Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1992

"Staying" and "straying" : social reproduction and resistance to secularization

Lisa Graham McMinn
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

McMinn, Lisa Graham, ""Staying" and "straying" : social reproduction and resistance to secularization" (1992). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 4427.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.6305>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Lisa Graham McMinn for the
Master of Science in Sociology presented April 28, 1992.

Title: "Staying" and "Straying": Social Reproduction and
Resistance to Secularization.

APPROVED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

Robert Liebman, Chair

Robert Shotola

Robert Everhart

Martha Balshem

Until the twentieth century, most American colleges were founded by churches. Their primary purpose was the preparation of godly clergy and laity. Impacted by trends that encouraged secularization, most of these schools changed their missions. Pluralistic values, ideologies which privileged scientific knowledge over religion, and technological demands were the most important pressures upon church-founded colleges. Most responded to state induced incentives (i.e. money for all but "pervasively religious" schools) by conforming to the secularizing trend.

While pluralism in America enables and gives respect to diversity, it is a double edged sword. Although pervasively religious institutions were allowed to exist, they did not receive the same measure of help from the state as did secular schools. However, some church-founded schools held fast to a program of whole-life education which integrated faith with learning.

This thesis explores how church-founded liberal arts colleges--specifically fundamental/evangelical liberal arts colleges--stayed the drift toward secularization. It uses comparative case studies to examine the structures and beliefs which enabled "staying" schools to resist secularization. Social reproduction theories are used to explain both the reproduction of the dominant culture (secularization) and the reproduction of a subculture (fundamentalism/evangelicalism). Secularizing institutions conform to state incentives and so reproduce what the state sees as necessary for societal survival. Resisting institutions isolate themselves from the dominant culture by establishing boundaries which let in only what accords with the church and so reproduce a culture the church sees as necessary for the survival of evangelicalism/fundamentalism.

Eight liberal arts colleges were purposively selected to represent points on a staying-straying continuum. Indexes of campus culture were developed to examine boundary maintenance. Factors such as on and off-campus conduct codes regarding smoking and drinking, chapel attendance

requirements, the offering of women's studies courses, and faculty and student professions of faith were used to distinguish among campus cultures.

Two hypotheses examined the association between exclusive boundaries, strong affiliations, and resistance to secularization. Of these, exclusive boundaries proved more powerful an explanation than affiliation. This is partly because affiliation was indexed by belonging to an organization of other Christian colleges rather than affiliation with fundamental churches. An unexpected finding was that denomination (particularly fundamental/evangelical versus non-fundamental) distinguished between staying and straying schools. Differences in ideology suggest an underlying motive for schools which erect strong boundaries and so resist secularization. This thesis suggests the need for future research with a larger sample of church founded liberal arts colleges in order to explore the fundamental/evangelical factor further.

In summary, this thesis suggests the enabling force behind resisting schools is fundamentalism. Without exception, those schools which demonstrated the most resistant cultures were founded by fundamental or evangelical church denominations. These denominations give resisting schools the motivation (and sense of mission) to maintain and reproduce their fundamental/evangelical cultures rather than conform to the culture of the secularizing majority.

"STAYING" AND "STRAYING":
SOCIAL REPRODUCTION AND
RESISTANCE TO SECULARIZATION

by

LISA GRAHAM MCMINN

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
SOCIOLOGY

Portland State University
1992

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of Lisa
Graham McMinn presented April 28, 1992.

[REDACTED]
Robert Liebman, Chair

[REDACTED]
Robert Shotola

[REDACTED]
Robert Everhart

[REDACTED]
Martha Balshem

APPROVED:

[REDACTED]
Grant Farr, Chair, Department of Sociology

[REDACTED]
C. William Savery, Interim Vice Provost for Graduate
Studies and Research

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I would like to thank my family: Mark for his encouragement and direction when I felt stuck, and Danielle, Sarah and Anna, for being patient with my temporary obsession. I would also like to thank my thesis committee: Bob Liebman for his enthusiasm and direction, Bob Shotola for his careful reading and comments, and Bob Everhart for his willingness to serve on the committee. Finally, I dedicate this thesis to all the staying schools still attempting to stay the secularizing trend and maintain their faith-centered distinction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.	1
A Day in the Life of Professor Brown . . .	1
A Remnant of Institutions.	3
Definitions of Concepts.	4
Historical Context	6
The Research Question.	12
II LITERATURE REVIEW	13
Theoretical Background	14
Methodology and Design	37
III DISCUSSION OF DATA COLLECTION	45
Quantitative Analysis Discussion	45
Profile and Case Study Discussion.	49
IV CONCLUSION.	71
Social Reproduction Theories Revisited. .	71
What Exactly is the Enclave?	72
Future Directions for Research	75
Conclusion	77

REFERENCES.	80
APPENDICES.	84
A INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES . . .	84
B QUESTIONNAIRE	85

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I Denominational Standings	57
II Summary Comparison Table:	
Linfield/GFC in 1950s.. . . .	58
III Summary Comparison Table:	
Linfield/GFC in 1990s	58

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. Pluralistic Culture: Conformity.	22
2. Pluralistic Culture: Deviancy.	30
3. Exclusive Membership Index	46
4. Staying Culture Index.	47
5. Association Between Exclusiveness and Affiliation	48

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A DAY IN THE LIFE OF PROFESSOR BROWN

Professor Brown says "Good Morning" to the department's secretary, grabs his mail, and unlocks his office door precariously balancing mail, coffee, student papers, today's lecture, and the book he borrowed from a colleague last term (or was it a year ago?) He drops his stuff on the desk, including a drop or two of his coffee which splats on a student paper.

So far, Professor Brown could be teaching anywhere. Professor Brown walks across campus to his class. He passes a newly erected bell tower which chimes every fifteen minutes. A white cross stands out beautifully against the red brick. He enters his classroom. Today they open with prayer--not always, but today it seems especially appropriate. One of the faculty was arrested last night, charged with a B class misdemeanor for phone harassment. He's out on bail, but Professor Brown knows the disturbance to the campus community will be great. He doesn't pray specifically for his colleague, but his heart feels heavy.

After class, he works clearing his desk of the memos, forms, and other miscellaneous clutter he always seems to have.

He'd like to get more research done, but between committee obligations, student demands, his "10 hour a week job so he can afford to teach here," and his 12 hour teaching load, he's not left much room for research. Oh well, maybe this summer.

At 11:00 he goes to chapel. It's only required for students, but faculty, staff, and administrators are encouraged to attend. This is Spiritual Emphasis Week and special speakers have been brought in. The topic is world awareness, something he definitely thinks students need more of. Goodness--most students in his history classes didn't even know who Ollie North was. Students usually attend chapel twice a week, but this week, they attend every day. The class schedule is rearranged to make it work.

After chapel Professor Brown goes to faculty lunch. Every Tuesday there is lunch-for-a-dollar. (Monday and Thursday he skips lunch to play basketball with a bunch of other lunch-skipping professors). He usually enjoys faculty lunch, but today he's running a bit late (another last minute student request). Announcements are made. No one refers to the arrest of last night, though everyone is thinking about it, and much discussion has already occurred in more private places. People wonder what will happen to him. The job of a professor doesn't end when he or she leaves the parking lot. Professors are expected to be active in a church, encouraged to participate in some kind of public service, and sign a document agreeing to a prescribed lifestyle. So people wonder--will he be offered a contract next year? Will he be dismissed immediately?

The President opens with prayer, everyone eats, talks, laughs, and enjoys this time of community together. Someone makes a joke--it has something to do with faculty retreat last fall. There is a good sense of camaraderie in the room. If asked, Professor Brown would say he prefers teaching at a Christian college. I can integrate my faith with my discipline, he would say, and that's important to me. I have credibility I may not get in my church (which maybe is a little anti-intellectual), and I have credibility I may not get at a university ("He's religious--we know what that means!") Besides, everyone feels like family here. We care about each other, we help each other, we belong.

A REMNANT OF INSTITUTIONS

While churches founded the great majority of American colleges, only a fraction of church-founded liberal arts colleges in the United States are like Professor Brown's institution. These schools demonstrate a resistance to secularization. It is seen in the curriculum of Christian Heritage, a college in San Diego, California, where the women's studies courses are home economics and home management courses. Or in the community of George Fox College in Newberg, Oregon, where faculty, students and administrators worship together twice a week. Or in the membership criteria at Columbia Christian in Portland, Oregon, which requires that all board members belong to the Church of Christ. This contrasts with

secularized Linfield College in McMinnville, Oregon, where prayer before faculty meetings was dropped because a non-Protestant faction of the faculty resented the exclusivity of Protestant prayer. Or in the absence of a requirement that any of the board members at Albertson College of Idaho, a Presbyterian college, come from the denomination.

Most of the church-founded liberal arts colleges have secularized. But a remnant of small (ranging from several hundred to several thousand students) evangelical colleges resisted secularization. What factors contributed to their ability to maintain a community integrating religious faith and learning? This thesis suggests the enabling force behind resisting schools is fundamentalism. Without exception, those schools which demonstrated the most resistant cultures were founded by fundamental or evangelical church denominations. These denominations give resisting schools the motivation (and sense of mission) to maintain and reproduce their fundamentalist cultures rather than conform to the culture of the secularizing majority.

DEFINITIONS OF CONCEPTS

Secularization: the process whereby science replaces religion as the basis for knowing. This results in differing patterns of structures and expected behaviors between secularized and resistant colleges (e.g. requiring faculty to make a profession of faith to be hired, or requiring students

to attend chapel). The process will be explored in chapter two and the patterns in chapter three.

Staying: refers to the maintenance of faith-centered patterns (i.e. Wheaton College in Chicago, Illinois, requires students to abide by an *on-and-off* campus conduct code regarding alcohol and smoking).

Straying: refers to the weakening or disappearance of faith-centered patterns (i.e. Linfield College dropped off-campus conduct code expectations regarding alcohol and smoking).

Intentional community: a group (or groups) of people committed to shared beliefs they consider vital to the organization, who define clear boundaries between those inside or outside the community, and who actively engage in boundary-maintenance activities.

Enclave: an isolated institution or community whose members hold to a way of life that is radically different from the majority. As such they are considered "deviant" minorities. Amish communities are an example of an enclave.

Distinctives: those traits which allow us to distinguish between "kinds" of believers. A distinctive of Quakers that differs from Baptists is the Quaker pacifist stand. A distinctive that allows us to distinguish between fundamentalist and mainstream denominations is the fundamentalist's adherence to the inerrancy of the Bible.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The political picture

Nearly all higher education institutions in the United States operated under the influence of religious bodies until the mid-nineteenth century (Burr 1961; Butts 1955; Hunter 1987; Marsden 1991). Schools were founded as religious institutions with the goal of educating literate and godly laity and clergy. The focus was not so much on advancing science or expanding scholarship but on moral development, civic responsibility, and social integration (Hunter 1987:165). Secularization began in the post-Civil War era (Power 1991:285). However, up until WWI, most colleges and universities in America were still secure and held fast to the assumption that religion should be an integral part of learning (Burr 1961). But the technological voluntarism promoted by Herbert Hoover's administration in the 1920s, the pragmatic educational reforms of the F.D. Roosevelt administration in the 1930s, large-scale promotion of higher education using federal monies (such as the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 or the G.I. bill which gave educational opportunities to servicemen), and the liberalism of L.B. Johnson's administration in the 1960s all contributed to greater government involvement which diminished religious influence in the country's higher education institutions (Cremin 1988:116, Power 1991:306).

