A PERSONAL INTERVIEW SURVEY

OF

COLLEGE ECONOMICS TEACHERS

Conducted for the
American Iron and Steel Institute

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

Peter H. Rossi, Director
Herbert Goldstein, Business Manager

Responsible for this study:

Ann F. Brunswick
Associate Study Director

Paul B. Sheatsley
Eastern Representative

Report No. 79

July 1961

PREFACE

This report describes the objectives, methodology and findings of a personal interview study of college economics instructors conducted by the National Opinion Research Center on behalf of the American Iron and Steel Institute.

In a separate appendix we present, as well, a full set of tables showing the percentaged distribution of response to each question asked, tabulated separately for each of the sample groups:

1) Members of the American Economics Association
2) Combined total of subscribers to AISI publications
3) Subscribers to Steel Facts
4) Subscribers to Steelways
5) Receivers of "Inflation, Productivity, Profits and the Steelworker"
6) Instructors teaching in Liberal Arts economics departments
7) Instructors teaching in the economics departments of undergraduate schools of Business or Business Administration

Because our two basic samples, one drawn from the AEA membership generally, the other from Institute mailing lists, could not be combined, and because each is too small for intensive cross-tabulation, this study must be regarded as an exploratory one. Certainly the percentaged figures, which are usually based on 200 cases or less, must be viewed as the approximations which they are, rather than as precise estimates.

The descriptive findings nevertheless provide, for the first time, a detailed profile of the population of college economics teachers: their personal and professional characteristics, their reactions to the programs and materials of the various economic interest groups, and their own evaluations of the present economics curriculum.

The reader should bear in mind throughout that the AEA sample is presumed to be representative of all economics instructors. The subscriber sample, in contrast, is representative only of that special group of instructors who are known to receive at least one AISI publication. In generalizing about undergraduate economics teachers as a group, we have naturally leaned most heavily on the responses of the AEA sample, but whenever the AISI subscribers have shown significant differences, these are pointed out in the report.

We have not considered ourselves competent to assess the implications of these findings from the standpoint of AISI nor to draw up a list of specific recommendations. We prefer to leave such action to those more familiar with the sponsor's needs and goals in this area, and to the professional economist who can communicate the needed materials to his colleagues. We do submit this report in the expectation that the findings will provide the Institute with the necessary guidelines for whatever program it chooses to undertake.

We should make special acknowledgement of the helpful advice received throughout the planning and execution of this study from Roger Fox of the sponsoring organization; from Albert L. Ayars and Bertis E. Capehart of Hill & Knowlton, Inc., and from Peter H. Rossi and Paul N. Borsky of NORC.

In addition to these, we wish to thank Dr. George Fersch of the Joint Council on Economic Education for his help during the development of the interview schedule; Dr. Percy Guyton, also of the Joint Council, for his advice on classifying and coding the abundant free-answer material; and the Datatab Corp. for their efficient and careful preparation of IBM cards and machine tabulations.

Despite all of the above assistance, the authors take full responsibility for all facts and interpretations reported herein, and any errors or weaknesses are theirs alone.

Ann F. Brunswick
Paul B. Sheatsley

National Opinion Research Center
100 Fifth Ave. New York 11,N.Y.

C O N T E N T S

SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS

Personal Characteristics of the Teachers

Most teachers in our sample of undergraduate economics instructors are young men. Four out of five are under 50, and a third of them are younger than 35. Their average income from all sources is about $9,000 per year.

They differ from most other population groups in that two out of three come from business and professional families, and also in the relatively large number who report that they or their father were born abroad. A full quarter of these economics teachers profess to no religion, a fact which further distinguishes them from most other segments of the population.

Only about one instructor in ten calls himself a Republican. Half of them claim a Democratic preference, with almost all of the others stating that they are "independent." In the 1960 Presidential election, four out of five of those voting cast their ballot for Kennedy. Of those voting in the 1956 election, three out of four preferred Stevenson to Eisenhower.

Consistent with their Democratic political preference, almost three-fourths of the undergraduate economics teachers believe the federal government should take a greater role in the national economy. Specifically, they most often mention education, full employment and economic growth, public health, and urban problems as areas calling for greater government participation. Only one instructor in six would have the federal government reduce its role in the national economy.

The teachers do not seem particularly active in community affairs. Fewer than half belong to any local group or organization, and the majority appear to restrict their social contacts to fellow faculty members.

Their non-professional reading habits also reflect an intellectual orientation. They read a great many magazines, but these are almost entirely news, business or "egghead" magazines.

Their Professional Characteristics

Three out of four college economics teachers whom we interviewed hold the Ph.D. degree. Only 4% have only the B.A. or B.S.

The great majority are found in the larger colleges and universities of over 2,500 students. Half are teaching only in Liberal Arts institutions, a little over a third in Schools of Business Administration; the remainder are in Schools of Commerce or divide their time between two types of school.

Three out of five of these instructors are teaching a general introductory "Principles of Economics" course, but most teach other courses as well. Almost half teach three or more. They average about ten years' teaching experience and one out of four is a full professor or department head.

The average teacher in our sample belongs to three professional societies or associations, and four out of five attended at least one professional conference during the 18 months preceding our interview.

Almost all of them read the American Economics Review regularly, and the average teacher reads four other professional journals as well. Most frequently mentioned are the Journal of Political Economy, Quarterly Journal of Economics, Review of Economics and Statistics, and Economics Journal.

Three-fourths have published at least one professional paper and almost half have authored or co-authored a book on some phase of economics.

Though the teachers do not seem to take much social part in community affairs, almost half of them have at one time or another performed some kind of professional activity in the community: participation in panel discussions, talks before local groups, etc. In addition, three teachers out of five have served as consultants to some organization outside the college, most usually with business or industry.

Two out of three of our college economics instructors spent last summer working, most usually teaching, writing or doing research, or consulting. Only 6% have ever participated in an industry sponsored summer employment program, although 14% of the subscribers to AISI materials report such experience. Reactions of those who did participate were uniformly favorable.

About a third have at one time or another combined a full-time or part-time job with their teaching position, and one teacher in four has held an outside job, in addition to his teaching, during the last five years. Largely as a result of their summertime and other professional activities, only three teachers in ten are dependent entirely upon their teaching salaries.

The Programs of Economic Interest Groups

Almost half the teachers express interest in educational materials prepared by industry groups; slightly fewer are interested in materials prepared by labor groups; fewer than a third express much interest in materials prepared by farm groups.

Most instructors who are interested in industry materials are also interested in labor materials. The AISI subscribers tend to be more interested than other teachers in both types of material.

If we include those who say they are "slightly interested," four teachers out of five evidence at least some interest in materials prepared by industry. A majority indicate they could put such materials to use in the classes they teach.

Those who lack any interest in industry-prepared materials (one teacher in five) have two main criticisms: such materials are hopelessly biased, or else they are irrelevant to the courses the instructor teaches. But these same criticisms are raised with equal frequency against labor materials by those teachers who are not interested in those.

