personal Political Information;" and "Parent(s)' Political Information." Located between the second and third divisions were the C Scale and semantic differential sections. The purpose of the latter was to measure the meanings that certain ideas had to different people. Respondents were asked
to rate six person/issue concepts (FBI, Martin Luther King, Socialism, Karl Marx, Nuclear Weaponry, and President Reagan) in terms of five seven point descriptive scales with ends of adjectives and their respective antonyms (right-wrong; bad-good; fair-unfair; unjust-just; and positive-negative) (see Appendix B). This one subdivision was discovered to be less difficult for students to comprehend and respond to than originally expected. It is immediately obvious when a respondent misunderstands the written instructions of this section. The answers are either missing altogether or consistently contradictory.

However, an item which called for sexual preference, a topic that is inevitably problematic and was expected to be somewhat sensitive, resulted in an even higher degree of controversy than was predicted. The question, which included the responses of homosexual and bisexual, was not allowed by the principal to appear on the questionnaire distributed to the Wheat Ridge High School students. Despite the fact that it received limited criticism from the respondents during the pretest, the objection on the part of the high school teachers and administration was not anticipated. Nevertheless, at least two of the three thesis committee members were prepared for this kind of objection.
The Pretest

It was desired that the pretest sample be as similar as possible to at least one of the intended final sub-samples. The group involved students from a sociology course at the University of Colorado at Denver. The six participants who volunteered were requested to do so by the instructor (foreign students were excluded) and the administration of the questionnaire was conducted in the same classroom, but in the absence of the instructor. In attendance were three males and three females; three undergraduates and three graduates; three Whites, one Black, and two Hispanic/Chicanos. The mean age was thirty-three-years-old.

The purpose of the single pretest was "... to time the interview, to check the wording and ease of understanding the questions, to spot possible problems of spillover, and to correct these problems at the outset" (Zisk, 1981:104-105). Other objectives included eliminating some questions that simply did not "... discriminate between respondents or, as an alternative, to change the categories..." (Ibid.).

Upon completion of the questionnaire, the pretest respondents were asked if they enjoyed or disliked the experience and if they had any specific questions or comments (Zisk, 1981). The semantic differential sec-
tion was reconstructed (i.e., instructions revised and concepts changed) to a great degree on the basis of input from these participants. It was requested by the participants that an example be given and the too general concepts (business, education, family, government and religion) be replaced with more specific persons and issues.

The Sample

Both Wheat Ridge High School (WRHS) and the University of Colorado at Denver (UCD) were chosen first and foremost for the purpose of convenience. The researcher was a graduate of the former five years previously, and presently is in attendance at the latter. Therefore, the necessary contacts had already been established. Moreover, the primary goal was to minimize all related costs and expenses. Accordingly, the two schools were also selected because they were easily accessible, located within six to eight miles of one another.

University of Colorado at Denver

UCD is one of four campuses in the University of Colorado system. It is an urban, non-residential institution of higher learning, in the downtown area. UCD is one of three institutions on the Auraria Higher
Education Center (AHEC) campus (along with Metropolitan State College of Denver, and Community College of Denver). Students, faculty, and staff commute from the five counties in the greater metropolitan area and elsewhere.

In past years, UCD has maintained the importance of classroom instruction in front of service and research. In addition, it has generally attracted non-traditional students (e.g., older professionals in search of advanced degrees for promotion in rank). However, more emphasis is now being placed on scholarly work, and recent trends (which are reflected in the sample) indicate a greater number of younger students, especially those just graduated from high school.

According to the administration over the past several semesters the age of students at UCD has ranged from sixteen to eighty with the mean being approximately twenty-eight. Fifty-one percent were men and 49.0% women. Thirteen percent were minorities and 1.0% or more were foreign born.

Out of a total number of 10,848 students, and 5,385 full-time equivalent students (FTES), there were 1,513.9 FTES in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS), and 351.3 FTES in the Division of Social Sciences (SS). The simple random sample at UCD was drawn from the population of all SS undergraduate courses
taught on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday (stratified by time slot with the only restriction being one from each period no matter how few or many). It included 182 students from four lower and five upper division day and evening courses representing six different academic departments (Anthropology, Economics, Social Sciences, History, Political Science, and Sociology). Seventy-four percent of the respondents reported that they were full-time students. Thirty percent were business majors, 14% were political science majors, and 13% listed something other than the twenty-three major options in the codebook. In addition, 21.4% were employed full-time; 42.9% part-time; 29.1% unemployed; and 6.6% other.

The mean age was 24.967 (median = 23.300; mode = 19.000; range = 41.000). The breakdown in sex was: 44.5% male; and 55.5% female. There were 83.9% Whites; 2.2% Blacks; 3.3% Hispanic/Chicanos; and 10.6% other. From the same sample, 13.9% described themselves as Christian; 43.6% Catholic; 26.7% Protestant; 2.0% Jewish; 1.0% Mormon; and 12.9% other. In addition, 9.6% considered themselves strongly religious; 46.9% religious; 33.9% neutral or undecided; 7.3% anti-religious; and 2.3% other.

In regards to housing arrangements, 38.1% stated that they lived at home with parent(s); 25.4%
alone or with friend(s); 32.6% with spouse or mate; and 3.9% other. Also, 2.2% reported their SES as lower class; 16.7% working; 70.5% middle (2.2% middle by itself, 10.0% lower middle, 32.2% middle middle, and 26.1% upper middle); 2.8% upper; 3.9% no class; and 3.9% other. Eighty-three percent made it known that they liked school; 2.2% disliked school; 12.1% were neutral on the subject; and 2.7% were conflicted.

Wheat Ridge High School

Wheat Ridge, Colorado, has some features characteristic of a rural community, yet the majority of WRHS students live in areas of Wheat Ridge (as well as the adjacent cities of Lakewood and Golden) which consist of predominantly white, affluent, suburban neighborhoods. Ninety-six percent of the students at WRHS are White. Fifty-one percent are male and 49.0% female.

WRHS (grades ten through twelve) is part of the Jefferson County Public Schools which is considered by many to be one of the finest public school systems in the state and region. The district places great emphasis on academics as well as athletic achievement. It has received nation-wide recognition for its students' performance on the ACT, SAT and other such standardized tests and college entrance exams (WRHS and other Jeffer-
son County students have scored consistently above the national norm). The district has also been ranked nationally in individual and team sports competitions.