The process

Secularization of education has been described as a process whereby the non-religious realm of science replaced the irrelevant and unreal foundation of an integrated faith (Burr 1961; Jencks 1977; Marsden 1991; Pace 1972; Burtchaell 1991; Ringenberg 1984).

Since the mid-nineteenth century, several social forces pushed higher education institutions toward secularization. The first was the rise of the natural sciences over religion in the post-Civil War period. With the rise of the natural sciences came a skepticism toward religion as the basis of knowledge. By 1920, traditional religion was considered by many academicians to be unreal or irrelevant to the pursuit of education. (Jencks & Riesman 1977; Marsden 1991). It seemed as though educational goals were being redefined--away from raising up godly clergy and laity and toward training people to meet the demands of an increasingly technocratic society.

A closely related second force pushing education away from religious roots was growing government involvement in the late 19th century. Society needed an education system that would keep up with rapid industrial expansion and its growing technological needs (Butts 1955; Burtchaell 1991; Jencks & Riesman 1977; Marsden 1991). Governmental policies (specifically concerning public money) were society's tool for making sure education conformed to changing needs. Government involvement through the establishment of a strong public education system was opposed from the early 19th century by

political, economical and religious conservatives who saw public education as a threat to the private control (Butts 1955:444). However, the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 functioned as an impetus for the state and university movement. Each state was granted 30,000 acres for the establishment of agricultural and mechanical colleges with the task of addressing the needs of a rapidly expanding society (Butts, 1955:466).

This resulted in a third force pushing educational institutions toward secularization: tremendous financial incentives. Religious institutions fought for some of the public funding going to land grant universities, but lost. For example, religious institutions in Michigan saw the University of Michigan as their competitor and attempted to persuade members of the legislature to oppose public aid to the State university (Burtchae11 1991:23).

However, by the end of the nineteenth century it was generally established that public funds would not be used for private schools (Butts, 1955:452). The college retirement fund (TIAA) established by the Carnegie Foundation is an example of a program adding financial pressures to religious colleges. Participation was initially only granted to nonsectarian institutions. Other business contributors and state legislatures made similar demands, adding stress to the already unstable economic conditions (due to the Great Depression) in the early twentieth century (Ringenberg 1984; Wicke 1964).

Between the world wars, religiously affiliated colleges became increasingly aware that they had to compete with this new public education--with its popular secular ideology, exciting opportunities to participate in the rapid expansion of a growing country, and federal and state money to back it. And a fourth social force, increased competition for students drawn to the state universities, also pushed private higher education away from its religious roots. To attract students, religious institutions had to become more pluralistic and so reflect the changing values influencing public higher education. For instance, they would have to broaden their curriculum to offer an education similar to that of the public university. They would have to recruit faculty on the basis of credentials rather than religious beliefs or affiliation. And they would have to open their doors to students regardless of their religious preferences.

The pressures forced institutions to choose among strategies for survival and growth. They essentially had two options. The first, and easier choice was to drop religious distinctives, follow the dominant culture and secularize to have a better chance for survival (Ringenberg 1984; Wicke 1964). It was the path of least resistance and offered the greatest potential for expansion and most schools took it.

The second choice was to resist secularization. Many of these schools floundered and folded (Jencks & Riesman 1977). Only a few survived. George Fox College, is an example of a

college so committed to its religious distinction that faculty willingly gave up part (and sometimes all) of their salaries during the Depression in order to keep the school open (Beebe 1991:42).

The schools that endured benefitted from new opportunities for higher education. In the mid-twentieth century, the economy recovered, attending college became more popular, and greater government support for higher education benefitted private as well as public schools (Butts 1955; Ringenberg 1984). However, only those religious schools with strong traditions, a strong base of support, a solid constituency of students, and a good supply of facilities and faculty could truly continue undisturbed. Most were vulnerable to competing schools taking away prospective students, the perils of small endowments, and consumer driven accommodations (Martin 1982). When the dust had settled, most church-founded colleges changed their missions and choose secularization as the path of least resistance.

While the current economy's strength enables schools which have so far survived to be less influenced by economic pressures, these pressures continue to be felt. For instance, George Fox College felt the pressures poignantly when the decrease of college-age students in the mid '80s combined with a loss of state money due to a choice to remain "pervasively religious" at a time when the government again restricted public funds for religious institutions (Beebe 1991:117).

These pressures and processes brought different fates for liberal arts colleges. Pace's (1964:vii) typology of church-founded schools remains useful for comparing the outcomes. His four types:

- 1) colleges that had Protestant roots but are no longer Protestant in any legal sense
- 2) colleges remaining nominally related to Protestant denominations but probably on the verge of disengagement
- 3) colleges established by major Protestant denominations which retain connections with church
- 4) colleges associated with evangelical, fundamental, and interdenominational Christian churches

Colleges in the last category are the focus of this thesis. They appear to be the exception rather than the rule. Of 3,300 church founded four year liberal arts colleges in North America (Canada and U.S.), only about 125 are associated with evangelical, fundamentalist, and interdenominational Christian churches (Longman 1991:interview). These schools are "staying" schools which have maintained a mission clearly consistent with their religious founding: to integrate faith with learning.

The thesis does not consider the third category of Pace's typology that includes mainline Protestant, Catholic, Mormon, and Jewish schools which still retain strong connections with their founding church, but are not considered evangelical or fundamental.

THE RESEARCH QUESTION

More than 3,300 colleges were founded by churches. Considering that most of them have secularized, why have any resisted? What factors explain the staying power of evangelical and fundamental church-founded liberal arts colleges?

I use social reproduction theory to explain both secularization and the resistance to secularization. How staying colleges reproduce themselves is the primary focus with an emphasis on boundary-setting strategies which protect them against external influences. Eight church-founded liberal arts schools from various positions on the staying-straying continuum will then be examined regarding their boundaries and the culture they are reproducing.

I have two goals for this thesis. The first is to better understand the distinct cultures of staying schools as compared to straying schools. The second is to explore the question: How do boundary setting strategies explain why these colleges stayed the currents of secularization, and how well?

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Given the interplay between a changing culture and a resistant church, how have some church-founded schools drifted with the culture while others have remained true to the faith? Social reproduction theories can explain both secularization and resistance to secularization. The difference lies in what is reproduced and how it is reproduced.

The dominant culture is not an organization, but rather a complex conglomerate of beliefs, values, and artifacts. As such the culture needs a concrete mechanism for reproduction to occur. The state is one mechanism by which the dominant culture reproduces itself. The role of politics as a social force is explained by Deutsch as follows:

Politics involves the steering or manipulation of human behavior by a combination of threats of enforcement with habits of compliance... *(These)* may be capable of overriding or modifying many other goals, habits, or preferences that exist in the society (Deutsch 1966:242).

The individual (and corporate) conviction that the state is *legitimate* gives the state the power to be an instrument for producing, preserving or changing institutions of the state (Deutsch 1966).

Most educational institutions became increasingly secular as they responded to demands from the state which reflected the

dominant culture. This process by which demands are made and responded to will be explained by a state-centered argument.

Religious cultures are conglomerates of beliefs, values and artifacts within the overall culture. Religious educational institutions are the organizations which reproduce religious cultures. They reproduce faith-centered education by maintaining separate structures and boundaries which enclose them. In essence, schools resisting secularization do so by creating their own cultural enclaves with well-defined boundaries which allow for reproduction of their own culture rather than the dominant culture. These boundary-maintaining structures will be explained by an intentional community argument.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Social Reproduction Explanation for Secularization

Social reproduction theories are based on the assumption that to survive societies must perpetuate essential cultural elements intergenerationally. These theories emphasize the mechanisms used by a society to reproduce culture. For example, our society reproduces patriotism in children when children are taught to respect the American flag and recite the pledge of allegiance.

As recognized by Durkheim, education is the primary mechanism of social reproduction. "Durkheim taught pedagogy all his life" writes Fauconnet in his introduction to Durkheim's

Education and Sociology (1956). Durkheim (1956:28) says:

Education is the influence exercised by adult generations on those that are not yet ready for social life. Its object is to arouse and to develop in the child a certain number of physical, intellectual and moral states that are demanded of him by both the political society as a whole and the special milieux for which he is specifically destined.

Although we may like to think of education as a private matter since children belong first to parents for intellectual and moral development, education is a social function. Since societies need a community of ideas and sentiments to survive, the state needs to be actively involved in educating its young (Durkheim 1956:80). The development of the individual is not the primary priority of education, but rather perpetuating the conditions necessary for the society's existence (Durkheim 1956:123).

Bourdieu (1970) and Bernstein (1977) elaborate Durkheim's social reproduction theory. Bernstein emphasized modes of transmission and Bourdieu the structural context of transmission (MacDonald 1977:34). Bourdieu's main theoretical proposition is:

Every power which manages to impose meanings and to impose them as legitimate by concealing the power relations which are the basis of its force, adds its own specifically symbolic force to those power relations (p.xv).

Bourdieu's emphasis on the structural context of knowledge transmission stresses the unconscious perception that the reality being transmitted is accurate. A "cultural code"

includes thought, language, perception and meaning which unconsciously orders the reality and provides the underlying social basis for the final product (MacDonald 1977:34). For example, the transmission of patriotism occurs unconsciously as a child recites the pledge of allegiance, sings "God Bless America," and learns the history of the United States. Educational institutions, according to Bourdieu, thus perform two important functions: the conservation of culture, and the reproduction of culture (MacDonald 1977:35).

Bernstein (1977) suggested looking at different structural relationships to enable an investigation of different forms of social control put forth by different segments of a society. Structural features of the economy will be found in the same form within public education institutions (i.e. hiring teachers based on performance and credentials). Structural features of Christianity will be found in the same form within evangelical educational institutions (i.e. opening ceremonies in prayer). This suggests a social reproduction theory could be united with a cultural reproduction theory. (MacDonald 1977:30).

These emphases on power and structural relations imposing meaning and control will be applied both to the mechanisms used by the state in promoting a secular education, and the church, in resisting secularization.

State-Centered Explanation

A state-centered explanation is essentially a survival-of-the-fittest argument, where secularization occurred as colleges attempted to adapt to changing demands from the state. This explanation suggests the paths of religiously-affiliated schools were determined by the ways resources and regulatory efforts of state and federal governments shaped higher education to conform to the demands of the dominant culture (McMinn & Liebman 1991).

Early in the twentieth century government administrations (e.g. Hoover and Roosevelt) believed the public interest would be best served by increasing government involvement in higher education. The Kennedy and Johnson administration in the 1960s is cited as one which dramatically increased public spending for financial aid in support of educational endeavors (Ringenberg 1984:188). But state involvement went beyond merely donating public money. It excluded "pervasively religious projects." Public money was used to mold an educational system which would meet the needs of the state.

Therefore, the religiously based colleges which survived the nineteenth century still had to change substantially if they were to survive in the twentieth century (Marsden 1991; Mayers 1972.) The needs of an emerging industrialized, technologic society were insatiable (Marsden 1991; Brown 1952) but not inevitable, and the heritage offered by religiously based colleges appeared to be an unwanted commodity in the modern world. Marsden (1991) saw the demands of an increasingly

pluralistic and technocratic society, and ideological conflicts as being three major forces to which all educating institutions had to respond.