When asked for suggestions for improving industry's materials, those who take at least some interest in them have two suggestions: make them more factual and objective, less promotional; and gear them more closely to the college audience by putting them on a more scholarly and analytical level.

The instructors are well aware of the publications of outside groups and agencies. When shown a list of 25 such organizations, 80% or more of the teachers expressed familiarity with 15 of them. The materials of only four of the 25 had been seen by fewer than half of the teachers.

The outside materials most appreciated by undergraduate economics teachers are those issued by government agencies, foundations and non-partisan research groups; e.g., Brookings Institution, Committee for Economic Development, Joint Economic Committee, Twentieth Century Fund, etc.

The outside materials most often rated as "of little use" are those issued by special interest groups and by two foundations who are apparently regarded by many teachers as mere spokesmen for a particular economic viewpoint. Examples of materials most often rated as of little use are those published by the National Association of Manufacturers, Foundation for Economic Education, American Economic Foundation, American Petroleum Institute, General Motors, DuPont, etc.

Publications of the American Iron and Steel Institute have achieved surprising penetration. Four out of five instructors have actually seen them and almost all the others are at least aware of them. This is significantly better distribution than has been obtained by General Motors, for example, or by DuPont, the Foundation for Economic Education, or even the Joint Council on Economic Education.

As a special interest group, AISI can scarcely expect its publications to be rated as useful as those of government agencies or of the major foundations engaged in economic research. Yet 20% of the teachers say the AISI materials are "essential" or "very useful," and another 47% regard them as "moderately useful" -- a total of two instructors out of three who find them of at least occasional help.

This achievement would seem particularly noteworthy since the AISI publications have generally been prepared for a broader audience than the college economics teacher. It should be pointed out, moreover, that these responses were made at a time in the interview before any industry, organization or publication had been singled out for special inquiry. Thus there was no opportunity for response bias in favor of one group rather than of another.

Although nine teachers in ten say they attend professional meetings at least occasionally, and most of these say they look at the eudcational exhibits shown there, the majority cannot think of any particular exhibits which impressed them, either favorably or unfavorably. Those most often cited were the textbook exhibits prepared by the major publishing houses.

Only thirteen respondents remarked on AISI or steel industry exhibits, and reactions were mixed. Five teachers out of six had no ideas at all on how to improve exhibits to make them more valuable.

One teacher in eight (but one in five of the AISI subscribers) has at one time or another attended a summer economics workshop. Only two respondents with such experience said the workshop was sponsored by AISI.

The minority who have attended a summer economics workshop have found them helpful, and only five or ten percent of the instructors seem hostile to the general idea. The great majority appear indifferent: they have no objections to such workshops, but they have never attended, know little about them and have no ideas as to how they might be made more useful.

The A.I.S.I. Publications

Almost half of the economics teachers read Steel Facts at least occasionally. Steelways and Charting Steel's Progress are read at least occasionally by about one teacher in every six. "Inflation, Productivity, Profits and the Steelworker" was read by about one-fourth of the instructors.

Two-thirds of these readers say they receive their own copies of the periodicals; the remainder see them at the library or read a friend's copy. Approximately half of the readers of each publication say they started reading it because "It was sent to me in the mail."

Among teachers sampled from the Steel Facts subscriber list, four out of five read the magazine at least occasionally and 44% read it regularly. Among those sampled from the Steelways list, the same situation prevails. Four out of five say they read Steelways at least occasionally, and half read it regularly.

Steel Facts seems to reach almost all Steelways subscribers, and is in fact read by a higher proportion of the latter than of the Steel Facts list itself. Better than nine in ten of the Steelways subscribers say they read Steel Facts.

Of the three, Steel Facts is most commonly identified as a publication of the American Iron and Steel Institute. Eighty-five percent of the Steel Facts subscribers who read it, and two-thirds of its readers in our general sample correctly identify the source.

About half the readers of Charting Steel's Progress in our general sample say it is published by AISI, but only one out of three readers of Steelways names AISI as the source. Many of the latter's readers believe it is published by U.S. Steel or by Bethlehem Steel.

"Inflation, Productivity, Profits and the Steelworker" was recognized as an AISI publication by only a quarter of its readers in our general sample of economics teachers.

Of the four AISI publications inquired about, the "Inflation, Productivity. . ." article was most often termed helpful to the teacher of economics. About two readers out of five found it very or fairly helpful. The comparable figures for Steel Facts, Steelways and Charting Steel's Progress were 26%, 22% and 18%, respectively.

The AISI subscriber group as a whole was more likely to say that all of these publications are helpful to them, the percentages ranging from about half in the case of "Inflation, Productivity. . .", to about a third for the three periodicals.

The periodicals are most often used by the teacher for his own information, to provide background data about the steel industry. Only about one instructor in ten says he puts these publications to class use.

The three periodicals are most often admired for the factual, current information they provide about the steel industry. "Inflation, Productivity. . .", however, is commended most often for its effective presentation of the steel industry's point of view on a controversial subject.

The great majority of instructors can think of nothing they particularly dislike about the AISI publications. The most frequent complaint is of bias against labor and toward industry, but this is spontaneously mentioned by only about one reader in every six or seven.

When they are asked directly about the degree of bias in the AISI publications, the proportion rises. Over half the "Inflation, Productivity. . ." readers considered it very or fairly biased; two out of five made this charge concerning Steel Facts, and about a quarter of the readers of Steelways and Charting Steel's Progress find them at least "fairly"biased.

In view of the readers' awareness that these publications are issued by a special interest group, however, it is not surprising that substantial numbers of readers should regard them as biased. Some readers, in fact, go on to explain that it is only natural that they should be biased and ask, in effect, "How could it be otherwise?"

More indicative, we believe, of the true amount of objection to the materials because of bias is the fact, cited above, that only about one reader in every six or seven volunteers this criticism when he is asked "What about the publication don't you like so much?" This interpretation seems supported by the finding that "Inflation, Productivity. . .", which was most often accused of bias, was at the same time regarded as the most useful of the four publications, precisely because it provided a clear and effective presentation of the industry's point of view.

Evaluation of the Economics Curriculum

Though the majority of instructors have some criticism to make of the introductory economics curriculum, there was far from consensus on the particular areas most deserving of greater attention. No one suggestion was offered by more than 10% of the sample.

Most instructors are satisfied, however, with the balance struck between theoretical principles and applied problems in the introductory economics classes given at their schools. Fifteen percent complain that too much attention is given to theory, while 10% feel there is too much emphasis on applied problems.

In their own teaching, about 60% of the instructors say they tend to stress theoretical principles, about a quarter say they place greater emphasis on the applied aspects of economics, and the remainder say "It depends" or that they place equal emphasis on both.