Ironically, the WRHS Student Senate had arranged a "Political Awareness Week" to be held during the period of the research. It was organized because, as their elected leaders expressed it, "intelligent voters are the key to the survival of our system of government." Though many of them cancelled at the last minute, invited speakers included the Libertarian candidate for Governor, a Republican State Senator, and an anonymous member of the Democratic Worker's Party. Student attendance at the different sessions was extremely poor, most likely due to the possibility that they did not want to miss out on homework assigned during classes which were still being held.

Out of a total number of 1,393 students, the sample from WRHS included 114 students from six classes - one each of the following fields: business, english, history, humanities, sociology, and spanish. The sample frame consisted of students of faculty members who taught throughout the entire school day. The teachers were chosen on the basis of availability. The principal assisted in the scheduling process.

The mean age of respondents was 16.605 years
(median = 16.571; mode = 16.000; range = 4.000). There were 43.9% males and 56.1% females. The break down by race was 93.0% White; 0.9% Black; 2.6% Hispanic/Chicano; 0.9% Native American; and 2.6% other. In terms of religious preference, 16.9% considered themselves Christian; 38.2% Catholic; 34.8% Protestant; 3.4% Mormon; and 6.7% other. Also, 8.8% described their position as strongly religious; 54.0% religious; 35.4% neutral or undecided; and 1.8% anti-religious. In addition, 1.8% reported their SES as lower class; 3.5% working; 87.6% middle (1.8% middle by itself, 4.4% lower middle, 35.4% middle middle, 46.0% upper middle); 4.4% upper; and 2.7% no class. From the same sample 55.3% made it known that they liked school; 7.9% disliked it; 31.6% were neutral on the subject; and 5.3% conflicted.

Although the two samples are not meant to be generalized to any particular population (e.g., Colorado or U.S. high school or college/university students), at the very least they are clearly representative of their respective institutions.

Collection of the Data

The 296 questionnaires were collected from the two samples within the same week. Distribution at WRHS was completed in one day, whereas the process at UCD required twice that time. The widely used Statistical
Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) allowed for computer processing once the codebook and data file were created. Simple frequency distributions and cross tabulations (i.e., the usual descriptive statistics) were generated for analysis upon completion of the respective programs.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Presentation of the Findings

One of the major aspects of the study was to investigate the association between high school or college and the source of influence on one's political attitudes and behaviors. It was found that a systematic relationship, statistically significant at the 0.0001 level, does exist between the variables school or level of education and source of influence on the subjects in terms of present political attitudes and behaviors. In other words, the probability of obtaining chi-square values of 43.637 and 66.283 or larger with one and five degrees of freedom respectively, is less than one chance in 10,000. With $X^2$ notably larger than the critical region in both cases, the "null hypothesis" of no difference between the two samples was easily rejected. Furthermore, phi and Cramer's V (measures of association for $2 \times 2$ and $2 \times k$ crosstabulation tables in that
order) indicate a significant strength of relationship. With values of $\phi=0.395$ and $V=0.477$, the variables (school and influence) are neither independent (i.e., statistics equal to zero), nor perfectly related (i.e., statistics at the upper limit of unity). Instead, a high degree of association does exist. (It should be noted at this point that $2 \times 2$ tables will always have lower values than $2 \times k$ tables because the differences between observed and expected frequencies are larger in the latter.)

As predicted, the WRHS students reported that parent(s) have been the greatest influence on them in terms of their present political attitudes and behaviors, whereas the UCD students stated that other factors have had a greater affect on them politically. Respondents from both samples ranked friend(s) and media similarly. However, no more than 2.7% of the WRHS students (and a slightly higher 4.4% of the UCD sample) selected secondary teacher(s) as the greatest influence, in comparison with a much larger 20.6% amongst the UCD students who chose college teachers(s) and another 12.8% of the same sample who combined college teacher(s) with a wide variety of other responses (only 1.7% of which included parents).

It was expected that the high school students would report their political attitudes and behaviors as having changed little or not at all, whereas the college
Table 3-1
Source of greatest influence on present political attitudes and behaviors by school (condensed)
(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREATEST INFLUENCE</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=111)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=180)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent(s)</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College teacher(s) and/or other(s)</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.0001
Table 3-2

Source of greatest influence on present political attitudes and behaviors by school
(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREATEST INFLUENCE</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=111)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=180)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent(s)</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend(s)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary teacher(s)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College teacher(s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(s)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.0001
students would suggest that theirs have changed (mostly in the liberal/radical direction) somewhat, if not considerably. This second hypothesis was also supported. The relationship between the variables school or level of education and change in personal political attitudes and behaviors is statistically significant (see Tables 3-3 and 3-4).

Sixty-seven percent of the WRHS students revealed that their personal political attitudes and behaviors have changed little or not at all, while 63.3% of the UCD students disclosed that theirs have changed somewhat, or considerably, over the years. Further, 13.6% of the UCD students expressed the difference in their political attitudes and behaviors as being more liberal or radical (while only 3.6% of the WRHS students used such terminology in the open-ended question to describe themselves.) In contrast, exactly half as many (or 6.8%) of the UCD students specified an increase in conservatism.

In support of the third hypothesis a strong relationship was also found to exist between school or level of education and opinion regarding college. (On the 2 x 4 table, \( X^2 = 99.863, V = 0.587, \) and level of significance = 0.0001.) Amongst the WRHS students, 74.8% noted uncertainty as to whether college provides more, less, or as much as the family and secondary schools in terms of
Table 3-3

Degree of change in personal political attitudes and behaviors by school (condensed)

(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE OF CHANGE</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=112)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or not at all</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat or considerably</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.0001
Table 3-4
Degree of change in personal political attitudes and behaviors by school
(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE OF CHANGE</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=112)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat more conservative</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat more liberal</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat more radical</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat better understanding of politics and government</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat other</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably more conservative</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably more liberal</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably more radical</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably better understanding of politics and government</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably other</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.0001
different perspectives about government and politics. Nonetheless, a surprising 25.2% of the high school students suggested that college provides more than does their own level of education (and/or parents). As was expected from the UCD sample, an overwhelming majority of the students (73.2%) reported that college provides more in terms of different (i.e., a wider range of) perspectives about government and politics than any other factor or influence.