Technocratic expansion. Until after the Civil War, higher education simply meant expertise in the classics (Marsden 1991:36). From 1860 to 1910, economic and social pressures oriented schools toward agricultural and technical education. The Morrill Land Grant Act in 1862 is an example of how education was being shifted toward technology as an alternative to liberal arts education. Education reformers said that for American civilization to compete in the modern world it would have to produce genuine scholars, not clergy-trained individuals steeped in the classics (Marsden 1991:36). Money from industry and government continued to turn the tide toward a curriculum which was more practical and scientific. And attending a college which offered such preparation became a financially prudent choice. Prospective students who wanted to compete for jobs in the modern world chose colleges which would best prepare them for the technocratic jobs becoming available. Many colleges still operating as religious institutions in the 1860-1910 era were Bible Schools, and did not attempt to offer the preparation for public service that could be attained from a secular university (Hunter 1987).

Ideological conflicts. Changes in ideologies accompanied the push for technological advancement. With classical and religious education being pushed to the periphery, ideals

emphasizing a "respectable academia" emerged from the technological and professional side (Marsden 1991:39). The legitimacy offered by a supportive state likely helped assure victory of science over religion as the foundation for knowledge. Secularization progressed as faculty and administrators, once drawn from the ministry, began to come from the academic profession (Jencks & Riesman 1977). Along with a faculty of professionals (rather than a faculty of ministers) came "objective" research and teaching. This shift away from a curriculum that was subjectively religious could be seen in the transformation of *theology* departments--with an emphasis on religion as a foundation for knowledge, into *religious studies* departments--with an emphasis on a scientific approach to the study of religion (Burtchaell 1991:37).

Pluralism. The United States is a society proud of its cultural pluralism. Until the 1930s we thought of ourselves as a melting pot of many cultures. Since the 1930s the picture of a mosaic is suggested as more accurately reflecting our belief that the parts are important contributions to the whole and should not be lost in the mix (Cremin 1988:116).

Our state legislates pluralism with "equal rights" policies concerning hiring and admission practices in almost all facets of life--except regarding religion, where there is adherence to the separation of church and state. Although religious institutions maintained the right to hire and admit

on the basis of religious preference, religious colleges could not ignore the increasing ethnic and religious diversity of the culture. They felt pressure to follow the trend and become pluralistic as well: to loosen strong ties with their church, and to relax restrictions concerning who could be hired or admitted, what courses would be taught, and what religion would be preached. Constituencies of church-founded schools (faculty, students, alumni, financial supporters) fought against allowing Protestant exclusivism to continue (Marsden 1991). A Linfield professor said that the break from the Protestant traditions of the school (i.e. prayer before faculty meetings) has been in deference to non-Protestant faculty who verbalized discomfort of a tradition which excluded their own religious (or non-religious) preference.

Pluralism was a double edged sword. While the state allowed diversity, it did not economically support institutions choosing to deviate from the dominant education. George Fox College offers an example. GFC experienced a financial crisis in the 1980s when, in a four-year period, state and federal monies were severely cut because of their choice to remain pervasively religious. Money from the state of Oregon PESIC (Purchase of Educational Services from Independent Colleges) program was reduced from \$225,000 in 1979 to \$130,000 in 1982. At the same time a US Pell Grant was reduced from \$351,000 to \$271,000. Forty percent of the student aid package in 1979 was paid by the federal government; four years later, only 12% of it came from federal money. George Fox's enrollment

subsequently decreased 26% from 1981 until 1986 (Beebe 1991:117).

While values of pluralism allowed evangelical colleges to exist, the state does not help them do so. Colleges ultimately had to consider their resource base as they faced decisions between compromise and possible failure. Only a few religious colleges had strong enough bases of support (i.e. endowments and a dependable supply of students choosing their institution over another) to forgo the assistance offered by the state to conforming institutions (Martin 1982). Since most schools lacked such resources, they were more readily influenced by external state-centered pressures to secularize.

Why schools stray

A state-centered explanation fits well with theories of social reproduction in explaining why schools stray. Together, they describe the pressures for colleges to secularize. Social reproduction suggests secularization is inevitable as education moves with culture because it is part of the culture. A state-centered explanation describes the pressures for colleges to conform to ideological changes, technological needs and a society which values pluralism. Bourdieu's (1970) concept of an economically driven society requiring education which meets the needs of the market is supported by Marsden's research on demands for educational changes based on a secular ideology, technology and cultural pluralism. The following figure

illustrates the interplay between social reproduction theories and a state-centered argument (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Pluralistic Culture: Conformity. Education is a tool the state uses to reproduce the culture. Since not all education conforms to cultural norms, the state applies pressure for educational institutions to conform (the arrow represents pressures to conform by the state). Conformity ensures the institution will function as a tool for the transmission of culture. The state needs education to perpetuate itself and the educational institutions need the resources of the state to survive.

Most studies of secularization focus on schools which have secularized. For example, Burtchaell (1991), believed secularization was universal, as illustrated by the transformation of U.S. higher education at Vanderbilt University. His list of the factors making for secularization included the availability of non-church financial resources, conflicts over academic goals when lay presidents presided, and the transfer of faculty loyalty from the church to the

"academic guild" (Burtchaell 1991:24). A history of Lutheran higher education also emphasizes economy and the pressures to conform as reasons for changing to an education meeting the technocratic needs of society (Solberg 1985).

These explanations (and Marsden's) can be subsumed under a social reproduction theory. In summary, this theory suggests that culture uses politics (i.e. state money designated for non-religious institutions) to pressure educational institutions to reproduce a secular culture (one embracing ideologies which support a technocratic curriculum).

One view of social reproduction theory might suggest uniformity. Over time, educational institutions would lose distinctions and become the same. But, in fact, distinctions remain. Earlham College in Richmond, Indiana, is an international college. Reed College in Portland, Oregon, is known for its elite eccentric personality. Evergreen in Olympia, Washington, is a free-form Montessori-like college. And 125 evangelical schools are distinct because they have not followed the path toward secularization. While Jencks and Riesman (1977) claim most colleges founded after 1900 have been secular, 44 out of 78 schools described in the Christian College Coalition's Guide to Christian Colleges (1990) were founded after 1900. Pluralism in the United States has made the path to secularization not be as certain as some assume, allowing social reproduction of many cultures rather than just the dominant one.

An explanation of why some schools have not secularized is missing from the literature, resulting in an incomplete understanding. Not all institutions conform to the state-centered pressures to secularize. The next section uses the concept of intentional community to explain how religious distinctions were maintained.

Intentional Community Explanation

An intentional community is a group of people committed to mutual beliefs who define clear boundaries between those inside or outside the community (Kanter 1972). From the view of social reproduction theory, they are deviant in that they want to reproduce themselves, rather than the dominant culture. They exist inside the dominant culture, but as an enclave, largely isolated from external influences. Most work on intentional communities focus on communes, rather than liberal arts colleges.

One example is Zablonki's (1980) study of the communal life of Bruderhof, whose members surrender self-interest absolutely to the commune. He defined an intentional community as a group of persons associated voluntarily for the purpose of establishing a whole way of life. They were characterized by a common geographic location, economic interdependence and social, cultural, educational, and spiritual interchange. The community was held together by tradition, sovereignty, and charisma (leadership), all of which were inadequate unless

collective behavior led to a merging of experience and a loss of autonomy (Zablonki 1980:149).

Humans attempt to legitimate their actions and structure, which recurrent actions reproduce (B. Berger 1981:167). This was the conclusion of an ethnographic study of a hippie commune in California called "The Ranch". He explored how the traditions of daily practice (i.e. chapel) which tended to be strong, shaped the convictions or ideals (i.e. faith integrated with learning) which tended to be frail (Berger 1981:171). Reproduction occurs via teaching (indoctrination), training (ritual enactment), and the circumstances in which both take place. Successful reproduction lies in the taken-for-granted character of the associations made between ideology, enactment, setting, and experience. Labeling is part of reproduction: as others see us, so we reflexively see ourselves, surrendering to the labels given, and acting accordingly (Berger 1981:207-211).

Can Christian higher education be seen as an intentional community? Perhaps if it has a strong sense of community which results in a clear sense of who belongs inside or outside the community and where full commitment and unequivocal belief are central to the viability of the organization (Kanter 1972). Evangelical colleges need to modify to meet new demands, but must intentionally plan modifications if they are to keep their mission intact, rather than let change occur unintentionally (Mayers 1972). With Kanter and Mayers in mind, the following definition of intentional community is offered in this thesis:

a group (or groups) of people committed to shared beliefs they consider vital to the organization, who define clear boundaries between those inside or outside the community, and who actively engage in boundary maintenance activities.

Two mechanisms help Christian colleges maintain intentional communities. The first involves affiliating with like-minded schools. Affiliation serves the need for support or approval and is an effort to counterbalance external forces which would cause extinction (Scott 1987). Affiliating with like-minded schools also legitimizes them as viable educational institutions. Similarity legitimizes organizations (DiMaggio & Powell 1983) and schools belonging to the Christian College Coalition (an organization which coordinates resource sharing among Christian colleges) are essentially homogeneous regarding their commitment to a faith integrated with learning. Out of similarity a pool of interchangeable colleges is created--an intentional community beyond individual colleges, a "Brotherhood".

The second mechanism involves creating an enclave with strong loyalty and commitments from members and well-defined boundaries to oppose influence from the dominant culture. Intentional communities mobilize loyalty and commitment to "harness human energies to the organization's purposes" (Coser 1974:1). Greedy institutions are those which seek exclusive and undivided loyalty and attempt to decrease the claims of competing roles. Commitments go beyond the typical 40 hour work

week. Coser illustrates with the celibacy required of priests in the Catholic Church. While perhaps not as extreme, members of fundamental colleges also subscribe to a whole-life package, and are expected to cooperate with requirements such as signing agreements to abstain from alcohol. These greedy institutions can be small, exclusive groups which attempt to monopolize the total personality of individuals to withstand attacks from outside. They force members to take decisive stands in both public and private matters. They are not tolerant since the true believer is convinced he or she has a special hold on the truth. Tolerance is considered a weakness. Although the larger society sees compromise as a virtue, greedy institutions see it as a sign of disloyalty (Coser 1974:104,107).

Along similar lines, Moscovici (1980) studied the influence of majority and minority groups regarding compliant (conforming and superficial) versus conversion (deviant and genuine) behavior. When one switches to a minority belief, he or she experiences a genuine change, a conversion. When one adopts the majority position, it is often to take the path of least resistance and is a superficial compliant response. Minority positions, such as faith-centered education, are strongly held convictions even though the majority criticizes them, and considers them deviant and lacking in objectivity. For a minority position to have a continuing influence it must be consistent. Consistency is gained by adopting a "rigid" minority stance or a "fair" minority stance. A rigid position heightens the threat of the majority, and effectively blocks

any compromise. The fair position combines firmness with flexibility, leaving the door open for reciprocal concessions with the majority (Moscovici 1980:215-216).

Why colleges stay

If staying schools are intentional communities, then the intentional community research suggests they have boundaries and affiliations which control those who are allowed inside and those kept outside (Coser 1974; Zablonki 1980; Kanter 1972). Although affiliating with like-minded colleges will be explored as an hypothesis explaining staying, I expect the exclusive enclave nature or boundary-maintaining mechanism to be a more powerful explanation. The enclave mechanism provides a stronger means of maintaining intentional community because enclaves are structured to reproduce themselves rather than the dominant culture.

Rose (1988) suggests a fraction of Americans prefer to send their children to a private school for an education consistent with their faith, rather than have them exposed to the secularism in the public education. She looked at two communities with Christian elementary schools. Her conclusions support both a social reproduction theory and an intentional community. She concluded Christian elementary education represents efforts of fundamental Christians to increase control over the socialization and education of children, and therefore, society's future leaders (Rose 1988:199).