Asked generally about particular "economic viewpoints" which are discussed in their classes, three teachers in ten said they did not present or stress any special viewpoint or were unable to answer the question. Another three in ten answered in terms of analytic or scientific viewpoints, referring in their replies to particular schools of economics theory. About one teacher in six indicated hospitality to all kinds of viewpoints. Only a minority answered the question in terms of ideological or special interest group viewpoints.

When asked specifically about the emphasis given to industry's viewpoint and to labor's viewpoint "in today's college economics curriculum," half the instructors express satisfaction with respect to each. Fifty-one percent say that industry's viewpoint receives "the right amount" of emphasis and the same proportion answer "right amount" for the labor viewpoint.

About one instructor in six feels there is too much emphasis on industry's point of view in economics courses today, while about the same proportion complain there is too little. With respect to labor's viewpoint, however, about one teacher in four believes it receives too little emphasis, and only one in ten feels it is stressed too much. / AISI subscribers differ scarcely at all from the general sample in their replies to these questions.

The overwhelming majority of the teachers (86%) believe that "basic values should be brought out in teaching economics," but the instructors differ on just what these basic values are. About 40% answer along the lines of developing enlightened citizenship or encouraging a scientific rather than emotional approach to economic problems.

About one teacher in five mentioned as a basic value in economics some idea concerning individual freedom and choice, often including free enterprise as an extension of the concept. The same proportion saw the basic value of economics in terms of the efficient allocation and use of resources or of economic growth.

Use of Particular Teaching Aids

While only one instructor in twenty says he "frequently" has outside speakers talk to his class, more than half adopt this procedure at least occasionally. Speakers are drawn from a wide variety of sources; business and industry, government agencies, banks and brokerage houses, labor groups, and universities are all mentioned frequently, but none preponderantly. Almost all of those who use outside speakers express satisfaction with the speakers' presentations.

Class visits to local companies and organizations appear to be employed as a teaching aid far less frequently than outside speakers. Only one instructor in five says he ever arranges such visits, though a larger proportion of the AISI subscribers (31%) do so. Again, almost all of those who organize class visits speak favorably of the technique.

Student debates appear to be rarely employed in college economics classes today. Only one teacher in seven ever uses this technique, and only 3% do so regularly.

Audio-visual aids are used by only 29% of the general sample (but by 43% of the AISI subscribers). Movies are the medium most often employed. Instructors who do not make use of audio-visual aids complain that such devices are not appropriate to the courses they teach or that they do not know of any suitable materials.

Three-fourths of the teachers have seen at least one film strip on economics. Those referred to most frequently were issued by commercial publishers such as McGraw-Hill and Prentice-Hall. Film strips dealing with the steel industry were rarely mentioned.

Only one instructor in six considers film strips helpful to him in his teaching. About a third call them "slightly helpful," but half the teachers reject them entirely. The preponderant belief is that presently available film strips are too superficial and not appropriate for teaching at the college level.

I

PURPOSE AND DESIGN OF THE SURVEY

The busy reader may wish to skip this introductory section and may feel free to do so. But we think the study's findings can best be understood if they are preceded by this description of the nature of the survey and the sampling and interviewing procedures employed.

The Objectives

This survey was conducted to provide the American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) with objective data, obtained directly from college economics instructors which would guide the Institute in developing a program of economics education at the college level. Its primary concern was to explore the instructors' reactions to the present undergraduate economics program, with special attention to their needs for materials from an industrial group like AISI.

A second concern of this research was to evaluate exposure and reactions among college economics teachers to various aspects of the Institute's present program, particularly with regard to the use of four publications: Steelways, Steel Facts, Charting Steel's Progress, and "Inflation, Productivity, Profits and the Steelworker."

Though recognizing that these publications had not been developed specifically for the college economics instructor, it was felt that information on how, why, when and by whom among the instructors these materials were used would further our insight into the most appropriate types of materials for use at the college level.

Additionally, to the extent that respondents were familiar with them, reactions to the Institute's convention exhibits and to the workshops and conferences on economics in the college curriculum were part of the stated objectives of the study.

Background Readings

A brief survey of the relevant literature indicated that past inquiries into economics education have focused more on the secondary school level and on teacher training institutions than on the colleges.

The 1950 Supplement to the American Economic Review, "On Teaching Undergraduate Economics" (10)*, and the Brookings Institution 1951 Report (6) were particularly useful in providing background on important problems and issues in undergraduate economics teaching. The Brookings report and the Bibliography prepared by the Joint Council on Economic Education (4) indicated the wide range of organizations which are supplying materials for economics education.

---

* Numbers refer to citations in the Bibliography, Appendix A.

The Academic Mind (5) contained helpful suggestions for classifying instructors according to their professional characteristics. This last publication, along with reports of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (14,15,16,17) provided necessary information for the classification of the colleges represented in our sample.

The Broad Areas of Inquiry

It seemed to us, following our review of the relevant literature and discussions with AISI, that at least seven general areas deserved special investigation in any study of the teachers' receptivity to industry prepared materials. And it was around these seven areas that our interview schedule was constructed. They were:

1) Personal characteristics of the teacher: his age, income, education, place of birth, political orientation and affiliation, community activities, etc.

2) His professional characteristics: teaching rank, areas of specialization, degrees received, schools at which he studied and taught, length of time in teaching, professional group memberships and activities, etc.

3) Characteristics of the college in which the respondent teaches: its size and type, whether primarily Liberal Arts or Business, its geographic location, the size of its economics department, its "control" (e.g., public or private, denominational or non-denominational), the academic quality of the college, etc.

4) The attitudes of the teacher toward the assumptions and emphases now found in the undergraduate economics curriculum, especially with regard to the orientation toward theoretical vs. applied economics, toward economic values and viewpoints, and the teaching of these.

5) The teacher's use of community resources in teaching undergraduate economics; e.g., arranging class visits to community institutions, the use of outside speakers in the classroom, etc.

6) Awareness of needs and gaps in the introductory economics curriculum.

7) Attitudes toward and awareness of materials prepared by economic interest groups, with particular focus on those prepared by AISI.

In developing the questionnaire, two assumptions were made and used rather broadly. First, that any data about attitudes toward and use of AISI materials could be meaningful only in the context of attitudes toward the materials of other industry and interest groups, and of attitudes toward industry's proper role in the total economy.

The second basic assumption was that our attention should be concentrated on the introductory economics course, especially in our questions about needs and gaps in the curriculum. This decision was essential if we were to phrase questions specific enough to elicit comparable replies. The introductory economics course was particularly well suited for this purpose because, of all undergraduate economics classes, these are the largest and most numerous and cover the widest range of economic topics.

The Sampling Design

In line with the two overall objectives of the study -- (1) determining the needs for college economics teaching materials, and (2) the appraisal of reactions to AISI materials now available to educators -- two types of samples were drawn.

To satisfy the first objective, a sample of approximately 270 names was drawn by random means (every 30th name) from the latest listing of the United States membership of the American Economics Association (1).