To test hypotheses numbers four through six, the respondents were asked a series of questions, and were expected to react to numerous statements or scales, the scores of which were combined. Students were then grouped according to the different characteristics (see Figures 3-1 and 3-2).

As predicted, 60.2% of the respondents from WRHS stated political affiliations, political labels and strength, political positions, and desired forms of societal or political-economic organization that were identical to their parent(s)' (as the respondents reported them to be). On the other hand, 57.8% of the UCD students surveyed recorded affiliations, labels and strength, positions, and desired forms of organization different than their parent(s)'. The relationship between these two variables is significant at the 0.010 level (see Table 3-7).
Table 3-5

Answer to question, "Does college provide more or less than the family and secondary schools in terms of different perspectives about government and politics?" by school (condensed)

(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=111)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=179)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANSWER</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>Don't know or other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.0001
Table 3-6

Answer to question, "Does college provide more or less than the family and secondary schools in terms of different perspectives about government and politics?" by school

(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=111)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=179)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.0001
Table 3-7

Respondent's and parent(s)' political affiliation, political label and strength, political position, and desired form of societal or political-economic organization by school

(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=108)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=166)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL AFFILIATION, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.010
Figure 3-1

C Scale (Closed-Mindedness)

Looking back over my life, I find that I still have the same basic beliefs I grew up with.

You've pretty much got to go along with the ideas and policies of those who are more knowledgeable than yourself.

I think it's frequently good to change your opinions about things. (Reverse Scored)

It is important for children to learn when to disobey authority. (Reverse Scored)

There is hardly a single important issue on which my beliefs are the only valid ones. (Reverse Scored)

It is best to be wary of an individual who often changes his/her beliefs.

I think it best to maintain my own opinions even though many other people may have a different point of view.

It is necessary to reserve judgment about what is going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.
Figure 3-2
Semantic Differential Scales

Conservative person/issue concepts
FBI
Nuclear Weaponry
President Reagan

Liberal or Radical person/issue concepts
Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.
Socialism
Karl Marx
It was expected that the WRHS students would report high degrees of dogmatism (or closed-mindedness) and regard with favor the conservative person/issue concepts, as compared to the UCD students who would indicate lower degrees of dogmatism and higher degrees of support for the liberal or radical persons and issues. However, the relationship between the variables school or level of education and dogmatism or closed-mindedness is not significant. Nonetheless, the UCD sample is almost evenly distributed amongst the high and low dogmatism categories (43.5% and 42.9% respectively), while 52.2% of the WRHS students could be classified as closed-minded and only 30.1% open-minded.

The final assumption of the study was that high school students are significantly more conservative than college/university students. In support of the FBI, nuclear weaponry, and President Reagan (i.e., conventional concepts) were 36.9% of the WRHS students as compared to 26.3% of those from the UCD sample. An additional 39.6% of those from the WRHS sample and 52.6% of the UCD students indicated favoritism towards Martin Luther King, Socialism, and Karl Marx (i.e., liberal or radical concepts). Exactly half as many (or 26.3%) of the UCD students supported the conservative person/issue concepts or opposed the liberal or radical person/issue
Table 3-8
Degree of dogmatism (or closed-mindedness) by school
(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE OF DOGMATISM</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=113)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.10
Table 3-9
Measure of dogmatism by school

(Reported as a quantitative score: 1 = open-minded; 4 = closed-minded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado at Denver</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat Ridge High School (N=113)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.10
Table 3-10  
Political direction of support for person/issue concepts by school  
(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLITICAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=111)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=171)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/Radical</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.10
Table 3-11

Measure of political direction of support for person/issue concepts

(Reported as a quantitative score: 1 = Liberal/Radical; 6 = Conservative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>MEASURE OF POLITICAL DIRECTION</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=111)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=171)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P=0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
concepts. An almost equal number of students fall within the conservative and liberal or radical categories from the WRHS sample. Nevertheless, the differences are not statistically significant.

**Interpretation of the Findings**

The findings presented above tend to prove the suppositions that the predominant influence on college/university students in terms of political attitudes and behaviors is from college teachers and other factors (rather than parents); college students have personal political attitudes and behaviors which have already changed (mostly in the liberal/radical direction) somewhat or considerably; and college students have political affiliations, political labels and strength, political positions, and desired forms of societal or political-economic organization different than (and mostly to the left of) their parents'. Nonetheless, other results tend to only weakly support the hypotheses of a positive association between the variables school or level of education and dogmatism or closed-mindedness as well as between school or level of education and support for the different person/issue concepts. The data suggest that the change amongst the college/university students may be due to external stimuli instead of internal disposition such as
dogmatism or closed-mindedness, or any permanent element of personality structure. Further, it can be discounted that support for person/issue concepts is a responsible outside factor. This suggests that there may be other environmental causes of the so-called "liberating experience." One possibility is analytical orientation, or more simply, the ability to do analysis (see Ogles, 1983). As was stated earlier, college/university students are encouraged to develop such intellectual skills as empirical inquiry and rational discussion. "... [W]hat liberal education does is to liberate us from prejudice and superstition and teach us to think for ourselves" (Fallon, 1983:2). Furthermore, not only are college students taught how to think but they are also directed towards full comprehension. The power to understand social problems, for example, is a major aspect of creative and intellectual liberation (as will be discussed in the following chapter).
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

It is a common assumption in our country that education is meant to meet the needs and wants of students, their families, and the community at large. However, first and foremost, schooling in the U.S. must reinforce support for or conformity to (i.e., "internalization of") conventional norms and values. "The education we provide for our children reflects the kind of society in which we want to live. If we fail to understand that connection, we fail to appreciate the moral purpose of education" (Webb, 1981:8).

"In a sense, what children learn in a traditional school is political. Submission to authority, abhorrence of deviance, and the like are political" (Carnoy, 1972:226). However, "without experiencing politics, reading about politics does not open up vistas; it merely continues children's old experiences with words, or with other nonreal world experiences" (Ibid., 227). At the primary/secondary level, students are ex-
posed to the theory of democracy by way of textbooks, lectures, and discussion, but they are seldom if ever allowed to put it to practice by having an active role in the decision-making process both in and out of school. Locke would agree that a true understanding of politics requires experience, "... but law is a useful subject to study through reading (Sahakian and Sahakian, 1975:102).