Another ethnographic study looked at Bethany Baptist Academy, a fundamental private school with kindergarten through high school (Peshkin 1986). Parents and teachers believe Bethany Baptist Academy is God's choice for their children (Peshkin 1986:39-40). The school is described as being a total institution based on the absolute truth endorsed and the involvement of faculty and students in and out of school. For instance, high school students sign a statement saying they will wisely and conscientiously choose which TV programs they watch, and will not listen to music which creates a reckless spirit, suggests immorality, or turns listeners against authority (Peshkin 1986:311).

Mayberry's (1988) research on the Oregon home schooling movement is consistent with Rose and Peshkin. She concluded one reason parents choose to home school their children was an effort to reclaim control of their children's education and protect them from the ideologies of public education.

The conclusion from these studies is that within the dominant culture, subcultural enclaves are able to exist which strive to reproduce themselves by creating intentional communities. The existence and prosperity of these schools illustrate how well pluralism functions in our society (Peshkin 1986:227). An interesting paradox is that the exclusive doctrine of these enclaves causes them to reject the pluralism which helps guarantee their survival in a secular culture (Peshkin 1986; Marsden 1991). Figure 2 is a model of how these deviant institutions exist within a pluralistic culture.

Figure 2. Pluralistic Culture: Deviancy. The very pluralism which dilutes differences in educational institutions allows the survival of deviant (staying) ones. Deviant institutions insulate themselves by creating boundaries which insure reproduction of themselves rather than the state-centered education.

Boundary maintenance is imperative if Christian colleges are to remain intentional communities with a purpose of reproducing an education integrating faith with learning. Life at a Christian college is a total way of life. It is a model of the "world as it ought to be", and reflects how important boundary strategies are in the beliefs of members. Christian colleges resemble Coser's (1974) greedy organizations which seek exclusive and undivided loyalty from members. Though perhaps to a lesser degree, they are similar to the Catholic priest accepting a celibate lifestyle. Faculty and

administrators not only sign statements agreeing to abstain from alcohol, they also endorse statements of faith put forth by the college. Personal lives are expected to reflect a Christian way of life. Merely tolerating the college's faith position is not adequate. To be hired, they must actively live it. Student Life departments illustrate intentional community efforts with their emphasis on meeting the spiritual, social, and emotional needs of students.

Specifically, how have staying schools used these two mechanisms (boundary maintenance and affiliation) for resisting secularization and thus remaining intentional communities? Regarding boundaries, evangelical and fundamental colleges recruit participants from within exclusive circles. Recruitment is essential for schools withstanding secularization (Zablonki 1980; Ringenberg 1984)--they must unapologetically recruit governors, administrators, faculty, and students committed to the church (Burtchaell 1991b:38). Christian Heritage is a school which unapologetically requires all students to sign a statement of faith, as well as all faculty and board members. The lower ratios of Ph.D.s on faculties such as Christian Heritage in part reflects this emphasis on Christian character over credentials.

One result of this exclusivism is that evangelical and fundamental schools are outside the arena dealing with current mainstream issues (Pace 1972:107; Mayers 1972:9). They are exclusive cultures wherein moral values on homosexuality,

abortion, and feminism are less likely to be questioned.

Perhaps also lacking is awareness of news events outside the enclave. Mike Allen, a faculty member at George Fox College said, "I had to inform students about the Clarence Thomas and Anita Hill hearings. I thought about bringing a TV to class so they could watch it. They weren't following it on their own."

The challenge of secularization leaves religion with two options: to hang on to its "cognitive deviance" or to surrender by adopting the ideas of the majority. If a religious group decides to cling to its minority position, success depends on huddling together with like-minded fellow deviants (Berger 1990:19). Affiliation with like-minded institutions gives affirmation and credibility to participating members (Dimaggio 1983; Zablonki 1980; Berger 1990; Cremin 1988). Christian colleges use affiliation by participating together with similar schools in associations such as the Christian College Coalition, and/or the maintenance of strong denominational ties to the founding church. The Christian College Coalition is an organization of individual colleges which encourage the flow of resources and approval between colleges. For participating colleges, the CCC enhances visibility, sponsors conferences, obtains grants, offers a network for information exchange, and support in curriculum development. Faculty Dean of George Fox College, Lee Nash, said, "We chose to affiliate with the CCC because membership gives us a sense of belonging, of support, of not feeling isolated. And it gives intellectual confidence.

Faculty can feel honest in their pursuit of knowledge, yet comfortable integrating that pursuit with faith."

Schools with strong affiliations with founding churches receive a similar advantage from huddling together. Christian Heritage, which was founded by Smith Memorial Baptist Church, requires its students to attend Smith Memorial unless they were previously attending another church in the area. Such a tie enhances and reinforces shared values and beliefs.

So, it seems, a minority of liberal arts colleges maintain their mission of integrating an evangelical faith with learning. It is not enough to say they survive because they affiliate with like-minded, they also, and perhaps primarily, guard their membership boundaries. As Moscovici (1980) noted in his discussion of deviant minority groups, they believe they have a special truth, and they want to reproduce it in generations to come. Perhaps the tenacious belief that what they are doing is what God wants them to do gives the courage to continue as deviant intentional communities isolated from the dominant culture.

But the arguments do not lend as clean-cut a dichotomy between straying and staying schools as this explanation might suggest. Not all staying schools look alike. The following two factors complicate the picture.

First, staying institutions are dynamic, and on a continuum of their own. While the organizational structure of staying institutions are similar, their ideologies are not. Not

all Christian schools are as fundamentally conservative as the ones depicted by Rose and Peshkin. "Evangelical" and "fundamental" are terms used interchangeably by those outside evangelical or fundamental worldviews. However evangelicals and fundamentals draw a sharp distinction between them.

Evangelicals consider fundamentalists to be rigid, narrow-minded and suspicious of anything secular. Fundamentalists view evangelicals as selling out and compromising on fundamental beliefs such as the inerrancy of scripture. Evangelicals would not necessarily support a private fundamental education offered to protect children from the secular "wicked" world. Humanism has been unfairly accused by fundamentalist authors as supporting rights without responsibility, pornography, drug use, and destruction of the family (McMinn and Foster 1990).

This conversation between two elderly women taken from Clyde Edgerton's novel Walking Across Egypt is an exaggeration. But it does reflect the response to secular humanists noted among fundamentalists.

"I declare, it's upset me terrible. I've started sleeping with my gun now."

"Sleeping with it? Under the pillow?"....

"Yes, and don't tell Finner either."

"He don't know?"

"He thinks one is enough, but I don't feel safe with one under just his pillow. Mr. Lowry gave a talk Wednesday night at prayer meeting about secular humanists. He said they were all over the place."

"What are they, anyway? I keep reading about them."

"Well, they do all these secular things for one thing and you just don't know when one's liable to break in your bedroom and start doing some of it."
(p.203-204)

There is a broader acceptance (and more accurate understanding) of humanism among evangelical colleges (McMinn and Foster 1990). McMinn and Foster's book titled, Christians in the Crossfire attempts to educate Christians about the true nature of both sides. They argue that neither side represents the other fairly. McMinn and Foster's attempt to do so reflects a perceived need for greater understanding and cooperation between humanism and religion. In an effort to recognize this distinction between staying schools, colleges discussed in this thesis will be referred to specifically as either fundamental or evangelical where appropriate.

The second complicating factor is that being an enclave does not entirely protect an institution from state-centered pressures. Some influence still leaks through--how much likely depends on how permeable the boundaries are allowed to be, or using Moscovici's (1980) concept; how "fair" (flexible) or how "rigid" a minority acts regarding interactions with the majority. These enclaves are not entirely isolated, but still exist within a culture tolerating their existence. As culture reproduces itself, even the enclaves within it gradually come to reflect aspects of the dominant culture. All schools have been influenced by secularization to some degree. For instance, colleges began dropping the word "Bible" from their names and schools such as Friends Bible College became Barclay College, and Fort Wayne Bible College became Summit College (and later merged with Taylor University). Chapel at many colleges used to

be required, but no longer is (Wicke 1964). At George Fox College chapel used to be held daily, students used to be required to profess Christianity, and the library used to be closed on Sunday. All of these have changed over time. A historical comparative study of church-founded schools would likely demonstrate that the religious restrictions are becoming less stringent and more inclusive over the years in response to the secularizing trend of modernity. The mission of schools has shifted from an earlier mission to raise up godly laity and clergy to the need for highly-trained specialists to keep our mechanized and technocratic society fed (Marsden 1991).

Rather than suggesting schools have either secularized or not, I suggest that staying schools fall somewhere on a continuum of secularization. All are being influenced by the changing dominant culture, but some change more rapidly and significantly than others. Yet there seems to be a critical point centering around their stated mission. Both Longman and Rickey suggested that as long as schools stress integrating faith with learning they are perceived by themselves and others as "staying" schools.

Summary

Durkheim, Bernstein and Bourdieu all suggest that education functions as a tool for social reproduction. The majority of educational institutions responded to the state's demands and followed the social reproduction of the dominant culture. Why some schools have not reproduced the dominant

culture can be explained when one considers the reproductive quality of an intentional community that is an enclave within the dominant culture.

The emphasis of explanations for secularization in the literature have focussed on state-centered pressures for change. The explanation offered in this thesis carries state-centered arguments a step further. By considering education as a tool of culture (Durkheimian tradition), it becomes inevitable that education will reproduce the dominant (secular) culture. That is, secularization is inevitable *unless* institutions become isolated subcultures where they reproduce their own founding mission (an education integrating faith with learning) rather than something determined by the dominant culture. My research methodology and design are geared toward investigating the process and structure of these intentional community enclaves.

METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are suggested to explore the association between exclusive boundaries, strong affiliations, and resistance to secularization.

1) Exclusive membership and strong affiliations are associated positively with staying.

2) Exclusive membership and weak affiliations are associated positively with staying.

3) Non-exclusive membership, but strong affiliations, are associated weakly, but positively with staying.

4) Non-exclusive membership, and weak affiliations are associated positively with secularization.

Rationale for Comparative Case Study Design

These hypothesis were explored using a comparative case study design. Qualitative research such as this is appropriate: 1) when attempting to understanding the "why" of a question rather rather than make predictions; 2) when deeper delving is necessary for the research to be valuable; and 3) when all the relevant variables cannot be identified up front (Marshall and Rossman 1989). These criteria fit this thesis. The goal of this study is to better understand why some schools have resisted secularization, with a design flexible enough to accommodate surprising answers along the way.

While a statistical analysis of a hundred schools might yield interesting results (significant or not), it would not paint a very thorough picture. If the concepts of community could be properly operationalized and statistically measured, I suspect the results would offer only a shallow understanding of community and the secularization process. By looking in greater depth at fewer cases I hoped to better understand the process of secularization as influenced by issues of community.

Data Collection Methods

School catalogues were used to profile eight liberal arts colleges founded with the intent of offering an education strongly integrated with faith. These were purposively selected (rather than randomly selected) so that a representation of the various cultures could be attained. Twenty liberal arts college catalogues were randomly chosen out of the approximately 100 available catalogues at the GFC library. Selection was made after an initial examination of the catalogues and through two interviews. One interview was with Jeff Rickey, who works with an admissions consulting firm which has serviced over 100 liberal arts colleges. The other was with Karen Longman, Vice President of the Christian College Coalition. Their exposure to the cultures of these schools was helpful in selecting appropriate colleges which fit into the four hypotheses. Missing information from catalogues (e.g. the absence of a mission statement) was considered significant data rather than missing data if inclusion is standard for staying schools.