The second universe from which our sample was drawn consisted of mailing lists for three of the AISI publications: Steelways, Steel Facts and "Inflation, Productivity, Profits and the Steelworker." Each of these was sampled separately to produce a systematic random sample of between 50 and 70 individuals. (Although our original plans entailed sampling also the subscribers to Charting Steel's Progress, this listing was not available to draw from.)

The total sample was designed to provide 250 interviews representative of college economics instructors generally (the AEA sample), and 50 interviews with a representative sample of the mailing list of each of the three AISI publications referred to above. Combining the three independent subscriber samples would give us 150 interviews with teachers presumably exposed to AISI materials.

To reach these numbers, we drew more names than actually needed to allow for expected losses in the field -- about 10%, under the procedures here employed. Thus, our drawing of names provided us with 276 from the AEA Directory, 53 from the Steelways list, 60 from Steel Facts, and 73 from "Inflation, Productivity, Profits and the Steelworker."

Because all four lists overlap to a certain extent, our four samples turned out to have a number of duplications. When these occurred, we aribtrarily assigned the case to the smallest sized sample group. Thus, if a Steelways subscriber also happened to be drawn for our AEA sample, we counted him for assignment purposes only in the former group.

Though each sample name was assigned to only one group (and of course, interviewed only once), for purposes of analysis the "overlap cases", of which there were 14, were included in each of the samples for which they were drawn.

The Sampling Procedure

The mailing list for "Inflation, Productivity, Profits and the Steelworker" indicated what course and at what school the addressee taught. With this information, screening consisted only of separating active undergraduate economics instructors from those who did research or administrative work, who taught only at the graduate level, or who taught other than economics.

The Steelways and Steel Facts lists, however, did not have this information on courses taught, and sometimes showed only the subscriber's home address. To make sure the names we drew were actually undergraduate economics instructors, each was checked against the AEA Handbook. If the person was listed in the Handbook as an undergraduate economics instructor, he was kept in our sample. All others were discarded. In effect, practically the entire mailing lists of these two publications had to be checked in this fashion in order to screen out irrelevant names.

With the lists thus screened and the sampling interval determined on the basis of the size of the listing and the sample size required, the drawing of names proceeded. But there was one further modification of pure random sampling procedures. Respondents had to be accessible to NORC interviewers, which meant their schools had to lie within one or another of NORC's 68 primary sampling units (metropolitan areas and counties) throughout the United States.

Whenever our count landed on a respondent who was otherwise qualified, but whose school was located outside an NORC sampling point, we characterized the school on the basis of three criteria and then took into the sample the next eligible person on the list who taught at a school within an NORC sample point which satisfied these criteria.

The three criteria used in characterizing the schools were: (1) Geographical region: East, Midwest, South or West; (2) Control: Land grant or state, district or federal; county or municipal; private non-denominational; or denominational, and (3) Type: Liberal Arts, School of Business, Teachers College, Junior College.

Substitution Procedure

Though all lists were screened as carefully as possible on the basis of available information, the number of assigned respondents who could not be located at the schools indicated for them, or who turned out to be ineligible for the interview, immeasurably exceeded any expectation. Table 1 shows the dimensions of the problem.

TABLE 1

	AEA	Steel Ways	Steel Facts	"Inflation"	Total Sample
Origianl sample	251	53	49	70	423
Original respondents actually interviewed	79	28	20	52	179
Substitute respondents interviewed.	166	12	31	3	212
Substitute respondents not interviewed	23	20	22	4	69

Only 31% of the AEA group, 53% of Steelways, 41% of Steel Facts, and 74% of "Inflation. ." were found eligible and available for interview. In the case of Steelways, a majority of the substitutes were similarly unqualified or unavailable; to obtain 12 more interviews from this group, a total of 32 potential respondents had to be contacted.

The large number of unavailable respondents seems attributable chiefly to the mobility of these instructors in changing from one school to another, thereby outdating very quickly the lists available to us. The AEA Handbook itself was five years old.

The number of instructors who turned out to be ineligible for the study was due to the incompleteness of the listings; e.g., they did not indicate when an instructor was teaching only graduate courses. A contributing difficulty was the recent trend among business schools to become graduate institutions. The only list which did not have these pitfalls of datedness and incomplete information was that for "Inflation, Productivity, Profits and the Steelworker."

In all, 281 substitutions were made. These, added to the original unduplicated sample of 423, indicate that more than 700 economic teachers had to be drawn for our sample, and attempts made to interview them, in order to obtain our goal of approximately 400 completed interviews with eligible respondents.

Interviewers were instructed to locate their own substitutes for unavailable AEA respondents by interviewing the instructor at the same school who had replaced the originally designated respondent, or who was teaching the most similar course-load. If neither of these instructions was sufficient, the interviewer was told to substitute the instructor at that school whose last initial was closest to the original's.

All substitutions for subscribers, of course, had to be made from the office lists by going back to the originally selected name and choosing instead the next name at a school with similar characteristics of location, control and type. When the lists became so depleted that these criteria could not be met, we relaxed them in the order listed. Actually, in the case of the Steelways list, we finally exhausted all available names within the NORC sampling areas.

The two methods of substitutions employed had the effect of improving the representativeness of the AEA sample, but of introducing a bias into the subscriber sample. By substituting the teacher's replacement when the originally designated AEA member was no longer at the school, the sample was automatically brought up to date and included its full quota of younger and more mobile instructors. When a subscriber was found to be no longer teaching at the school, however, neither he nor his replacement could be interviewed; his substitute had to be some other man on the list who had not changed schools. As a result, the sample of subscribers includes a disproportionate share of older and less mobile teachers.

It should be noted that sample losses due to refusals to be interviewed were extremely low. Of the approximately 700 respondents designated for interview at one time or another, only 5 were lost through refusal. Four others initially refused, but on further explanation and assurance from the office, proceeded with the interview.

The Interviewing

Interviewing was carried out by 45 interviewers of NORC's national staff, at 113 colleges throughout the country. Three-quarters of the interviews lasted between one and two hours.

Each interviewer received as part of his (or more usually, her) working materials an 18-page manual of instructions describing the overall purpose and method of the survey, and offering detailed suggestions on the proper handling of each item in the questionnaire.

Just prior to the interview, each instructor was sent a letter from the NORC Study Director, briefly explaining the nature of the study and the importance of his cooperation, and advising him that an interviewer would soon phone for an appointment.

Interviewers checked with the economics department secretary at each school to ascertain respondents' schedules, and then phoned them for appointments. It was at the point of inquiry with the department secretary that the assigned respondent's unavailability or ineligibility was determined. In such cases, the interviewer forwarded an "Unavailable Report" to the NORC office and the substitution procedure above described went into operation.

At no time was the sponsorship of the survey revealed, lest it affect the interviewers' conduct of the interview or the respondent's willingness to answer freely and frankly. When pressed for information about the sponsor, the interviewer could say only that the survey was sponsored by "a non-profit agency concerned with economics education."