College/university students, especially those who assume full financial responsibility for their own costs and expenses (e.g., room and board, tuition and fees, etc.), gain practical experience by working (for pay) or through an internship (often for academic credit and little if any pay) in an area of special interest. Not only do most college students meet the minimum age requirement for voting and (if male) registration for conscription to military service, but they also have an opportunity to view from a distance, or be a firsthand witness of poverty, discrimination, and other such social problems. No doubt, a residential campus can become a so-called "Ivory Tower," but UCD has a high percentage of its student population which is employed in the community, and of course, everyone lives away from school.

According to Durkheim (1956:79), "It is..."
up to the State to remind the teacher consistently of the ideas, the sentiments that must be impressed upon the child to adjust him [or her] to the milieu in which he [or she] must live." Marx, on the other hand, felt that "Public education by the state is altogether objectionable. . . . Government and church should rather be equally excluded from any influence on the school" (Cosin 1972:171). Nonetheless, the primary objective of American schooling is to successfully transmit culture to the younger members of our society. This is one of the initial ways in which the process of socialization (coercive and noncoercive) takes place.

Among other things, culture supplies us with both written and unwritten rules of conduct. These laws or customs are first introduced to children by parents but also in formal education as early as their first year in school (i.e., in kindergarten, or maybe even in preschool). Before anything else, schools promote conformity to rules and obedience to authority (as well as competition amongst peers). "Their main purpose is to make these children orderly, industrious, law-abiding and respectful of authority" (Katz, 1975:xvi).

It can be said that,

Most citizens acquire their notions of rules, laws, and obedience, and develop strategies for utilizing the law through, an interaction between natural cognitive structures and a host of 'legal' environ-
ments such as the home, school, friendship circle, or court. (Evan, 1980:122)

"Law-studies," "law-focused education," or "law-related education" are different names for the same movement, one which "... emphasizes both the need for and the obligation of American schools to promote law literacy among the nation's school-age youth" (Naylor, 1976:5). Law studies are more commonly known as "citizenship education" and are examples of formal political socialization found in most if not all junior and senior high school social studies courses. Such programs are designed to:

- acquaint students with our present legal system;
- show that the law is a dynamic and changing institution;
- help students realize that they have a role in shaping tomorrow's laws; and
- encourage students to develop positive attitudes toward law and the future. (Franks, 1979:12-13)

It is believed by supporters of this curriculum, that law and future studies provide skills that can be applied to a variety of social, political and economic issues. The American Bar Association's Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship and similar groups, provide teacher-training sessions held at local, state, regional and national meetings of their professional organizations. Information about the legal and
political systems is taught to teachers by lawyers, business and government officials, and other individuals who believe that "those concerned with education must place as much emphasis on teaching legal and moral reasoning skills through law-related education as they currently place on teaching reading, writing, and arithmetic" (Naylor, 1976:25).

Law-related education introduces students to the police, courts, state legislatures, Congress, the executive and judicial branches, as well as the popular subject of "street crime;" however, nothing is done with "white collar crime" (or illegal and immoral activities of business or government). Neither is law (and political-economic power in general) presented as a form of social control over the "lower class."

Unfortunately, there is no discussion of the following hypothesis: Only those people (and segments of society) with political-economic power are represented in the formulation and application of criminal law; and only those people whose interests conflict with the law are likely to be defined as "criminals." (Quinney, 1970:16-19)

No doubt, law is unfairly presented as a common good and service for all. Likewise, politics are said to be fair for everyone. There is little if any opportunity for children to question authority and the system of laws (or the state and government) that they are
taught to obey. Children may only talk of law as it is confined to the present system. Again, one of the primary goals is to "... encourage students to develop positive attitudes toward law and the future."

Under capitalism as we know it today, students at the primary and secondary level will never read more than the simple cases of criminal and civil law. If they were allowed the privilege of free inquiry in this and other areas, then the capitalist ideology in society might not be maintained. Accordingly, it would be virtually impossible to reproduce the political attitudes, behaviors, and social relations similar to parent(s) and/or primary/secondary teacher(s), as well as a high degree of support for or conformity to capitalist norms and values, with an educational system that promoted independent judgment regarding law, politics, and other such societal issues. Finally, it can be said that, "law emerges not only to codify existing customs, morals, or mores, but also to modify the behavior and values presently existing in a particular society" (Evan, 1980:555).

The so-called "process of liberation" that exists at the college/university level in the U.S. is not well understood. Scientific studies in this area are much needed to supplement the literature already in
the fields of political socialization and resocialization (which, as was pointed out earlier, tends to focus on young children).

What else besides freedom from the norms and values of the family and previous education and schooling is there about the college/university experience that is liberating? To begin with, the liberating experiences take place both in and outside of the classroom, and in some cases, off-campus. In general, college students are given greater independence; they are exposed to a wide variety of cultural happenings; and they are inspired to experiment with new ideas and certain activities. More specifically, college students undergo consciousness raising. Real or hypothetical laws are explained to them (i.e., "theory"), and in some cases acted upon (i.e., "practice").

No matter if a student lives at or away from home while attending college, he or she will definitely be expected to assume additional responsibilities. To name a few: registering for classes, buying books, getting to lectures or labs on time. In addition, the majority of college students who in their freshmen and sophomore years occupy dorms or other on-campus residences, have no choice but to rely on themselves for cleaning (and in some cases cooking) as well as doing
the laundry, and so forth. Once these self-maintenance skills become better developed, the student will probably appreciate the independence that comes along with college. But at first it can be a painful transition to make.

Another important aspect of liberation is financial self-ruling or independence of material conditions. Even though most undergraduate students receive some monetary assistance from parents, at the very least they must assume the responsibility of managing what may be limited funds. This by itself can be difficult. In the beginning it is too tempting to do more spending than saving. So-called luxury items far above and beyond those basic or subsistence level goods and services often take precedence over school related needs and wants.

Most youth have well-formulated moral values by the time they begin their college careers. Nonetheless, many are still searching for some kind of truth. For these individuals, conflict with an organized church or religious denomination of earlier affiliation, may arise as a result of being exposed to the discrimination on behalf of society against homosexuals, racial and ethnic minorities, and other populations that are not only "disadvantaged" but also very much exploited. Certain
sects and cults often seem attractive to college students because they claim to offer a real life answer to the problem of alienation from self and others, a common (but usually temporary) result of separation from family and friends.