Phone interviews were conducted with administrators or administrative assistants to collect data about hiring practices, board membership, and library hours. Two in-depth interviews were also held, with sociologists from Linfield and from George Fox. These professors were chosen for their experience (each have taught at their school for at least 15 years). Michael Allen from George Fox is highly respected by faculty and administration. Paul Howard from Linfield was

highly recommended by the President's office. A careful selection of interviewees was made to ensure the most valid and reliable information would be presented. Due to the subjective nature of these semi-structured interviews, some bias is unavoidable. I tried to judge comments made by Allen and Howard in light of what I know about the schools. The phone interviews were less of a problem because the information obtained from these were facts about the school.

Linfield and George Fox College are compared using a case study format. Information on the remaining six schools is presented as profiles.

Variables

Two independent variables can be identified which help maintain intentional community boundaries: an exclusive membership (recruitment from within specified circles); and affiliations (participation with similar organizations).

Following Burchaell (1991b), Kanter (1972) and Zablonki's (1980) discussions of a necessary exclusive boundaries, recruitment practices of the board, hiring practices for faculty, and admission requirements for students were evaluated. These are the primary modes of entrance into the Christian college community. Affiliation was measured by membership in the Christian College Coalition. The CCC was founded in 1976 as an organization to pool and network resources for colleges committed to providing an evangelical education. Those colleges that are members value the

connection, mentioning such things as gained credibility, shared intellectual resources, and the comfort of associating with like-minded schools. This is in response to Berger's (1990) argument that like-minded minorities huddle together. The Christian College Consortium is the other major affiliatory organization. However, since the Christian College Consortium closed its membership after 13 schools joined, it was not used to measure affiliation (see Appendix A for specifications and coding information).

The dependent variables demonstrate the staying culture. These include the following:

- 1) The presence of a mission statement emphasizing the integration of faith with learning, and goals of building Christian character. A content analysis of mission statements in catalogues was done to obtain this information. The unit measured is the phrase (or paraphrase) "integration of faith with learning." The phrase was chosen because it appears frequently in literature and discussions of the the Christian College mission. Professor Allen suggested that "integration of faith and learning is the key motto for CCC schools". Even student evaluations at George Fox College have a statement regarding how well the professor integrates faith with learning. The future of the church-related college depends on its ability to keep a clear view of its mission, and on its success in interpreting goals to students, faculty, constituency, and the general public (Wicke 1964:vii).

2) The presence of a doctrinal statement. Asserting a doctrinal statement in a school catalogue was used as a measure of how rigid or fundamental a school is, rather than specifically whether or not it is a staying school. Using Moscovici (1980) "fair" versus "rigid" minority concept, I suggest schools without specified doctrinal statements in their catalogues will be more tolerant and willing to dialogue about and accept a diversity of doctrines among faculty and students.

3) A requirement to attend chapel. Some colleges hold (and require) daily chapel attendance, others hold (and require) chapel two to three times a week. A few hold it once a week, but do not require attendance. Although frequency of chapel might be a useful variable, the more significant issue seems to be whether or not chapel is compulsory. Communal worship was at the heart of an evangelical community, and compulsory chapel is intended to contribute to a sense of community (Wicke 1964:11).

4) Campus and curriculum activities (the offering of women's studies courses, conduct code expectations, and the availability of library services on Sunday.) These variables demonstrate varying aspects of religious and community life. Conduct code expectations reflect the monopolizing nature of total or greedy institutions like those depicted in Rose (1988) and Peshkin's (1986) studies. The unit for content analysis was the restriction of drinking and smoking on or off-campus. I included off-campus restrictions believing they better

indicate the total lifestyle nature of an staying institution. As with chapel attendance, conduct code requirements vary. They range from not having a conduct code, to restricting only the on-campus use of alcohol and tobacco, to prohibiting dancing and premarital sexual activity on or off-campus.

Library hours are considered because they represent the tradition which reveres Sunday as a day of rest and worship. The unit of measurement for library hours is simply whether or not the library is open on Sundays. Some schools only have afternoon hours, some are open all day. But the variable choice which seemed to indicate the biggest difference in "reverence for tradition" is whether or not library services are available at all on Sunday.

The offering of women's studies was considered because staying schools represent a tradition of patriarchy. A willingness to offer women's studies would demonstrate a "fair" rather than "rigid" minority, and a willingness to rub shoulders, concede and possibly compromise with the majority of learning institutions which reject patriarchy.

It is possible that some variables are more important than others, and deserve more weight than others. However, determining *how* much more important, or even which are more important, did not seem a possible task. I did not find any studies attempting to rank these variables, and do not feel confident in my own knowledge of the schools to rank them. Therefore, each variable was weighted equally. A 2x2 design was

set up to examine the relationship among exclusive membership and affiliation (independent variables) and staying cultures (dependent variables).

Summary

Generally I expected liberal arts colleges showing high intentional community (with boundary maintenance strategies such as exclusive membership and affiliations) to show high staying cultures (seen in mission statements, and campus and curricular activities). While affiliation and exclusive membership may have an additive effect, I expected exclusive membership to be a better indicator of staying culture than affiliation. My expectations came largely from the greater emphasis on exclusive membership than on affiliation, in the community/commune literature. Perhaps this emphasis is because membership affects those inside the boundaries directly and internally, while affiliation refers to associations which are external to the community and affect it less directly.

I have suggested that an intentional community argument within a social reproduction model be considered to explain the continuing existence of some church-founded schools. The Christian college is presented as a whole way of life enclave, offered as an persisting alternative to secular education. According to my hypotheses, schools maintaining intentional communities resist state-centered pressures to secularize, and demonstrate a staying religious tradition in higher education.

CHAPTER III

DISCUSSION OF DATA COLLECTION

As stated in the methodology and design section, several techniques were used to collect and analyze data. Therefore, the following discussion includes both quantitative and qualitative elements. A quantitative summary precedes the discussion of individual case studies and profiles.

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS DISCUSSION

The chief data sources were 1990-91 school catalogues and telephone interviews with each of the eight chosen schools (see Appendix B for questionnaire). Affiliation was indexed by whether or not each school surveyed belonged to the Christian College Coalition. To measure exclusiveness an index was developed considering the following questions (see Appendix A for specifications):

- Must faculty make a profession of Christianity?
- Must students make a profession of Christianity?
- What percentage of the board must profess Christianity?
- What percentage of the board must belong to a particular denomination?

The exclusiveness index ranged from zero to eight as shown in Figure 3. A median split of the scores was then computed to create a dichotomous exclusiveness variable.

Schools with a score of four or less were considered low on exclusive membership and schools with scores of five and above were considered high.

Figure 3. Exclusive Membership Index. This figure shows scores on the exclusive membership for each college.

A staying culture index was then developed to measure the dependent variable (see Figure 4). Consideration was given to the following: (see Appendix A for specifications):

- Is chapel required?
- Does a conduct code prohibit alcohol and smoking on campus?
- Does a mission statement integrate faith and learning?
- Is there a doctrinal statement?
- Is the library open for any part of the day on Sundays?
- Are women studies courses offered?

Figure 4. Staying Culture Index. This figure shows scores on the staying culture index for each of the colleges.

And finally, the association between exclusive membership, affiliation and staying culture is shown in Figure 5.

		Affiliation with CCC	
		Yes	No
Exclusiveness	Low	1.5 North Park Bluffton	0.5 Linfield, Albertson College of Idaho
	High	5.0 George Fox College Wheaton	5.0 Columbia Christian Christian Heritage

Figure 5. Association Between Exclusiveness and Affiliation.

The number in each quadrant reflects the average score of the quadrant's staying culture. Theories and research of Kanter 1972, Coser 1974, Berger 1990, and Zablonki 1980, (see chapter 2) support the finding that quadrants reflecting both affiliation and high exclusiveness demonstrate high staying cultures. George Fox and Wheaton, which are in the High/Yes category have a score of 5.0 (on a scale of 0-6). Also expectantly, Linfield and Albertson College of Idaho, which are in the Low/No category have low staying culture scores (0.5). I hypothesized that exclusive membership would be a stronger indicator than affiliation in predicting high staying cultures. This is supported by Columbia Christian and Christian Heritage. Neither belong to the CCC, but both maintain exclusive

memberships, and they scored as high as colleges in the High/Yes quadrant (5.0). North Park and Bluffton predictably fall somewhere in the middle with their score of 1.5, also supporting the hypothesis that exclusive membership is a stronger predictor than affiliation.

PROFILE AND CASE STUDY DISCUSSION

The following discussion is in two parts. First, a profile of the schools in each of the four quadrants is presented and followed by an analysis relating results to hypotheses. Second, George Fox and Linfield are presented as comparative case studies with a look at each school's progression through history.

Quadrant Profiles

Low Exclusiveness/No Affiliation Quadrant. *Exclusive membership:* Linfield College (score: 1) and Albertson College of Idaho (score: 0) are almost identical. Linfield's score point comes from the requirement that 27% of the board are members in American Baptist churches. Otherwise neither school requires faculty, students, or board members to profess Christianity.

Affiliation: Neither Linfield nor Albertson belong to the CCC.

Staying culture: Linfield College (score: 0) and Albertson College of Idaho (score: 1) again are almost identical. Albertson's point comes from not offering women's

studies courses. Neither school requires chapel, has a conduct code, a mission statement nor a doctrinal statement. The library is open for both on Sundays.

Low Exclusiveness/Affiliation Quadrant. *Exclusive membership:* Bluffton College and North Park College both scored 4 on the exclusiveness index, but for different variables. Faculty must profess Christianity for North Park. New full-time faculty at Bluffton must profess Christianity, but they still have faculty hired prior to this requirement who may not profess Christianity. Students do not have to profess Christianity at either place, but a Christian board is expected for both. Bluffton requires a percentage of the board to be denominationally tied; North Park does not.

Affiliation: both Bluffton and North Park belong to the CCC.

Staying culture: Bluffton scores 1 and North Park scores 2. Bluffton and North Park each get a point for having mission statements reflecting an integration of faith and learning. North Park gets a second point for not offering women's studies (Bluffton offers them). Both schools have some on-campus restrictions of smoking and drinking, but neither enforce an off-campus conduct code. Chapel is not required at either school, the library is open on Sundays at both schools, and neither has doctrinal statements.

High Exclusiveness/No Affiliation Quadrant. *Exclusive membership:* Christian Heritage scored the highest possible score (8), and Columbia Christian scored 6 on the exclusiveness

index. The difference was in the requirement for student professions of faith. Columbia Christian does not require students to profess Christianity, and Christian Heritage does. Otherwise they are identical: both require faculty and board members to profess Christianity, and both require very strong denominational representation (100%) for the board.

Affiliation: Neither Christian Heritage nor Columbia Christian belong to the CCC.

Staying culture: Christian Heritage again scores the highest possible score (6) and Columbia Christian scores 4 on the staying index. The differences are in conduct code (none specified for Columbia Christian) and library hours (Columbia Christian is open on Sundays). Both require chapel, both have a mission and doctrinal statement, and neither offer women's studies.

High Exclusiveness/Affiliation Quadrant. *Exclusive membership:* George Fox College and Wheaton College both scored 6, but again, for different variables. Faculty and board members must profess Christianity at both places, but a student profession of faith is only required at Wheaton. There is a requirement that 71% of board members be Quakers at George Fox. Wheaton, although founded by Wesleyan Methodists, is now an independent college, and the board denomination requirement does not apply.

Affiliation: both George Fox and Wheaton belong to the CCC.

Staying culture: Wheaton shows a strong staying culture with a score of 6, and George Fox College a moderately strong culture with a score of 4. Wheaton has a doctrinal statement, George Fox does not; the library is open Sunday afternoons at George Fox, not at all at Wheaton. Otherwise they both require chapel, have a conduct code, mission statement, and do not offer women's studies.