Although such questions were raised quite often, they seldom interfered with the conduct of the interview. Actually, interviewers reported that this sample of college teachers was exceptionally cooperative and, by virtue of their own familiarity with survey methodology, sympathetic to the interviewing process.

In their field reports, filed at the end of their assignments, interviewers recorded very favorable reactions to the study. Only three of the 45 reported indifference or dislike of the assignment, well over half stating that they "enjoyed the whole job."

Biggest difficulties encountered by the field staff, in order of frequency of mention, were reaching professors in order to set up appointments, finding substitutes for those no longer teaching on the campus, and timing the interviews to fit in with the free time available to their respondents. All interviews were conducted at the college at which the instructor taught, during his free time or when his teaching for the day was finished.

Interviewing started on December 5, 1960, was suspended during the Christmas holidays, and resumed in January. The greater part of the interviewing was completed by the end of January, but because of the large number of substitutions required, the last few interviews were not concluded until mid-February, 1961.

A Technical Note on the Sample Groups Described

Our two main sample groups are the cross-section of AEA members and the total of all subscribers (or receivers) of AISI publications. The latter in turn is sometimes broken down into the three subscriber groups sampled: Steelways, Steel Facts, and "Inflation, Productivity, Profits and the Steelworker."

In addition, because almost half of all respondents taught in Business Schools, we thought it important to compare the responses of such teachers with those of instructors employed at Liberal Arts colleges. Since there were not enough interviews to enable us to control for this variable separately for the two main samples, all instructors from both samples were classified as "Liberal Arts" or "Business."

We have noted (P.3) that some members of the AEA sample happened to be also on one of the subscriber lists; that some members of the subscriber sample appeared on more than one list, and that such "overlap cases" appear in each of the samples for which they were drawn.

Introduction of the Liberal Arts vs. Business dichotomy creates further problems of duplication, since 20 of our respondents taught in both the Liberal Arts and the Business School of their university. Moreover, some of the Liberal Arts and Business respondents are shown simultaneously in both AEA and Subscriber columns or are on more than one subscriber list. Table 2 shows the nature and extent of this duplication.

TABLE 2

	No. of Actual Interviews	Overlaps (more than one sample)	Duplicates (Lib.Arts & Business)	Total No. of Cases Tabulated
AEA	245	9	9	263
Steelways	40	-	5	45
Steel Facts . . .	51	3	1	55
"Inflation. ." . .	55	2	5	62
Total. . .	391	14	20	425

To be sure that these duplicated cases were not affecting our results, we made a number of test runs to compare the percentages shown with those we would have obtained had each respondent been classified in but one group. In only one of these runs was there a difference as great as 2%; in all others, the variance was 1% or zero. It is clear, therefore, that the duplications are not only small in number, but also distribute themselves in random fashion over the range of responses so that no particular cell is distorted.

Lacking evidence to the contrary, it is obvious that any differences shown between Liberal Arts and Business respondents could be related to differences between the AEA and Subscriber groups; and, conversely, that any differences between AEA and Subscribers could merely reflect their varying distribution as between Liberal Arts and Business. Table 3, however, shows that the representation in each pair of sample groups is similar, and that differences cannot be ascribed to this factor.

TABLE 3

	Total (425)	AEA (263)	Subscribers (162)	Liberal Arts (233)	Business (192)
AEA.	62%	100%	(4%)	61%	63%
Subscribers. . . .	38	(7%)	100%	39	37
Liberal Arts . . .	55%	54%	56%	100%	(10%)
Business	45	46	44	(9%)	100%

In discussing response differences between samples, we have generally insisted upon a standard of statistical reliability at the 99% confidence level before stating that the difference is a significant one. This means that differences between the AEA and Subscriber, or Liberal Arts and Business, groups should be at least 10% for proportions in the medium range (25% to 75%) and 8 or 9% at the extremes, if we are to be sure they are statistically reliable and not merely a function of the small numbers sampled.

One other point should be made concerning differences between the AEA and Subscriber samples. If it can be assumed that Subscribers are a special group with above average interest in and receptivity to AISI publications, attention to their characteristics, as these may differ from the broader AEA sample, will perhaps help the Institute to devise the most appropriate materials for this particular audience.

But it must be remembered that the AEA and Subscriber groups are not pure and distinct. Among the former are many readers of AISI publications; some of the Subscribers do not read or pay little attention to the materials sent to them. Furthermore, our data indicate that most Subscribers began reading AISI materials, not because of any special interest which led them to seek it out, but because "it was sent to me."

Differences between the two major groups, therefore, may simply reflect the varying and accidental ways in which the Subscribers happened to get on AISI mailing lists, rather than any special qualities about this group which makes them a superior target for industry materials.

II

THE COLLEGE ECONOMICS TEACHER: PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Age

Most teachers of undergraduate economics are young men. (Only 3% are women.) A full third of the AEA sample were under 35 years of age, and only one in five had attained the age of 50.

The Subscriber sample, as shown in Table 4, is very considerably older. Only one in eight is under 35, while more than a third have passed the age of 50. The difference is substantial enough to be well beyond the bounds of chance.

TABLE 4

AGE OF AEA SAMPLE AND SUBSCRIBER GROUPS

	AEA	All Subscribers	Steel Ways	Steel Facts	IPPS
34 years or younger.	34%	12%	7%	9%	18%
35-49 years.	47	51	48	43	60
50 years or older.	19	37	45	48	22
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

It will be recalled that the Handbook from which the AEA sample was drawn was five years old. But only about a third of this originally drawn sample were found available for interview, and there were substituted for these the men, mostly younger, who had replaced them in the department. This procedure provided a built-in method of avoiding the obvious bias in favor of older men which would otherwise result from sampling a 5-year-old roster.

Unavailable or ineligible subscribers, on the other hand, could be replaced only by additional names drawn from the same mailing list. If we can assume that it is the younger professors who are more mobile and thus less often available for interview, it is clear that substitution of other names from the same list would tend to bias the sample toward an older age group.

An additional source of this age bias among the subscriber group is the fact that all Steel Facts and Steelways names had to be checked against the AEA Handbook to be sure they were undergraduate instructors. Thus, any younger men who joined AEA since the Handbook was published are not represented in the sample. It will be noted that the "Inflation, Productivity. . ." list, the only one which did not have to be checked against the AEA Handbook, more nearly reflects the age characteristics of the AEA sample.

Income

The median gross annual income of the college economics teacher is about $9,000. Half of the AEA sample make more than that, half make less. It should be noted that this figure represents total income, and not merely teaching salary. As we shall see in a later section, seven out of ten have other sources of income.

Table 5 shows that high-income professors are more likely to be found on the subscriber lists, and also that Business School teachers are generally better paid than their colleagues in Liberal Arts colleges.