Colleges and universities are often viewed as havens for unconventional people, both students and faculty alike. Instructors and professors sometimes admit to being gay or lesbian and even encourage students to examine their own innermost feelings. Others talk about the use of drugs and different illicit activities. Casual sex and experimentation with drugs and alcohol are commonplace at some schools.

The college subculture can almost be seen as a simple extension of the more general adolescent subculture. Attitudes and behaviors reflect anti-establishment ideologies and vary from styles of dress and hair, use of language, and music listening habits to large-scale social movements concerned with such issues as nuclear weaponry and equal rights for women and other minorities.

Faculty and students often join efforts and stand side by side at rallies or protests (sometimes against the same college or university at which they teach or attend respectively). However, student govern-
ments or special interest groups do not hesitate to take advantage of grievance procedures and file charges against administrators, faculty, or staff who violate institutional rules or regulations. Therefore, it can be said that confrontation as well as cooperation takes place between these constituencies. The influence of faculty on the political attitudes and behaviors of college students is important as the findings of this study suggest. Nonetheless, Newcomb's longitudinal research data indicate that students may develop an eventual independence from their professors.

Ultimately, the college/university experience may teach students to freely think about and understand the concept of class struggle as well as the theory of fundamental social change. They are also introduced in many courses to some of the basic contradictions to be found in society. All of this constitutes the process of consciousness raising which takes place in the classroom. It is important indeed, but not sufficient for much radical change unless combined with practice.

College students are more likely to support reform or revolution to better meet the needs and wants of their fellow human beings because of what they have done and seen during the four or more years of matriculation. College students have a unique opportunity to
be a part of a mixture of different sexes, ages, races, and to hear people speak about the world in which they live from their own experiences. Furthermore, college students adjust to the norms and values of this, their new social surroundings - the school community.

There are several things that would have made this study stronger. At first it was thought that the college/university sample should have been a more traditional institution of higher learning (e.g., younger students located on a residential campus with dormitories, fraternities, and sororities, or other housing arrangements away from parents), preferably a medium-sized public school with a high rate of out-of-state residents in attendance. However, UCD was actually an advantageous sample after all. It proved to be an interesting choice because of its unique blend of students from diverse social backgrounds. The University of Colorado at Boulder, for example, is more likely to have a higher percentage of both students and faculty from the middle class and far fewer people from the lower class (e.g., divorced, separated, or widowed women with children, who receive state or federal government aid; and other workers and poor people dependent on income maintenance programs). Nonetheless, the high school studied could have easily been more typical
(i.e., chosen from a less affluent neighborhood with some racial variety). In addition, a larger sample could have been designed, possibly with two or more high schools and the same number of colleges and/or universities in order to make the findings of the research more representative of the general population. Finally, a more ideal situation would be to follow the same group of students as they graduate from high school and enter college or graduate from college and enter the work force and take notice of any further changes or to simply compare the differences between college freshmen and seniors. Something else that this writer would definitely do differently if given the opportunity would be to develop instruments that would accurately measure a student's analytical ability, and independent judgment specific to alternative forms of societal or political-economic organization and add them to the questionnaire. Other measures that are needed include support for conventional norms and values and parent(s) political affiliations, political labels and strength, etc. (as opposed to students simply stating their own opinions as to what their parents' political attitudes and behaviors might be).

This study which has invoked the "interaction model," in part, confirms that most children are suc-
cessfully trained to be dogmatic or closed-minded. Related to this finding, students from WRHS were found to be only somewhat more conservative than the UCD students. One possible subject for further research might be how to free children from the rigid norms and values that prohibit them from recognizing their full potential as human beings. Another suggestion is to investigate whether or not the improper use of grades as punishment for "bad" behavior and rewards for "good" behavior is as common in college as it is in high school (or at the primary/secondary level in general).

In addition to learning that college/university students do experience changes but are not necessarily more open-minded and/or progressive than high school students, one other thought about the phenomenon has come to mind. It is the opinion of this writer that change does not have to be in the liberal or radical direction to be considered "liberating." A college student may very well be liberated from what was previously taught in the family and school and become even more conservative than his or her parents and teachers. This is a very real possibility in the fields of business, engineering, or other areas.
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APPENDIX A

PERSONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION
### Table 2-1

Age of respondents by school

(Reported in years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=114)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=182)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16.605</td>
<td>24.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>16.571</td>
<td>23.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>19.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>41.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-2

Sex of respondents by school

(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=114)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=182)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-3

Race of respondents by school

(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=114)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=180)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Chicano</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-4

Religious preference of respondents by school

(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=89)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=101)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-5

Religious position of respondents by school

(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELIGIOUS POSITION</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=113)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Religious</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/Undecided</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-religious</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-6

Living arrangement of respondents by school

(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIVING ARRANGEMENT</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=114)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=181)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone or with friend(s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With spouse or mate</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-7

G.P.A. of respondents by school

(Reported on a 4.0 scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=109)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=166)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.P.A.</td>
<td>Mean 3.26</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median 3.27</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode 3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-8

Educational goal of respondents by school

(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL GOAL</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=112)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=181)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D., M.D., etc.</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-9

Feeling about school by school

(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEELING ABOUT SCHOOL</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=114)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=182)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicted</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-10

**Self-stated S.E.S. of respondents by school**

(Reported in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>Wheat Ridge High School (N=113)</th>
<th>University of Colorado at Denver (N=180)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (combined)</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B  QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

A.) TODAY'S DATE: ______/_____/______

B.) SCHOOL ATTENDING: ____________________________

C.) COURSE NUMBER AND TITLE: ______________

PLEASE NOTE: DO NOT include name, address and/or telephone number here or anywhere else on this questionnaire (anonymity requested in order to protect your own right to privacy!).

INSTRUCTIONS: The following questionnaire is designed to study the process of political resocialization. Student participation is voluntary and the student is free to discontinue participation at any time. Questions may be asked by the student both during and after the research is completed. Upon request, information will be provided regarding group responses only. Questions concerning rights as a subject should be directed to the Human Rights Research Committee, Graduate School, University of Colorado at Denver, 80202. __________ Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

PART ONE: PERSONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.) YOUR AGE: ______.

2.) YOUR SEX: ______.