Profile Analysis

Several general conclusions emerge from these profiles. *First: exclusiveness and affiliation associate positively with staying culture. If either of them is present, the staying culture is positively effected.*

Albertson College of Idaho (founded in 1891) is an example of a school with neither exclusive membership nor affiliation, and a low staying culture. While its mission statement mentions a voluntary partnership with the founding Presbyterian denomination, and a perpetuation of basic social, religious and economic values, it does not stress an integration of faith and learning as do schools in the other three quadrants.

North Park College and Bluffton College are, in some ways, anomalies. These schools were religiously founded, lost their religious distinctiveness, and are now choosing to increase *affiliation* to regain distinction as religious institutions (Rickey 1991).

North Park College was founded in Chicago in 1891 by the Evangelical Covenant Church. Though it now claims to be an independent Christian college, it acknowledges continued affiliation with the Evangelical Covenant Church in its school catalogue. Its mission statement endorses a perspective of faith integrated with learning, but is careful not to be too exclusive: "Ours is not a conformist environment: acceptance of diversity and ecumenicity is the spirit of our campus. Our door is open to students who recognize that education always implies values" (Mission statement: 1990-91 catalogue). It states that their mission is to relate liberal arts to the Christian faith in a spirit of open inquiry informed by the conviction that human knowledge has its foundation in God. Both a desire to acknowledge the importance of integrating faith and learning, and the desire to be inclusive (rather than exclusive) in doing so are present.

Bluffton was founded in Bluffton, Ohio, in 1899 by the General Conference of the Mennonite Church, and continues to recognize ties to the church with 11 out of 27 board members required to be denominationally affiliated. While these two schools show staying cultures higher than Linfield and Albertson, they are lower than the remaining schools.

This leads to a second conclusion. Using the variable definitions I chose, *exclusiveness has a stronger association with staying culture than affiliation*. The four schools with high exclusive tendencies exhibit the highest staying cultures.

Christian Heritage and Columbia Christian are schools in the low affiliation/high exclusiveness quadrant. However, both are strongly tied (affiliated) to their churches-- perhaps so exclusively controlled that membership to an organization such as the Christian College Coalition would create a negative draw of power away from the church. Therefore, putting these in a low affiliation cell because they do not belong to the CCC should be interpreted in light of the fact that they may not belong because they are the most exclusive schools of all. It is possible that membership in the Christian College Coalition was not the best indicator choice in ascertaining affiliation. Exploring the significance of church affiliation versus affiliation with an outside organization (such as the CCC) will be an important topic for future research.

Christian Heritage was founded in San Diego in 1970 by Tim LaHaye's church: Scott Memorial Baptist. LaHaye represents fundamental Christianity and Christian Heritage is an attempt to offer a fundamental Christian liberal arts education. It is one of two schools which had a specific doctrinal statement of faith in the catalogue as well as a mission statement. Students new to the area are encouraged to make Scott Memorial Baptist their church home for the years they attend Heritage. After discovering this preliminary data, I was surprised to find that this school offered Women and Family studies. None of the other staying schools had. However, I looked up the descriptions in the catalogue and found the following:

Out of 27 courses, ten were home economic courses (sewing, meal preparation), eight dealt with child-rearing issues, five considered consumer/home management issues, three dealt with personal/profession development issues, and one was an introduction to the field. Christian Heritage's Women and Family studies reinforces traditional roles for women rather than challenges them. (Not surprising if one is familiar with the fundamentalist writings of Tim and Beverly LaHaye. Some of their book titles include: The Battle for the Mind; How to Be Happy Though Married; and The Unhappy Gays: What Everyone Should Know About Homosexuality.)

George Fox College and Wheaton College are both exclusive and have strong affiliations. Both also belong to the Christian College Consortium (a 13 member group which is considered more conservative than the CCC). They differ only slightly in degree from Columbia Christian and Heritage College. Nevertheless, these two schools represent the cleanest picture of how the choice to belong to a group of like-minded organizations led to a sense of exclusiveness regulating who could come inside the boundaries, and the resulting high staying cultures.

Wheaton College is an independent school founded in 1860 in Illinois. Except that Wheaton is not governed by a church, it is most similar to Christian Heritage in staying culture. Wheaton is the only school other than Christian Heritage requiring students to profess Christianity and which closes its library on Sunday.

As noted in Figure 4 (pg.47) although Wheaton and Christian Heritage are from different quadrants, their high staying culture scores match. Columbia Christian and George Fox also match scores, and are also from different quadrants. This unpredicted outcome might be explained by considering denominational differences and the continuum between denominations which are fundamental (rigidly adhering to tenants of faith) and those which are liberal (approaching tenants of faith with an openness toward re-interpretation). For instance, Christian Heritage is a Independent Baptist school, which is a fundamental denomination similar to the General Association of Regular Baptist. George Fox College is a Friends school which is considerably less fundamental (they consider themselves evangelical rather than fundamental) than the Independent Baptist denomination, yet more conservative than Presbyterians. The following table from Boldon (1988) shows each school's founding denomination and corresponding fundamental or non-fundamental standing (no distinction is made between evangelicals and fundamentalists although some of the schools labeled as fundamental are actually evangelical).

This denominational factor appears to be significant as the most secular schools are from non-fundamental denominations. Although I did not consider denominational effect when choosing my independent variables, it obviously adds a helpful contribution to the explanation of these results.

TABLE I
DENOMINATIONAL STANDINGS

Linfield	American Baptist	Non-fundamental
Albertson	Presbyterian	Non-fundamental
Bluffton	Gen. Conf. Mennonite	Non-fundamental
North Park	Evangelical Covenant	Non-fundamental
George Fox	Evangelical Friends	Fundamental
Wheaton	Wesleyan Methodists	Fundamental
Christian Heritage	Independent Baptist	Fundamental
Columbia Christian	Church of Christ*	Fundamental

(* Not to be confused with United Church of Christ which is non-fundamental.)

Comparative Case Studies

With regard to Christian emphasis, Linfield College and George Fox College were similar in the 1950s, (see Table II) and are quite different now in the 1990s (see Table III). I have selected them primarily because of the availability of more in-depth information at these colleges. They do not quite represent the two extremes, but still function as a good comparison of the difference between a "secularized" church founded school, and a "staying" church founded school.

Notice how well the two schools would match on a "staying culture index" in the 1950's. What has been the historical pilgrimage of each school which would account for the variation now apparent in the 1990s?

TABLE II

SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE: LINFIELD/GFC IN 1950s

	<u>Linfield</u>	<u>George Fox</u>
Chapel attendance (required)	5x/week	5x/week
Bib/Religion course requirements	8-10 sem. hrs.	8-10 sem. hrs.
Faculty hiring practices	Profession of faith necessary	Profession of faith necessary
Purpose statement	Christian educ. strong emphasis	Christian educ. strong emphasis
Conduct Code	No social dancing, card playing, use of alcohol, tobacco. Church attendance expected.	

TABLE III

SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE: LINFIELD/GFC IN 1990s

	<u>Linfield</u>	<u>George Fox</u>
Chapel attendance (required)	None	2x/week
Bib/Religion course requirements	5 term hrs. philosophy or religion	8-10 sem. hrs.
Faculty hiring practices	No profession of faith necessary	Profession of faith necessary
Purpose statement	One statement of 15 mentioned supportive of Christianity	Four statements of 9 have strong Christian emphasis "faith integrated with learning"
Conduct Code	No conduct code	No use of alco- hol, illegal drugs tobacco, immoral sexual behavior "on or off campus"

Linfield College. Linfield College, founded in McMinnville in 1855 by the American Baptist denomination, maintained its distinctiveness as a Christian liberal arts college for 100 years (Holmes 1956). But ten years after Holmes history had been published, the school catalogue showed major shifts away from an emphasis on Christian college distinctiveness. This shift continued, until, by 1976, evidence of faith on campus was relegated to the chaplain's office.

When asked what contributed to Linfield's shift in emphasis, Linfield sociologist Paul Howard said Linfield merely followed the secularizing evolution in education along with the dominant culture, changing in response to the students' needs and wants. Howard, who has been at the college for 27 years, said the changes mostly came gradually. The visitation privileges between men's and women's dorm rooms occurred over a number of years. First visitation was granted, with doors open. Negotiations on how wide the door had to be open took place over a number of years. It graduated from all the way open, to "a crack big enough for a matchbook", (with discussions about whether the matchbook was to lie flat or could be on its side), to an eventual acceptance of closed doors. Howard said the no drinking on campus policy was changed more rapidly. It was known students left campus to drink anyway, driving up infamous and winding Peavine Road to their drinking spot. Shortly after an alcohol-related accident which killed three women students, a policy allowing alcohol on campus was instigated.

American Baptists are not as doctrinally evangelical as Quakers. As such, both Dr. Howard and the campus chaplain Dr. Apel emphasized that Linfield was never evangelical in the same way George Fox has been. Linfield was intended to be a school where middle-class youth could get an education. They strove to be non-elitist and to attract students from a diversity of religious (or non-religious) backgrounds.

Howard cannot remember compulsory chapel ever being a community-building activity because students resented the requirement to attend. Linfield began offering optional campus activities that qualified for chapel attendance, such as bringing in special speakers who spoke on non-religious topics. Eventually however, Linfield dropped the chapel requirement altogether.

Although Linfield fell into a state of financial crisis in the 1960s, Howard does not believe this played a part in the secularizing process. Linfield was already moving more toward inclusivity and diversity of religious faith. Their mission was to provide as excellent an education to undergraduate students as possible, and they looked for faculty candidates with strong credentials and teaching ability rather than candidates with a strong faith. Howard says that although faculty are encouraged to publish, teaching is the primary emphasis.

Linfield benefits from its connections to the American Baptist denomination, and they maintain them with a requirement that 29 percent of the board belong to American Baptist

churches. There have been factions which have wanted to break away from the denomination altogether, not because of control issues (the American Baptist are a congregationally-ruled denomination, and as such, do not attempt to govern or control Linfield) but because of identity issues. Those wanting to break away are from other religious traditions, or none at all, and prefer Linfield not specifically identify with any one denomination. Howard does not think disassociation is likely. He says connections give them some financial support (though not substantial enough to be crucial), as well as relationships and connections to people in the denomination for purposes of endowment building and recruitment of students. Although he acknowledges these may not be significant (i.e. a minority of students are American Baptist) it allows them to be "a big fish in a little pond, rather than a little fish in a big pond." The identity by affiliation is one still valued by the college president and others with power to maintain it.

Linfield's move toward secularization is not complete. Changes are still occurring in the 1990s. It was only a few years ago that prayer before faculty meetings was dropped because a constituency of the faculty protested the prayers were not consistent with their own faith.

Linfield now offers a women's studies curriculum, students take either a course in religion or philosophy, and remnants from earlier days are primarily visible via the campus ministry program directed by the chaplain.

George Fox College. George Fox College was founded in Newberg in 1891 as a Quaker institution for learning. Quakers in the 19th century wanted their youth to marry within the denomination, and establishing a distinctively Quaker college in an area with a large Quaker population helped ensure this would become a reality for a number of Quaker men and women. The school barely survived its first fifty years. Survival is attributed to strong community support (donations from community members came at critical times), strong commitment among the Quaker churches in the state and among a faculty willing to give up 40% (and sometime all) of their salaries during the depression (Beebe 1991:42).