TABLE 5

RESPONDENTS' INCOME

	AEA	Subscribers	Liberal Arts	Business
Under $6,000	11%	4%	10%	7%
$6,000 to $7,999	20	16	21	15
$8,000 to $9,999	21	19	22	18
$10,000 to $15,999	35	39	33	41
$16,000 or more.	13	20	13	19
Not ascertainable.	*	2	1	*
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Because subscribers are more frequently found in the older age groups, we recomputed the income data, controlling for age, and found that below age 50 the AEA-subscriber differences disappear. Above age 50, however, three-fourths of the subscribers but fewer than two-thirds of the AEA sample have incomes of more than $10,000.

Controlling for age has no effect on the Liberal Arts/Business differences shown above. At each age group, there is a clear tendency for Business School teachers to have higher incomes.

Family Background

Table 6 compares the population of college economics teachers, as represented by the AEA sample, with the United States population as a whole and with another professional group -- a national cross-section of physicians -- with respect to nationality and father's occupation. Data for both comparison groups are from a 1955 NORC survey.

One economics teacher in every five was born abroad, and more than two in five report that their father was born outside the United States. Doctors, on the other hand, do not differ at all from the general population, of whom only 9% were born abroad and only 27% have foreign-born fathers.

The fathers of 13% of the AEA group emigrated from Russia, Poland and the Baltic countries; 10% from the British Isles or other Commonwealth countries; and 9% from Germany or Austria.

The subscriber lists reflect the same nationality patterns, 'though to a slightly lesser extent. For example, 35% of all subscribers interviewed, as compared with 42% of the AEA sample, say their father was born outside the United States.

TABLE 6

FAMILY BACKGROUND OF ECONOMICS TEACHERS COMPARED WITH OTHER GROUPS

	AEA	Doctors	U.S. Population
Born outside U.S.	19%	8%	9%
Father born outside U.S.	42%	27%	27%
Father's Occupation:			
Professional	33%	27%	5%
Business, managerial	34	22	12
Farm	8	21	38
White-collar	5	9	4
Blue-collar, service	19	19	38
Not ascertainable	1	2	3

Perhaps because such a large proportion of the teachers and their fathers came here from abroad, the AEA sample is much more likely than the general population, and more likely even than doctors, to report that their father was in business or in one of the professions. Two-thirds of the economics instructors, but only half the doctors and one in six of the general population, report such occupations for their fathers.

In contrast, only 8% of the economics teachers, as compared with 38% of the general population, come from families in which the father was a farmer.

The subscriber sample does not differ significantly from the AEA group with respect to father's occupation, though it is interesting that more Business School teachers (37%) than Liberal Arts (28%) report their father to have been a business owner or manager.

The marital status of the AEA sample is not remarkable, and conforms closely to that of the general population -- except that, being younger, they are less likely to be widowed and more likely to be single (Q.61).* Five out of six are married; only 2% are divorced.

---

* Parenthetical question numbers indicate where full data may be found in the Appendix Tables.

Religion and Politics

When it comes to religion, we find the AEA sample to be surprisingly agnostic. No fewer than 25% of the group, when asked their religious preference, answer "None" (Q.57). In the other NORC surveys cited in Table 6, only 2% of the doctors and 3% of the public confessed to no religion.

Thirteen percent of the sample (in contrast to only about 3% of the general population) is of the Jewish faith. Only 45% (in contrast to about 70% of the public) states a Protestant belief.

Liberal Arts and Business School teachers differ not at all on these matters, though the AISI subscriber lists are much more heavily Protestant (59%) and much less likely to include non-believers (only 8%).

The political preference of the college economics teacher is overwhelmingly Democratic. As shown in Table 7, only 11% classify themselves as Republican, only 17% voted for Nixon, and only 22% voted for Eisenhower in 1956. This is consistent with the finding reported in "The Academic Mind," that only 30% of the social science professors interviewed had voted for Eisenhower in 1952.

TABLE 7

POLITICAL PREFERENCE AND VOTING BEHAVIOR

Party Preference	AEA	Subscribers	Liberal Arts	Business
Republican	11%	12%	10%	13%
Democratic	50	44	52	43
Independent	35	42	35	41
Other	4	1	2	3
None	*	1	1	-
1960 Vote				
Kennedy	69%	63%	68%	65%
Nixon	17	27	19	24
Other	1	1	1	1
Didn't vote	13	9	12	10
1956 Vote				
Stevenson	64%	59%	62%	62%
Eisenhower	22	32	25	27
Other	*	-	1	-
Didn't vote	14	8	12	11
Don't remember	-	1	*	-

It will be noted that the AISI subscriber lists contain somewhat fewer Democrats and more "independents", and that subscribers are considerably more likely to have voted Republican in the two Presidential elections. To be sure that this more conservative voting pattern is not merely a reflection of their greater age, we controlled for age and re-ran the table. The differences remained.

While the older age groups were more likely to vote Republican than the younger, at each age the subscribers were more likely to support the Republican candidate. But even those subscribers over the age of 50, the most conservative group, preferred Kennedy to Nixon by a 55-to-38 ratio.

It will also be noted that Business School teachers are somewhat less Democratic than the Liberal Arts group. This difference too holds for all age groups.

Attitudes Toward Government's Role in the Economy

Consistent with their Democratic political preference, almost three-fourths of the country's undergraduate economics teachers feel that the federal government should take a greater rather than a smaller role in the economy. The results are shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8

"How do you yourself feel about the federal government's role in the nation's economy today -- All in all, do you feel that the federal government these days should take a much greater role in the national economy, a somewhat greater role, a somewhat smaller role, or a much smaller role in the national economy?"

	AEA	Sub-scribers	Liberal Arts	Business School
Much greater role.	17%	10%	15%	13%
Somewhat greater role. . . .	56	52	57	52
Somewhat smaller role. . . .	12	13	12	13
Much smaller role.	4	10	5	8
Just about right now	8	12	7	12
No opinion or qualified. . .	3	3	4	2
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Subscribers are less likely than economics teachers generally to call for a greater role for the federal government, but even among these, fewer than one in four believes the government should play a smaller role in the national economy. The pattern is the same for Business School teachers. They are less likely than Liberal Arts to demand a greater role, but only one in five wants the government to play a smaller part.

When we controlled for the greater age of the subscriber group, their differences from the AEA sample disappeared except among those past the age of 50. In this age group, only 49% of the subscribers, as compared with 69% of the AEA sample, called for a greater role for the federal government; but even here only about one in three (35%) of the older subscribers demanded that it play a smaller role.

Asked to name the particular areas in which they would like to see more federal activity, the proponents of a larger role for the government mentioned an average of almost three areas per respondent (Q. 14-A).

Leading the list was education, cited by almost half of the "pro-government" group. Specific suggestions included federal aid for teachers' salaries and school construction, and a federally sponsored student loan program.

The area referred to next most frequently, by one-third of the "pro-government" group, was that of maintaining full employment and economic growth. Specific suggestions varied widely, but all of them in one way or another called for more government action to combat unemployment, to moderate swings in the business cycle and to promote a steady economic growth.