3.) YOUR RACE:
   a.) White 
   b.) Black
   c.) Hispanic/Chicano
   d.) Native American
   e.) other; please specify;

4.) YOUR U.S. CITIZENSHIP STATUS:
   a.) U.S. Citizen, National or related status 
   b.) Permanent resident or eligible alien 
   c.) neither a.) nor b.)

5.) YOUR STATE OF RESIDENCY:

6.) NUMBER OF YEARS YOU HAVE LIVED IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING:
   a.) rural community 
   b.) large city 
   c.) suburban neighborhood 
   d.) small city or town 
   e.) military base 
   f.) total overseas 

7.) YOUR RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE, IF ANY:
   a.) strongly religious 
   b.) religious 
   c.) neutral or undecided 
   d.) anti-religious

8.) YOUR RELIGIOUS POSITION:
   a.) strong religious 
   b.) religious 
   c.) neutral or undecided 
   d.) anti-religious

9.) YOUR MARITAL STATUS:
   a.) single
   b.) married 
   c.) separated 
   d.) divorced 
   e.) widowed
   f.) living with someone but not legally married

10.) YOUR SEXUAL PREFERENCE:
   a.) heterosexual 
   b.) homosexual 
   c.) bisexual 
   d.) non-sexual

11.) YOUR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS:
   a.) at home with parent(s) 
   b.) on campus 
   c.) off campus alone or with friend(s) 
   d.) off campus with spouse or mate 
   e.) other; please specify;

12.) YOUR EMPLOYMENT STATUS:
   a.) full-time 
   b.) part-time 
   c.) unemployed by choice 
   d.) unable to find suitable employment 
   e.) other; please specify;

13.) YOUR PRESENT OCCUPATION:
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14.) YOUR ATTITUDE ABOUT JOB:
   a.) extremely satisfied
   b.) satisfied
   c.) not satisfied
   d.) extremely dissatisfied
   e.) not applicable

15.) YOUR PERSONAL INCOME (OR FAMILY INCOME IF MARRIED) (LAST YEAR):

16.) WHAT SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF A MEMBER OF?
   a.) lower
   b.) working
   c.) middle; please specify (lower middle, middle middle, upper middle);
   d.) upper
   e.) no class
   f.) other; please specify:

17.) HOW MANY YEARS OF FORMAL EDUCATION HAVE YOU COMPLETED?

18.) YOUR STUDENT STATUS:
   a.) full-time
   b.) part-time

19.) YOUR COLLEGE MAJOR:
   a.)
   b.) not applicable

20.) YOUR EDUCATIONAL GOALS:
   a.) completion of B.A.
   b.) completion of M.A.
   c.) completion of Ph.D., M.D., law or other advanced degree(s)
   d.) none of the above

21.) YOUR HIGH SCHOOL G.P.A. (ON A 4.0 SCALE):

22.) YOUR COLLEGE (WHERE PRESENTLY ATTENDING) G.P.A. (ON A 4.0 SCALE):
   a.)
   b.) not applicable

23.) YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT SCHOOL:
   a.) mostly like
   b.) mostly dislike
   c.) neutral
   d.) conflicted

24.) HAVE YOU EVER BEEN IN THE MILITARY?
   a.) no
   b.) yes (please specify when and where served):

25.) YOUR POLITICAL AFFILIATION:
   a.) Republican
   b.) Democrat
   c.) Independent
   d.) no affiliation
   e.) other; please specify:

26.) YOUR POLITICAL LABEL AND STRENGTH:
   a.) always radical
   b.) mostly radical
   c.) always liberal
   d.) mostly liberal
   e.) always conservative
   f.) mostly conservative
   g.) apolitical
   h.) other; please specify:

27.) YOUR POLITICAL POSITION:
   a.) far right
   b.) right
   c.) middle
   d.) left
   e.) far left
   f.) other; please specify:

28.) YOUR DESIRED FORM OF SOCIETAL OR POLITICAL ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION: (You may answer more than once.)
   a.) capitalism
   b.) socialism
   c.) communism
   d.) anarchism
   e.) pluralism
   f.) authoritarianism
   g.) other; please specify:
29.) DID YOU VOTE IN THE LAST U.S. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?
   a.) yes
   b.) no
   c.) not applicable

30.) DID YOU VOTE IN THE LAST U.S. CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION?
   a.) yes
   b.) no
   c.) not applicable

31.) DID YOU VOTE IN THE LAST STATE ELECTION?
   a.) yes
   b.) no
   c.) not applicable

32.) DID YOU VOTE IN THE LAST LOCAL ELECTION?
   a.) yes
   b.) no
   c.) not applicable

33.) HAVE YOU EVER HELPED WITH A POLITICAL CAMPAIGN AT ANY LEVEL?
   a.) yes
   b.) no

34.) HAVE YOU EVER BELONGED TO A POLITICAL CLUB OR ORGANIZATION OF ANY KIND?
   a.) yes
   b.) no

35.) HAVE YOU EVER ATTENDED A POLITICAL PROTEST OR RALLY OF ANY KIND?
   a.) yes
   b.) no

36.) HOW OFTEN DO YOU READ THE LOCAL NEWSPAPER?
   a.) every day
   b.) often
   c.) seldom
   d.) never

37.) HOW OFTEN DO YOU WATCH THE LOCAL TELEVISION NEWS AND/OR LISTEN TO THE LOCAL RADIO NEWS?
   a.) every day
   b.) often
   c.) seldom
   d.) never

38.) HOW OFTEN DO YOU WATCH THE NATIONAL TELEVISION NEWS AND/OR LISTEN TO THE NATIONAL RADIO NEWS?
   a.) every day
   b.) often
   c.) seldom
   d.) never

39.) DO YOU TALK POLITICS WITH FRIENDS?
   a.) often
   b.) sometimes
   c.) seldom
   d.) never

40.) DO YOU TALK POLITICS WITH FAMILY?
   a.) often
   b.) sometimes
   c.) seldom
   d.) never

41.) IN YOUR OPINION, WHO HAS BEEN THE GREATEST INFLUENCE ON YOU IN TERMS OF YOUR PRESENT POLITICAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS?
   a.) parent(s)
   b.) friend(s)
   c.) secondary school teacher(s)
   d.) college teacher(s)
   e.) media
   f.) other(s); please specify:

42.) HAVE YOUR PERSONAL POLITICAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS CHANGED OVER THE YEARS?
   a.) little or not at all
   b.) somewhat (in what ways?):
   c.) considerably (in what ways?):