Although in the 1950s George Fox and Linfield looked similarly conservative, in the 1930s George Fox was torn between factions wanting it to become a Bible College and factions wanting it to go the way of a liberal college (Beebe 1991). The Quaker Yearly Meeting was attempting to pull the college toward the fundamental side, and turn it into a Bible college. Although the president of the school, Levi Pennington, was decidedly with the group wanting to move the college in a liberal direction, his goal was to bring the two extreme positions to the middle. Pennington was president for thirty years, and perceived as a tower of strength. Yet the faculty lacked consensus on which side of the modernity debate they should reside. Pennington's retirement gave the conservative Yearly Meeting an opportunity to regain control and "rescue"

the college from a potential shift toward secularization. Within five years of Pennington's retirement they had a president suited to their conservative agenda. However, George Fox did not become a Bible College, but retained the liberal arts college emphasis pursued under Pennington's leadership.

As Linfield values its American Baptist roots, so George Fox values its Quaker roots. The rewards are similar (as are the minimal returns on those rewards--they also do not receive significant financial support). And, like Linfield, there have been factions in the faculty and administration who would like to drop, or significantly loosen, the denominational ties. Some feel being non-denominational would broaden George Fox's appeal for student recruitment. But for the present anyway, loosening or dropping ties seems unlikely.

George Fox appears to be moving forward, though in small increments, along the continuum of secularization. Recognizing a need to offer an education in keeping with the demands of students, it is making changes. Although women's studies are not offered, a course called, "Women in the Bible" has been available, and this year for the first time, a course called "Gender issues in psychology" is being offered. Chapel and Bible course requirements have been reduced. This year for the first time the library is open a few hours Sunday afternoons.

When asked candidly about the pressures George Fox faces in struggling to resist secularization, sociology professor Mike Allen suggested the following. First is the pressure to become more inclusive rather than exclusive when the student

body count is low, and second, is to emphasize professionalism and expertise in faculty above Christian devotion and commitment. I have asked five or six other faculty what they think are the pressures facing George Fox, and they each respond with similar concerns. These coincide well with the factors identified by Burtchaell (1991) in his discussion of the pressures faced by Vanderbilt prior to secularization. Allen has taught at George Fox for fifteen years. He believes the college is moving slowly toward secularization. George Fox is reorganizing into three schools, each with a separate dean under one vice president. According to Allen, as the school grows, specializes and compartmentalizes, the college's sense of interdependency and need for community breaks down. As the school adopts graduate programs in business and education which are not primarily Christian in approach, the pervasiveness of Christianity on campus diminishes. Will George Fox eventually relegate "religion" to a department as many other church founded schools have? Some faculty unsure of the changes on campus wonder.

Both Deb Lacey, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and Allen say the emphasis on scholarly production is diminishing the prior emphasis on mentoring relationships with students. Also weakening the community, according to Allen, is a sense of competition taking precedence over cooperation as individual recognition is emphasized over community recognition.

However, compared to Linfield, George Fox still has a strong sense of community. Recruitment of faculty still implies a total life style commitment. Faculty are to emphasize faith and integration in teaching (student course evaluations address how well faith was integrated); publish in Christian publications (as well as professional/academic); participate actively in a local church, and maintain an active and growing Christian faith and lifestyle (which, at George Fox, also includes abstaining from alcohol).

Dirk Barram, Vice President of Academic Affairs at George Fox, compared his experience at Judson Baptist College with George Fox. He said, "The community was stronger at Judson-- not because it was more fundamental, but because Judson was struggling to survive, and community members were striving together in their efforts to help the college succeed." Barram feels the success and growth at George Fox in recent years does make it more vulnerable to secularization via a breakdown of community and a lost sense of mission. He feels more attention may need to be given the borders. For instance, George Fox may need to admit fewer athletes on the basis of how well they perform athletically and consider instead how well they fit into the George Fox community. Barram and Lacy feel the need to increase the effort given to maintaining community in light of the rapid growth and specialization. Both Barram and Lacy are motivated to protect George Fox's mission, and each has

strategically been given a position with influential power regarding boundary maintenance strategies.

A Comparative Summary of Linfield and George Fox

The following four observations emerge from this comparative study. First, both George Fox and Linfield are non-apologetic about the stance they have taken toward secularization. Linfield has been more open to secularization as an American Baptist (non-fundamental) denomination. When more federal funding became available by being inclusive rather than exclusive, they had no apparent difficulty making the necessary changes. Indeed, one might surmise they welcomed modernity and the challenge to offer an education in keeping with the needs of the country and the desires of the majority. George Fox openly fought against a move toward secularization in the 1930s and has willingly accepted a smaller piece of the federal money pie to ensure the freedom to maintain their mission, and be as exclusive in hiring and admitting practices as they deem necessary to protect the community they offer. They welcome the challenge to maintain a distinction which educates and builds the whole person--the emotional, spiritual, and intellectual. They believe their way of life represents a truth worth preserving and protecting against the secularizing tide.

Second, it is interesting to note that although George Fox and Linfield are at odds in most respects, they are similar in valuing their church affiliations. It could be argued that

the affiliations are more present at George Fox (with events such as "Quaker emphasis week"), but the surprise for me was realizing a school as secularized as Linfield still values the ties at all.

A third observation is that the cultures at both schools have changed. This thesis is not about how some schools changed and others did not, but rather a question of rate and magnitude. Both schools are growing, specializing, and offering programs that demand greater flexibility. George Fox does not insist the older students attending the one night a week degree completion program refrain from alcohol. How long will it take before traditional students note the discrepancy and demand the freedom to drink alcohol off campus? George Fox's visitation privileges have also evolved over time. Currently hours are specified when men and women may be in each other's rooms. Until last year the doors had to be open. This year they are suppose to be shut because the fire code now dictates closed doors. Perhaps matchbooks never entered the discussion because, first of all, smoking is prohibited (who would have matchbooks?) and second, it is *expected* that no prohibited sexual activity will take place behind closed doors, on or off campus.

This leads to the final observation. Although both schools have experienced campus culture changes, the sense of community is more vital at one than the other. When asked, Dr. Howard could not articulate a sense of community at Linfield.

He could discuss their goal of offering as excellent an undergraduate education as possible, he could discuss how chapel never contributed to a sense of community because students resented going, but he could not describe how the concept of "community" might fit Linfield. It did not seem an appropriate word to use when discussing the nature of what Linfield was about.

This contrasts sharply to Professor Allen, and Dr. Barram, for whom the sense of community is a central focus of what George Fox is about. They easily talk about barriers to community, what needs to happen to enhance community, and describe what it means to them for George Fox to be a community.

It is possible this difference concerning community is between informants rather than between colleges, or that community is a concept widely discussed at George Fox but not at Linfield. Nevertheless, both schools contribute something unique to the student looking for a liberal arts education. One offers an inclusive, diverse liberal arts approach, in line with the dominant culture, the other offers a whole life approach to education, as defined within the enclaves of evangelicalism.

Summary

When one looks at the data from all eight schools, two general conclusions emerge regarding affiliation and exclusiveness as indicators of staying cultures. First, the

data support an intentional community argument as seen in the association of boundary maintenance strategies such as affiliation and exclusiveness. Intentional community, was defined in this thesis as *a group (or groups) of people committed to the centrality of shared beliefs considered vital to the organization, who define clear boundaries of those belonging inside or outside the community, and who actively engage in boundary maintenance activities.* The two schools which strayed from the centrality of a once-shared religious belief and who stopped guarding their borders, conformed to the external pressures to secularize. The schools which still guard membership borders continue to also be committed to the centrality of shared beliefs, and have resisted secularization.

Second, the data indicate affiliation as described by membership to the CCC is less significant as an indicator than exclusiveness. Affiliation with a *controlling* church appears to be equally powerful (as seen in comparing Christian Heritage to Wheaton). The argument could be made that affiliation with a church which excludes other affiliations is an extreme form of exclusiveness. This may be explained by considering affiliation and exclusiveness as opposite sides of the same coin.

I return to Berger's (1990) statement that those wishing to hold onto a minority position must huddle together with other like-minded fellows. If "huddling" suggests exclusiveness, and "like-minded" can be affiliation, then these data

support an intentional community which depends on boundary maintenance strategies as these.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

SOCIAL REPRODUCTION THEORIES REVISITED

The question is not which schools' paths can be explained by social reproduction--as discussed in chapter two, they all can be. Rather the question is which cultural norms are being reproduced by various educational institutions? As Durkheim and others noted, education is a tool by which culture perpetuates its values. Durkheim suggested each type of people offers its own appropriate education (1955:28). Some rigid institutions (staying schools) live within their own cultural enclaves, and desire to reproduce their own way of life. Others are fair institutions (straying schools) which started with one mission (reflecting the dominant culture at that time), but adapted because they understood and accepted the underlying mission as one of serving the culture. Besides, it ensured their survival. Still others (public institutions) were open systems from the start, created by the state to interact with the dominant culture, and reproduce the necessary tools to meet the modernizing needs of the dominant society.

State-centered pressures were felt differently by each kind of institution. Public institutions did not have any reason to feel antagonism toward the state which created and sustained them. They understood their mission of preparing

people to meet the technological demands of society and embraced it without resistance.

The majority of schools such as Linfield, which were founded with a mission of integrating faith with learning, responded to state-centered pressures by conforming. They functioned as religious schools when that was the dominant culture for education. But as non-fundamental institutions they felt little need to resist secularization, especially in light of the government's incentives to secularize.

However, a few schools "stayed". As rigid minorities, they perceived secularization to be a threat to their founding purpose. They created structures which allowed them to exist as cultural enclaves within a dominant culture constantly pressuring them to conform. Their boundary maintenance strategies seem to be working--reflected in varying degrees in six of the school cultures this study examined.

WHAT EXACTLY IS THE ENCLAVE?

An enclave is an isolated institution whose members passionately believe in a way of life that is radically different from the majority (Jencks & Reisman 1977:330). The underlying assumption (and my initial one in this thesis) has suggested that the institutions themselves are the enclaves. But if the nature of educational institutions is to serve and perpetuate a culture, then what culture is the institution serving? Itself? Probably not. The enclave is likely broader than the institution itself.

Can the organization to which the institution affiliates be the enclave? Not if we think it is the Christian College Coalition. The CCC is too diffuse an organization, and represents too broad a spectrum of schools (as seen in comparisons between North Park and Wheaton). Besides, it was not strongly associated with resisting secularization in this study.

Perhaps the enclave is the school's founding denomination--or perhaps the broader circle of fundamental and evangelical denominations. The chart on page 57 shows the fundamental (or evangelical) versus non-fundamental standing of each of the denominations represented in this study. Without exception the staying schools were founded by fundamental or evangelical denominations. The denomination is able to provide the educational institution a culture to be reproduced. And if the denomination sets rigid boundaries, then it requires the school (a tool for social reproduction) to set rigid boundaries as well.

The percentage of board members required to belong to the denomination becomes significant as one considers the boundary-defining job of boards. They decide the criterion for faculty hiring and admission policies.

In addition to providing boundaries, the denomination may need to provide resources. For instance, George Fox College has maintained denominational ties and the catalogue and members of the school mention identity, student constituency, and some

money as benefits gained from the affiliation. If resources are not provided, at least sometimes, the school dies, as in the case of Judson Baptist College. The college was founded in 1955 by Hinson Memorial Baptist church, and closed in 1984. The failure was a financial crisis it could not survive. However, Dirk Barram, who worked as Student Dean at Judson for its last eight years gives the underlying reason he believes it failed.

Hinson Memorial Baptist is a Conservative Baptist (fundamental) church. The denomination never accepted the liberal arts concept. (There are now no Conservative Baptist liberal arts colleges, only Bible schools). Judson felt the tensions of being connected with an anti-intellectual denomination which was skeptical of their "liberal" mindset. The school needed denominational support to survive. This would have given the school a much needed affiliation (it did not belong to the CCC) that would have provided ideological support, sent students, money, and given the school an identity. Instead the denomination mostly ignored the school.

