Lewis S. Feuer's *The Conflict of Generations* is one of the most extensive efforts to explain events on the campus and on the barricades in terms of what is coming to be called the "Oedipal revolution."

Largely missing so far have been serious attempts at empirical research on student unrest, and the ACE studies are designed in part to help fill the gap.

Almost nothing, of course, infuriates student revolutionaries more than an analysis which shifts attention from the social or political conditions they are protesting to the behavior of the protestors. Any reporter who has covered campus protests is familiar with the radical's remonstrance, "For God's sake don't write another story about alienated youth."

The university Left was weaned on the social and behavioral sciences. They owe much to C. Wright Mills, Marcuse, Fanon, Lewis, and Debray for their social perceptions and revolutionary theory.

Now, many American social and behavioral scientists are attracted to the study of the apostles of social change. But they find themselves consigned politically to the liberal middle and separated by an ideology gap from the student radicals who insist that the proper study of the behavioral sciences is American institutions, not them.

—JOHN WALSH

Confidentiality Is Not the Only Issue Causing Unrest among Student Critics of the Effort To Study Protests

A statement by the social scientists at the Center for the Advanced Study of the Behavioral Sciences calling for a study of student unrest (*Science*, 5 July 1968) concluded, "We are aware that the pursuit of these questions may be viewed with alarm by some groups. Insidious motives may be ascribed to proponents of a national study on campus unrest." If this was not an anticipation of trouble, it was at least prophetic. In the few short months during which the study has been under way, it has been the subject of controversy among its own staff members, its university advisers, and its government sponsors, as well as the focus of attack by the nation's two most influential student organizations, the National Student Association (NSA) and the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Two colleges, Oberlin and Swarthmore, have refused to cooperate, and other schools have refused to let interviewers ask certain questions about race and religion. Most of the complaints are focused on the in-depth interviews of students which are a part of a study on campus unrest; this study is separate from the American Council on Education (ACE) freshman study. ACE research head Alexander Astin, who subcontracted the study to the Bureau of Social Science Research (BSSR), ruefully admits, "We had no idea what we were getting ourselves in for."

The questions, which have been raised both by social scientists connected with the study and by students and social scientists opposed to the study, fall into three general categories: the problem of confidentiality and violation of privacy, the question of what should be studied and how, the matter of the political uses of the data.

NSA first raised the question of confidentiality and privacy, to which the new guidelines are addressed, early in the fall of 1968. Concerned about the growing number of government investigations of student protests, drug use, and draft resistance and the more general climate of what NSA staff members call "anti-student" feeling in the country, NSA president Robert Powell became worried about certain aspects of the ACE freshman study. The fact that ACE was collecting Social Security numbers as well as names and addresses of the freshmen interviewed for follow-ups and was asking students a few questions about drug use and protest participation troubled NSA. Powell got the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) to advise them. Robert Christen, chairman of the Academic Freedom Committee of ACLU, made three recommendations: that Social Security numbers be striken from the forms; that ACE should develop a procedure to separate the names of participants from their answers to questionnaires; and that every questionnaire should be stamped with the notation that participation in the study is voluntary.

ACE agreed to the ACLU recommendations; however, this did not head off the more complicated and serious questions of confidentiality presented by the campus unrest study. Meetings of the advisory group for the study were fraught with conflict from the start. At the first meeting, in December, a number of the university social scientists advising ACE argued that the study should not focus primarily on student behavior (or disruptive actions) but should examine the precipitating social and political causes of protest as well. Some NIMH officials still agree with this criticism. But this argument about research design was not the serious professional question for the advisory committee that the question of confidentiality was to become. The fact that the entire study was about disruption meant that much of the information collected might be incriminating either to student participants or to others whose activities a student might describe. The student questionnaire—30 pages long—included many open-ended questions about personal drug use and political views as well as requests to name groups and nonstudents involved in protest. BSSR was taking the names of the participants, although no follow-up interviews were planned, and recording the names on the face sheet of the questionnaire. The identifying sheet is now destroyed.

No less important a factor in underscoring these issues was the announcement by the McClellan special investigations committee this spring that it would begin subpoenaing data about students for its study of campus violence. Also alarming to advisory committee members was the increasingly "hard line" taken by the Justice Department about student protests, and the recommendation by another congressional committee that federal scholarships be cut off from students participating in demonstrations. To NSA staffers, members of SDS, and sociologists like Yale's Kenneth Keniston and Chicago's Richard Flacks, the BSSR data began to look more and more germane to these investigations of students.

This is, of course, not the first time the question of the responsibility of social scientists in protecting their subjects from invasion of privacy has come up. Although ethics of research in clinical psychology and medical science has been more highly developed, social scientists are beginning to

deal with the question. Hearings on invasion of privacy were held by Representative Cornelius Gallagher (D–N.J.) in 1965, and a major part of the recent House Government Operations Committee staff study on the federal uses of social science was devoted to questions of ethics and confidentiality. In February 1969, the BSSR released its own guidelines for protecting subjects' rights. The code says, in part, "BSSR will not supply to clients, other organizations, or individuals any data that can be associated with the name of a respondent unless the respondent's consent has been specifically obtained, or unless, in the case of collaboration with another research organization, the BSSR is fully assured that the information passed to that organization will be held as confidential to the same degree that our own policy specifies."