43.) IN YOUR OPINION, DOES COLLEGE PROVIDE MORE OR LESS THAN THE FAMILY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN TERMS OF DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE ABOUT GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS?
   a.) more
   b.) less
   c.) same
   d.) don't know
44.) to 51.) INSTRUCTIONS: The purpose of this section is to get your honest opinions regarding the next 8 statements. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Simply indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement in the following manner:

- strongly agree = SA
- agree more than disagree = A
- unsure = U
- disagree more than agree = D
- strongly disagree = SD

44.) LOOKING BACK OVER MY LIFE, I FIND THAT I STILL HAVE THE SAME BASIC BELIEFS I GREW UP WITH. __________

45.) YOU'VE PRETTY MUCH GOT TO GO ALONG WITH THE IDEAS AND POLICIES OF THOSE WHO ARE MORE KNOWLEDGEABLE THAN YOURSELF. __________

46.) I THINK IT'S FREQUENTLY GOOD TO CHANGE YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT THINGS. __________

47.) IT IS IMPORTANT FOR CHILDREN TO LEARN WHEN TO DISOBEY AUTHORITY. __________

48.) THERE IS HARDLY A SINGLE IMPORTANT ISSUE ON WHICH MY BELIEFS ARE THE ONLY VALID ONES. __________

49.) IT IS BEST TO BE WARY OF AN INDIVIDUAL WHO OFTEN CHANGES HIS/HER BELIEFS. __________

50.) I THINK IT BEST TO MAINTAIN MY OWN OPINIONS EVEN THOUGH MANY OTHER PEOPLE MAY HAVE A DIFFERENT POINT OF VIEW. __________

51.) IT IS NECESSARY TO RESERVE JUDGEMENT ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON UNTIL ONE HAS HAD A CHANCE TO HEAR THE OPINIONS OF THOSE ONE RESPECTS. __________

52.) to 57.) INSTRUCTIONS: The purpose of this section is to measure the meanings of certain things to different people by having them use a series of descriptive scales. Again, please give honest opinions as to what these person and issue concepts mean to you. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers.

For each underlined concept that you feel is very closely relate to one end of the scale, you should circle 1 or 7.

right 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 wrong
right 1 2 3 or 6 5 7 wrong
2 or 6 should be circled if you feel the underlined concept is quite closely related to one end of the scale.

bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
bad 1 2 3 or 6 5 7 good
INSTRUCTIONS. Continued.
If the underlined concept seems only slightly related to one end of the scale, then circle 3 or 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number you circle, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you're judging. Accordingly, 4 should be circled if you are undecided, consider the underlined concept to be neutral on the scale, or feel the scale is completely irrelevant or unrelated to the underlined concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle one and only one number on all five (5) scales below every underlined concept. Don't look back and forth through the items. Make each item a separate and independent judgement. Your true impression is important.

**EXAMPLE:**
(underlined concept)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**52.)**
(right) F.B.I.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**53.)**
(right) MARTIN LUTHER KING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**54.)**
(right) SOCIALISM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**55.)**
(right) KARL MARX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUCLEAR WEAPONRY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>57.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESIDENT REAGAN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>58.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ARE SOME MAJOR U.S. SOCIAL PROBLEMS AT PRESENT? (Please list five (5) in order of importance.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>62.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARENT(S)' DESIRED FORM OF SOCIETAL OR POLITICAL ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION:</strong> (You may answer more than once.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 63.) |
| HOW CLOSELY DO YOU AGREE WITH YOUR PARENT(S)' GENERAL POLITICAL BELIEFS? |
| a.) | very closely |
| b.) | closely with one but not the other |
| c.) | in some ways closely, in other ways not closely |
| d.) | mostly disagree with them |
| e.) | other; please specify: |

| 64.) |
| HOW POLITICALLY ORIENTED ARE YOUR PARENT(S)? |
| a.) | highly political |
| b.) | somewhat political |
| c.) | not very political |

| 65.) |
| HAVE YOUR PARENT(S)' POLITICAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS CHANGED OVER THE YEARS? |
| a.) | little or not at all |
| b.) | somewhat (in what ways?): |
| c.) | considerably (in what ways?): |
February 17, 1983

Rand Leslie Kannenberg
465 S. Wright St. Apt. #110
Lakewood, Colorado 80228

Dear Mr. Kannenberg:

The enclosed research prospectus has been approved by the Human Research Committee of the University of Colorado at Denver, under the rules for expedited research review and subject to the conditions in the following paragraph of this letter.

While a formal consent form is not needed for survey research of this nature, you should include in your "INSTRUCTIONS" to students:

---a few words about the nature of the research and its purpose. (e.g. "The following questionnaire is designed to study the socialization of American youth and young adults" or a like statement.

---an offer to answer any questions regarding the research, both during and after the research is completed. This includes an offer to release information about group responses, not individual responses.

---an instruction that the student is free to discontinue participation in the research at any time. This statement should be added to your statement that participation is voluntary.

---an instruction that questions concerning rights as a subject should be directed to the Human Rights Research Committee, Graduate School, University of Colorado at Denver, 80202.

Please send me a copy of your final questionnaire with the above instructions included on it. Students do not need to sign the statement, since it is printed on the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Carolyn H. Simmons, Ph.D.
Chair, Human Research Committee
University of Colorado at Denver
APPENDIX D
HUMAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE REVIEW

8/10/82

HUMAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE REVIEW

(NOTE: If exemption or expedited review is requested, please enclose one copy of this form and supporting data. If full committee review is requested, please enclose six copies of this form. Forms should be sent to: Carolyn Simmons, Box 102, Department of Psychology, UCD.)

1. Principal Investigator Karschberg Dept. ______
   Extension ________________ Home Phone ________________
   (If the principal investigator is a student, please name:
   Faculty Advisor ________________ Extension ________________)
   TITLE OF RESEARCH PROJECT: ____________________________

2. Research description. Please provide a brief summary of the project, including subject population and recruitment and procedures to be used. Attach questionnaires, interview questions or test copies if appropriate.