Affiliation in Judson's case was critical for survival. Perhaps schools like Judson could have secularized and survived. Perhaps for fundamental denominations, secularization is never a viable option. Perhaps the schools that closed were the most fundamental, and therefore doomed to fail because of the inherent incompatibility of anti-intellectualism and the academic enterprise.

The histories by Butts (1939, 1955), Brown (1952), Burr (1961) Power (1991) and Cremin (1988) did not discuss specific college failures and the reasons for their failures. It seems most often assumed they failed due to a lack of financial resources. Looking for an association between fundamentalism and failures is an interesting area for future study.

Judson failed because affiliations did not provide sufficient resources for survival, and except for the secular culture, it had no viable culture to reproduce. And so I return to a primary conclusion from this study: fundamental/evangelical denominations are the enclaves. And inside them are specific institutions--communities structured to reproduce the enclave they represent.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH

Denominationalism (especially fundamental/evangelical versus non-fundamental) emerged as the unforeseen important factor, the surprising variable. The ideology of the founding denomination helps answer the motivation question: why does any *particular* school resist secularization? Fundamental/evangelical schools resist because their nature is to be separate from the world. As the saying goes, "in the world, but not of the world." Future work could study the question by considering denominational founding as an independent variable and campus culture as the dependent variable. This would require a larger sample of liberal arts colleges.

Generalizability is an open question with case study comparisons due to the small number involved and the imprecision of qualitative methodology (Marshall & Rossman 1989). Therefore, this research cannot accurately be used to predict the future of other church-founded colleges. However, the theoretical conception offered here is broader than previous work. It embraces three types of higher education systems: public, church-founded colleges which conformed to state-centered demands, and church-founded colleges which resisted state-centered demands. At a general level the intentional community concept can be applied to all college communities as each school attempts to promote its own distinctive culture. The theory can be applied fruitfully to study the way that other religious colleges, such as Brigham Young, Brandeis, or Pepperdine resisted or accommodated state-centered demands.

Nevertheless, fundamental/evangelical colleges are a special case and cannot be lumped together with other religiously affiliated colleges. Notably they are small. Perhaps small size is necessary for controlling boundaries. The greater complexity of larger universities would likely overburden boundary maintenance strategies practiced by these colleges. These schools are also residential. Students live on campus, and in most cases are expected to abide by a specified conduct code. And these schools have an intentional recruitment policy which only allows those faculty and students into the school who will conform to the mission.

But modifications of this study could be made to explore other religious schools. This would involve two things. First, learning the distinctives about the culture being reproduced (Jewish, Catholic, or Mormon faith). And second, discovering what campus patterns best demonstrate influence of the enclave rather than the dominant culture in what is being reproduced.

Another limitation in this study is related to the data collection. Although I attempted to obtain valid interviews by selecting people who were respected on campus, had been with the school at least ten years, and who were perceived as having a good sense of the inner workings of the college, validity could not be certain. Some views are likely to have been subjective opinions and not necessarily representative of the community. However, as noted in the text, much of what was said in interviews was supported either in the literature or by other faculty and administrative members. Similarly, college catalogues leave room for error because there is not general consensus on what ought to be included. For instance, it is possible the assumption that the inclusion of a doctrinal statement by some (and the omission of it by others), is not actually significant data, but reflects variations one would expect to find in catalogues.

CONCLUSION

Where are these "staying" institutions headed? Will institutions like Professor Brown's continue to exist?

Burtchaell (1991b) did not think so. He suggested they are all on the path toward secularization and will eventually secularize. Jencks and Riesman (1977) predicted that some would become nonsectarian, some would sell to the state, and some would close, but that the great majority would struggle on, as they have for a century or more, clinging to religious labels to escape complete anonymity. These are rather negative pictures, implying attempts at resisting secularization are doomed to fail or that such schools cling to religious labels merely for the sake of distinction.

An intentional community explanations argues against Burtchaell, and growth trends argue against Jencks and Reisman. Staying schools are "deviant minorities" (a few clinging to a truth in the face of external pressures to conform) rather than conforming schools such as Vanderbilt. They are intentional communities reproducing a different culture altogether. Life will go on for Professor Brown--if he and others remain committed to their communities, and if they continue to guard their boundaries, and so preserve and reproduce their culture.

Although Jencks and Riesman admit some of these schools will survive, they suggest it will be an eked out existence. But growth trends argue against that. For instance, at George Fox College enrollment has been steadily increasing and almost doubled since 1986 (from 549 students to 1223). Programs have also been expanding. They began their degree completion program in 1986, started a graduate school of clinical psychology

(Psy.D.) in 1990 and are beginning two masters programs (in education and Christian studies) in 1992. The Christian College Coalition also demonstrates continued growth as a few new members continue to join each year.

While I began with an analysis of the boundary maintaining strategies and campus cultures, I discovered the importance of embedding within a fundamental/evangelical enclave. The motivating force for these schools to stay is fundamentalism. And it is likely that as long as fundamentalism/evangelicalism continues to demand and support a whole-life, faith-integrated education for its youth, its educational institutions will continue to resist secularization and reproduce their separate culture.

REFERENCES

- Beebe, R. (1992). A heritage to honor, a future to fulfill: George Fox College 1981-1991. Newberg, OR: Barclay Press.
- Berger, B. (1981). The survival of a counterculture. Berkeley, C.A.: University of California Press.
- Berger, P. (1990). A rumor of angels. New York: Anchor Books.
- Bernstein, B. (1977). Ritual in education, Class, codes and control, volume 3, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 2nd ed.
- Boldon, D. (1988). Formal church polity and ecumenical activity. Sociological Analysis. 49, 293-303.
- Bourdieu, P. (1973). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction, in Brown, R. (ed.) Knowledge, education and cultural change, London, Tavistock Publications Ltd.
- Brown, F. (1952). in American universities and colleges. New York: Charles Scribner & Sons.
- Burr, N. (1961). A critical bibliography of religion in America. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Burtchaell, J. (1991). The decline and fall of the Christian college (I). First Things: A monthly journal of religion and public life. April, 16-30.
- Burtchaell, J. (1991). The decline and fall of the Christian college (II). First Things: A monthly journal of religion and public life. May, 30-38.
- Butts, F. (1939). The college charts its course: historical conceptions and current proposals. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Butts, F.R. (1955) Cultural history of western education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

- Coser, L. (1974). Greedy institutions; patterns of undivided commitment. New York: Free Press.
- Cremin, L. (1988). American education, the metropolitan experience. New York: Harper and Row.
- Deutsch, K. (1966). The nerves of government: models of political communication and control. New York: Free Press.
- DiMaggio P., Powell, W., (1983). Institutional Isomorphism. American Sociological Review. 48, 147-160.
- Durkheim, E. (1956). Education and sociology. New York, The Free Press.
- Holmes, K.C., Ed. (1956). Linfield's Hundred Years. Portland, OR: Binfords and Mort, Pub.
- Hunter, J.D. (1987). Evangelicalism: the coming generation. Chicago: The university of Chicago press.
- Jencks, C. & Riesman, D. (1977). The academic revolution. Chicago: The university of Chicago press.
- Kanter, R.M. (1972). Commitment and community: communes and utopias in sociological perspective. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- MacDonald, M. (1977). Curriculum and Cultural Reproduction. Great Britain: The Open University Press.
- Marsden, G.M. (1991). The soul of the American University. First Things: A monthly journal of religion and public life. Jan. 34-47.
- Marshall, and Rossman (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Martin, W.R. (1982). College of character. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications.
- Mayberry, M. (1988). Doing it their way. Dissertation. University of Oregon.

- Mayers, M., Richards, L., Webber, R., (1972). Reshaping Evangelical Higher Education. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Pub. House.
- McMinn, L., Liebman, R. (1991). Strayers and stayers: rethinking the secularization of religiously-affiliated colleges. Presented at the 1991 Annual Meetings of the Association for the Sociology of religion.
- Moscovici, S. (1980). Toward a theory of conversion behavior. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 13, 209-213.
- Pace, Robert C. (1972) Education and evangelism: a profile of protestant colleges. New York: McGraw Hill Publishing Co.
- Power, E.J. (1991) A legacy of learning: a history of western education. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Ringenberg, W.C. (1984). The Christian college: a history of protestant higher education in America. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Christian University Press.
- Rose, S.D. (1988). Keeping them out of the hands of Satan: evangelical schooling in America. New York: Routledge.
- Solberg, R.W. (1985) Luthern higher education in North America. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
- Scott, R.C. (1987). Organizations: rational, natural, and open systems. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Wicke, Myron F. (1964). The church related college. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied research in Education, Inc.
- Zablonki, B. (1980.) The joyful community. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- College catalogues from Albertson College of Idaho, Bluffton, Christian Heritage, Columbia Christian, George Fox, Linfield, North Park, and Wheaton.

Interviews

Allen, M. (1991, 1992) professor of sociology, George Fox College.

Apel, W. (1991) chaplain, Linfield College.

Barram, D. (1992) vice president for academic affairs, George Fox College.

Howard, P. (1992) professor of sociology, Linfield College.

Lacy, D. (1991) vice president for student affairs, George Fox College.

Longman, K. (1991) vice president of CCC.

Rickey, J. (1992) Regional Director for D.M. Dagley.

APPENDIX A

INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Independent Variable Specifications and Coding

Exclusiveness Index

- 1) Do hiring practices require full-time faculty to profess Christianity? (2 points for "yes"; 1 point for "yes with exceptions"; 0 points for "no")
- 2) Do admission policies require students to profess Christianity? (2 points for "yes"; 0 points for "no")
- 3) What percentage of the board members have to belong to the founding denomination? (2 points for >50%; 1 point for 1-49%; 0 points for 0%)
- 4) What percentage of the board must profess Christianity? (2 points for >50%; 1 point for 1-49%; 0 points for 0%)

Affiliation index

- 1) Does the school belong to Christian College Coalition? (Colleges belonging to the CCC have high affiliation boundaries.)

Dependent Variable Specifications and Coding

Staying Culture Index

- 1) Is chapel required? (1 point for "yes")
- 2) Does a conduct code prohibit alcohol and smoking on campus? (1 point for "yes")
- 3) Does a mission statement integrate faith and learning? (1 point for "yes")
- 4) Is there a doctrinal statement? (1 point for "yes")
- 5) Is the library open for any part of the day on Sundays? (1 point for "no")
- 6) Are women studies courses offered? (1 point for "no")

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

- Q1. Must faculty profess Christianity?
1. Yes 2. No
- Q2. Must students profess Christianity?
1. Yes 2. No
- Q3. Is there an on and off campus conduct code prohibiting alcohol and smoking?
1. Yes 2. No
- Q4. Is chapel required?
1. Yes 2. No
- Q5. Is the institution a member of the CCC?
1. Yes 2. No
- Q6. Does the institution claim ties to the founding church by mentioning them in the catalogue?
1. Yes 2. No
- Q7. Is there a mission statement in the catalogue which states a "faith integrated with learning" perspective?
1. Yes 2. No
- Q8. Does the institution offer women's studies?
1. Yes 2. No
- Q9. Is the institution's library open on Sundays?
1. Yes 2. No
- Q10. What percent of board members must profess Christianity?
1. 0% 2. less than 49% 3. more than 50%
- Q11. What percent of board members must be from the founding denomination?
1. 0% 2. less than 49% 3. more than 50%