Public health and medicine was an area mentioned by more than a fourth of those calling for a greater federal role in the economy. Included here were calls for better medical care for the aged, a federal health insurance program, and more research.

Also named by a quarter of the group were urban and metropolitan area problems: urban redevelopment or renewal, metropolitan and regional planning; aid for highways, rapid transit facilities and airport construction; public housing,etc.

The minority of economic instructors (16% of the AEA sample) who would have the federal government play a smaller role in the economy point to two main areas: farm problems and policy, and regulation of industry. Better than two in five of this group call for less federal intervention in agriculture, and the same number offer a variety of suggestions which would give business a somewhat freer hand.

Only 12% of the "anti-government" group called for a smaller federal role in education, and fewer than 5% suggested less government action in the fields of public health, full employment and economic growth, and urban problems.

Community Activities

Wright and Hyman (18) have cited survey data to show that almost two-thirds of the adult public belong to no voluntary assocations. Judged against this standard, college economics teachers would seem to be fairly active in community affairs. For apart from their professional group memberships (which are many, as we shall see in the next section), better than 40% belong to some community organization, and 22% belong to more than one.

Yet, as shown in Table 9, when compared with doctors or even with other adults of equivalent income and education, the undergraduate economics instructor does not appear to be much of a joiner. The comparable data are from the previously cited NORC doctor survey and from Wright and Hyman.

Assuming the AEA group to be representative, the college economics teacher is less likely than someone else ofequivalent income and education to belong to a community organization, and when he does, is less likely to hold membership in more than one such group. The contrast with doctors is even more striking.

It should be pointed out that our question excluded professional group memberships, which were inquired about separately, while the Wright and Hyman data included them. Membership in "professional and learned societies," however, is claimed by only 2% of the general public, so that even if the Wright-Hyman figures are lowered by this amount, the economics teachers still lag in community activity, as measured by this question.

TABLE 9

COMMUNITY GROUP MEMBERSHIPS

Number of Community Organizations Belonged to:	AEA	Sub-scribers	Doctors	General Population $7,500 Income or More	General Population 4 Years College or More
None.	58%	36%	24%	48%	39%
One	20	32	24	22	25
Two or more	22	32	52	30	36

It will be noticed that the AISI subscribers are much more likely to be involved in one or more community organizations. The finding probably derives at least in part from their greater age and lack of mobility. As we have seen, subscribers who recently moved had no opportunity to fall into our sample. In consequence, those interviewed are more likely to be long-time residents of their community, and so perhaps more likely to join community organizations.

Civic and service organizations account for the largest share of community memberships (Q. 46), with religious or church groups the type next most often mentioned. Only 7% of the AEA sample, and 10% of the subscribers, belong to what we coded as "political or pressure groups": Republican or Democratic Clubs, NAACP, American Civil Liberties Union, or the like.

The only significant difference between Liberal Arts and Business School teachers occurs in this latter category, where 12% of the Liberal Arts but only 4% of the Business instructors report membership in a "political or pressure group."

A third of the subscribers, as compared to but a fifth of the AEA sample, have held office in a local organization; but this simply reflects the subscribers' greater number of memberships. Considering only those who belong to one or more organizations, subscribers are not significantly more likely to have held office than are the AEA group. Business School teachers, however, are significantly more likely to have held office than their Liberal Arts colleagues.

While no comparative data are available for other population groups, the replies to another question seem to confirm the impression that most undergraduate economics teachers are not especially active in or concerned about community affairs.

Asked about "the people you see the most of socially," only 36% say these are people "mostly not connected with the college" (Q. 47). The majority appear to restrict their social contacts to fellow faculty members, and in the case of 13% of the AEA sample, to their colleagues in the Economics department. Business School professors, more than Liberal Arts, are likely to extend their social contacts outside the college.

Non-Professional Reading

Aside from their voluminous professional reading (see next section), half of the AEA sample regularly read three or more non-professional magazines, and their tastes in this respect provide an interesting contrast to the doctors interviewed on the previously cited NORC survey. Table 10 compares the two groups.

TABLE 10

TYPES OF MAGAZINES READ REGULARLY

	Economics Teachers	Doctors
News magazines	47%	51%*
Business and financial magazines	47	
General quality or "intellectual" magazines.	53	16
General family and home magazines.	22	63
Travel and geographic magazines.	4	16
Sport and outdoor life	2	18
Hobby and special interest magazines	4	13
Miscellaneous magazines.	11	9
Don't read any magazines	5	13

* In the doctor survey, the first two categories were combined.

About half the economics teachers read Time, Newsweek or U.S. News and World Report. About half read a business periodical, such as Business Week, Fortune or Nation's Business. And about half regularly read what we have coded as "quality or intellectual" magazines: Harper's, Nation, Horizons, American Scholar, etc.

In contrast, only a little over one in five say they regularly read such general magazines as Life, Look, Saturday Evening Post, etc., and only small minorities appear interested in travel, sport or hobby magazines.

The doctors, on the other hand, are less likely to read non-professional magazines at all, and when they do, their tastes run to the lighter side. Relatively few doctors read the "quality or intellectual" magazines; almost two-thirds of them read Life, Readers Digest and other family magazines; while they provide also a much more receptive audience than the economics teachers do to such magazines as Holiday, National Geographic, Sport and Field, and High Fidelity.

AISI subscribers seem to read somewhat more magazines than the AEA group; 63% of the former, but only 54% of the latter, read three or more regularly. They are more often readers, too, of the general family and home magazines (38% as against 22%). Business School teachers read slightly fewer magazines than their Liberal Arts colleagues, and are especially less likely to mention "quality or intellectual" magazines.

III

THE COLLEGE ECONOMICS TEACHER: PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Education

Three out of four college economics teachers hold the Ph.D. degree. Twenty percent have a degree at the Master's level, and only a few (one out of 25) have only the B.A. or B.S. The doctorate is more typical of Business School professors (79%) than of Liberal Arts (71%). AISI subscribers differ not at all from the AEA sample in this respect.

We recorded considerable information about the schools our respondents attended, to determine whether experience with various sizes, types and locations of schools would be reflected in different attitudes toward the teaching of economics and toward the materials of private economic groups. Such analysis is handicapped, however, by the fact that many respondents attended several different schools and by the usual problem of small numbers of cases.

Detailed figures on schools attended are shown in the Appendix Tables (Q.37-B). The great majority of economics teachers were educated in the East or Midwest, at private non-denominational colleges or state universities. Almost three-fourths received at least one degree from a large college (9,000 or more enrollment); only 4% received a degree from a small college with enrollment of 700 or less. Ten percent gained at least part of their education abroad.

Subscribers are less likely to have attended state universities, but otherwise differ little or not at all from the AEA group. Business School teachers are more likely than Liberal Arts to have attended a Midwestern or state university of large size.