   Attachment 1
   Attachment 2
3. Consent Forms: unless you wish to omit a consent form (under conditions specified in C. of attached memo) attach a copy of the consent form you will be using. The following points must be included in a consent form:

a) A clear explanation of the procedures to be followed and their purposes, including identification of any experimental procedures.

b) A clear description of any discomfort or risks reasonably to be expected.

c) An offer to answer any questions regarding the research, both during and after the research is completed.

d) An instruction that the person is free to withdraw his/her consent and discontinue participation at any time without prejudice.

e) An instruction that questions concerning rights as a subject may be directed to the Human Rights Research Committee, Graduate School, University of Colorado at Denver, 80202.

f) Signature of subject. (For subjects below the age of 18, or for mentally ill or retarded persons, signature of parents or guardian is required. For children between 12 and 18, both parent and child should sign the consent form.)

You are reminded that consent forms are privileged records and must be protected for confidentiality.

4. Signature of Principal Investigator ________________________________

Action of Human Research Committee, UCD:

[ ] Approved as exempt or expedited research.

[ ] Approved as fully reviewed research.

[ ] Approved with conditions; see appended letter.

[ ] Disapproved; see appended letter.

[Date: 12-23-83]

UCD Human Research Committee
LETTER TO CAROL A. WILSON

March 24, 1983

Dr. Carol A. Wilson, Principal
Wheat Ridge High School
9505 W. 32nd. Ave.
Wheat Ridge, CO. 80033

Dear Dr. Wilson:

I am presently in the process of collecting data for my graduate thesis. The subject of my research is the political resocialization of American youth and young adults. Specifically, I am interested in the process of unlearning and relearning political norms, values, attitudes and behaviors.

I have designed a questionnaire (please find a single copy enclosed) which has been approved by the Human Research Committee of the University of Colorado at Denver in compliance with the rules and regulations of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

If possible, I would like to administer the questionnaire at my alma mater on some Monday, Wednesday or Friday during the month of April. I have chosen at random the following teachers: Debralee Bowland, William Determan, Jerry J. Hamill, Donald Headlee, Rita A. Klemm, Kenneth T. Larson, La Vern Thomas and Joseph Truglio. I am hoping that you and/or the eight teachers named above can arrange a schedule allowing me to go from one class during first period, to another during second period, and so on, all in the same day. I will assist the consenting teachers in passing out and collecting the questionnaires, as well as answering any questions that their students might have. Based on an informal pretest, the questionnaire takes approximately fifteen to thirty minutes to complete.

Thank you kindly for your time. I will call your office sometime soon. Until then, I am

sincerely,

Rand L. Kannenberg

cc: teachers
 files
MEMO

TO: 

FROM: Carol

TOPIC: Rand Kannenberg's Survey

On April 20, Wednesday, Rand will see Verne Thomas, 1st period (27)
Jerry Hamill 2nd period (25), Deb Bowland 3rd period (29), Rita Klemm,
4th period (55), Joe Truglio 5th period (6) and Ken Larson 6th period (30).

Jefferson County Public Schools
Form 988/Rev.Mar.67
APPENDIX G
LETTER TO UCD INSTRUCTORS

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES
Division of Social Sciences
1100 Fourteenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202
Phone: (303) 629-2616

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
AT DENVER

TO: D. Quiatt, Anth. 201; N. Langland, Econ. 201; F. H. Dow, ETST/S Sc. 329;
P. S. Allen, Hist. 102; C. M. McCarthy, Hist. 201; P. J. Meranto, FSC. 110;
V. L. Golich, FSC. 304; J. M. Davis, Soc. 302; R. H. Anderson, Soc. 421/521;
W. I. Griffith, Soc. 475.

FROM: Rand L. Vannenberg, Graduate Program in Sociology

DATE: March 28, 1983

RE: Research Project at UCD

I am presently in the process of collecting data for my graduate thesis. The subject of my research is the political resocialization of American youth and young adults. Specifically, I am interested in the process of unlearning and relearning political norms, values, attitudes and behaviors in higher education. I have designed a questionnaire (please find a single copy attached) which has been approved by the Human Research Committee of UCD in compliance with the rules and regulations of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

The ten (10) instructors and courses named above have been chosen at random. If possible, I would appreciate the opportunity to administer the questionnaire to your classes during their regular scheduled times on Monday, April 25th. If necessary, I will be able to do this on Wednesday, April 27th. and Friday, April 29th. I will assist you in passing out and collecting the questionnaires, as well as answering any questions that your students might have. Based on an informal pretest, the questionnaire takes approximately fifteen (15) minutes to complete.

Thank you kindly for your time and cooperation. I will be in touch with each of you individually sometime soon to confirm a date and time.

cc: Richard H. Ogles, Faculty Advisor
    M. Jay Crowe, Assistant Dean, Division of Social Sciences

rlk
TO:

FROM: Rand L. Karmenberg
DATE: 04/04/93

I have been unable to reach most of you by telephone to confirm a date and time for administering the questionnaire. For this reason please put down PLS. # in the space provided if the date and time selected are acceptable. If not, please cross it out and write in your name, course number and title in another place if empty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>MON. April 25</th>
<th>WED. April 27</th>
<th>FRI. April 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:50</td>
<td>P.H. Dmy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>671/254 222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:50</td>
<td>P.S. Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:50</td>
<td>N. Langland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECON 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:50</td>
<td>J.M. Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOC 302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-13:50</td>
<td>W.C. Dwyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOC 495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-14:50</td>
<td>V.C. Gohila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MG 204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:50</td>
<td>D. Quaidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANTH 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:45</td>
<td>R.H. Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOC 141/144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:55-19:10</td>
<td>R.S. Merenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSC 110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00-21:10</td>
<td>G.M. McGrath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I
THANK YOU LETTER TO WRHS AND UCD FACULTY

To: V. Thomas, J. Hanill, D. Bowland, R. Klemm, J. Truglio,
X. Larson, D. Quiatt, N. Langland, F. Dow, F. Allen,
F. Maranto, V. Golich, K. Davis, R. Anderson, L. Griffith

FROM: R. Kannenberg

RE: Thesis Research

DATE: July 5, 1983

First of all, thank you for allowing me to distribute questionnaires
to the students in your classrooms this last April.

Secondly, due to cost and other considerations, I am unable to
provide each of you with copies of the findings. However, please
encourage all students with an interest in the research to contact
me.

Again, I very much appreciate your cooperation.

Rand Yannenberg
c/o Graduate Program in Sociology
University of Colorado at Denver
Campus Box 105
1100-14th. St.
Denver, Co. 80202

629-8306

rlk