It is rare, however, and a reflection on the queasy state of relations between the academy and the government that social scientists (at least in this case) see a problem in protecting their data from the government. The question of a researcher's responsibilities takes on a new dimension when a government subpoena is issued. Members of NSA and SDS—who had followed newspaper reports of college administrators complying with government requests to furnish lists of SDS members, draft-eligible men in demonstrations, and student protesters on federal scholarship—believed that social scientists would also comply. Members of the advisory committee were concerned as well, and some feared that, even if the researchers refused to comply, the data might still fall into the hands of government investigators, and the answers and facts about campus protests could then be traced to the specific campuses and individuals. The second meeting of the advisory committee, in May, was generally confined to a discussion of these problems of confidentiality, and specifically to a draft of possible guidelines prepared by Kenneth Keniston. It was as a result of this meeting, and of many telephone calls between advisory board members and the less-than-enthusiastic ACE and BSSR researchers, that the guidelines were developed.

But the issuance of the guidelines does not end the objections of some social scientists or of NSA and SDS to the campus unrest study. In the view of these critics, guidelines restricting access to data do not deal with what they feel is the political bias of the study and the possible misuse of the study. SDS remains, as it was originally, unalterably opposed to the study, which it terms "domestic counterinsurgency." To these students any kind of research that would tell administrators how to avoid campus conflict (by either granting limited student demands or expelling protesters) is counterinsurgency. They equate it with such programs as pacification in Vietnam, which they believe stops insurgency without making real change. An April article in the SDS paper *New Left Notes*, entitled "There's a Man Going Round Doing Surveys," first called attention to the study and warned SDS members and sympathizers not to take part in it; many did refuse to cooperate, according to BSSR researchers.

Issue of Political Bias

NSA's criticisms, if less colorful, are more specific on the question of political bias. NSA president Bob Powell notes the clear position of ACE against campus unrest. He points to a recent ACE policy statement which says in part, "There has developed among some of the young a cult of irrationality and incivility which severely strains attempts to maintain sensible and decent human communication. . . . Disruption and violence have no part on any campus." Astin stresses that the research division and its studies are independent of control by policy statements of their boards of directors, but the view persists at NSA that ACE represents an association of college administrators trying to stop protest against their policies. A recent letter to Astin from Bob Powell sums up this view: "We are dealing with a national study, financed by the government, housed by an institution of college administrators which deals not with institutions but [with] individual behavior at a time when all forces of power in the nation are attempting to control that behavior."

Another worry of NSA and other student groups is that the in-depth interviews about student attitudes and about the characteristics of protesters will tell administrators and admissions officers enough about "protest-prone" students to keep such students from being admitted to colleges. NSA cites news reports that many college admissions officers are requesting special notes from high school counselors predicting the likelihood of given applicants' becoming protesters. The ACLU has opposed this practice as a violation of free speech and due process, as do the advisory committee guidelines. Astin admits that this might still be a result of the ACE study, but says this would be no different from other forms of discrimination, by race or sex. Although Astin has endorsed the guidelines, he was opposed to this section, saying such use of the study results to screen applicants was unethical, because, he says, "It is presumptuous for a group of uninvolved social scientists to tell administrators how to use knowledge." Keniston agrees that the guidelines will not prevent such use, and will only absolve advisory committee members of guilt. With this persistent criticism it is unlikely that ACE and the BSSR will expand the study as was originally hoped; more colleges may drop out, as Oberlin has, of even the freshman study. Students, increasingly troubled by arrests for drug use and protests, will be less likely to cooperate with the pertinent section of such studies. Ironically, the issuance of the guidelines on confidentiality, while a landmark for social scientists, is not likely to temper student reactions to their research.

Like the social scientists of the early 1960's who learned they would have difficulty doing research in Latin America sponsored by the Defense Department, researchers in this country may discover that it is often the political climate that defines their research to outsiders. From the scholars' point of view, social groups with grievances or demands for social change are the most interesting intellectually and the most important to understand. But from the point of view of the subjects, the possible political uses of the research is more important than the scholars' prerogative of freedom of inquiry. Whatever the overall validity of a social scientist's intentions, these suspicions of his subjects often put the researcher at odds with the subjects upon which he depends for his data. In some cases there may be no resolution to this conflict of interests. Social scientists may increasingly meet resistance, even in this country, to field work. The development of ethical statements like the guidelines will reassure some groups; for others, it will be a more difficult issue—that, as Keniston puts it, "of social scientists trying to control the use of their research as well as its results."—JUDITH COBURN

Miss Coburn is a Washington free-lance writer now engaged on a book on the social sciences.