We attempted to record in each case whether the respondent received a degree from a school of Business or Business Administration, but in many cases this could not be done because a university would be named without designation as to whether the Liberal Arts or Business School had granted the degree.

Nineteen percent of the AEA group, however, specifically referred to a Business School degree. For Business School teachers, the figure was 23%, for Liberal Arts 15%. Subscribers did not differ in any way.

The Schools at Which They Teach

Before continuing our examination of the professional activities and interests of the college economics instructor, it will be well to describe the schools at which they teach. Table 11 shows the distribution of our four main sample groups among colleges of varying "quality rating," size, location and type of control.

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLES BY TYPE OF SCHOOL

	AEA	All Subscribers	Liberal Arts	Business
A. QUALITY RATING				
Group 1 (high)	63%	41%	48%	63%
Group 2.	19	38	27	25
Group 3.	10	13	17	4
Group 4 (low).	8	8	8	8
B. STUDENT ENROLLMENT:				
700 or less.	3%	6%	6%	2%
701 - 2500	8	14	16	4
2501 - 9000.	28	36	28	34
Over 9000.	61	44	50	60
C. NO. OF ECONOMICS MAJORS:				
Less than 30	34%	42%	31%	43%
30 - 99.	29	37	33	32
100 - 149.	21	15	23	14
150 or more.	16	6	13	11
D. NO. TAKING INTRODUCTORY ECONOMICS COURSE:				
Less than 200.	25%	36%	38%	17%
200 - 399.	16	25	18	21
400 - 699.	39	29	34	38
700 or more.	20	10	10	24
E. LOCATION				
East	39%	35%	43%	31%
Midwest.	29	34	27	36
South.	17	18	16	19
West	15	13	14	14
F. TYPE OF CONTROL				
Private non-denominational	39%	38%	44%	32%
Public	46	31	33	50
Protestant denominational.	5	12	10	4
Catholic denominational.	10	19	13	14
G. TYPE OF ECONOMICS CURRICULUM TAUGHT:				
Liberal Arts	51%	49%	91%	-%
School of Commerce	6	6	-	13
Business Administration.	36	31	-	76
Lib. Arts & Commerce	2	4	2	3
Lib. Arts & Business	5	10	7	8

The quality rating cited in Table 11-A refers to a ratio system developed by NORC for another study, whereby all colleges in the United States are stratified into four groups, according to the proportion of their graduates who went on for doctoral degrees. Group 1 consists of those colleges whose ratio of graduate study to graduates is highest; Group 4 includes the schools which have relatively the smallest number of graduates going on for further study.

It is clear that the AISI subscribers, as a group, are drawn more heavily from the Group 2 than from the Group 1 schools. While 63% of the AEA sample are teaching at Group 1 colleges, only 41% of the subscribers were found at such schools. Business School teachers are also more likely to be found in the highest quality schools, though this finding is not unexpected since the large universities which include business schools are more likely to achieve a Group 1 rating.

When the schools are grouped according to student enrollment, the same findings appear. AISI subscribers are relatively more likely to be found at the small colleges. Only 44% of them, as compared with 61% of the AEA group, are teaching at large schools with more than 9,000 enrollment. Liberal Arts teachers, too, are more likely to be found at the smaller colleges.

The reader may be struck, as we were, by the small proportion of economics instructors teaching in colleges with small enrollments. The study of "The Academic Mind," for example, found 40% of the social science teachers in colleges of up to 2500 students, whereas our AEA sample shows a total of only 11% in colleges of this size.

A 20% sample of the AEA Handbook, however, reveals the following proportions: teaching in colleges of 700 or less enrollment, 5%, 701 to 2500, 15%; 2501 to 9000, 32%; and over 9000, 48%. If it is true that small college teachers are less likely to be AEA members, it is also true that college enrollments have increased since the last issue of the Handbook. The bias in our sample in this respect may thus be estimated at about ten percentage points, in favor of the largest universities and against the smallest colleges.

This bias results from our deliberate failure to control for size of school in the substitution procedure. The hundreds of small colleges in small towns all over the country are not often likely to coincide with an NORC sample point. The next name in the book which met the other criteria and which did fall within an NORC sample point would more likely be found at a larger shcool.

Had we controlled for size of school, we would have been forced to interview almost every economics teacher available at the small colleges within NORC sample points, and this would have produced an unwise clustering of cases. We do not regard the present bias as serious, in any case, since we did control for location, type of control and type of economics curriculum taught.

If school size is measured by number of economics majors, or by number of students taking the introductory economics course, we see again that the AISI subscribers are drawn more heavily from the smaller schools. Seventy-nine percent of the subscribers, but only 63% of the AEA group, teach at schools having fewer than 100 economics majors. Sixty-one percent of the subscribers, but only 41% of AEA, teach at schools at which fewer than 400 students are enrolled in the introductory economics course.

It may be noted that Business School teachers, though employed by larger universities, are less likely to teach at schools with more than 100 economics majors. This is because economics majors are more often found in Liberal Arts colleges. Students attending Business colleges are more likely to major in a business subject.

It is clear from all these criteria that the subscribers are teaching in smaller schools and smaller economics departments than the AEA group. And although the Business instructors' schools have fewer economics majors -- due to their very nature as Business divisions -- they have larger numbers of students taking introductory economics courses and are more often a part of large schools than are the Liberal Arts economics faculties.

The subscribers seem fairly representative of the AEA group from the standpoint of geographical location. A little over a third are found in the East, about the same number in the Midwest, with the remainder divided between Southern and Western schools. Liberal Arts professors are somewhat more likely to teach in an Eastern college, Business School teachers in the Midwest.

Table 11-F shows that AISI subscribers come disproportionately from Protestant and Catholic denominational colleges -- almost a third of them, as compared to only 15% of the AEA sample. Relatively fewer subscribers (31% to 46%) are found in public colleges or state universities. Since the denominational colleges are generally small and the public universities generally large, this finding is consistent with those reported above with respect to size.

Courses Taught and Teaching Experience

Three teachers out of five (61%) are giving a course in General or Introductory Economics, or in Principles of Economics (Q.1).

The second most frequently mentioned type of course taught is business-related: Business Economics, Business and Corporate Finance, Business Conditions, Government and Business, etc. One out of four (26%) is teaching such a course. And one out of five (21%) is teaching Money and Banking, Monetary Theory, Public Finance or the like.

No other type of course is mentioned by as many as 20%. The next most frequently referred to are: International Trade or European Economic History or Development (16%); Economic History (12%); Contemporary Economic Thought (12%), and Statistical Methods or Mathematical Economics (10%). Eight percent mentioned a course in American Economic Development, 6% a course on Income, 3% Consumer Economics, 3% Accounting, 2% Agricultural Economics, and 2% Marketing.

AISI subscribers are more likely to teach a labor course (19% to 12%), but not a business course (30% to 26%, not significant). Business School teachers, as might be expected, more often report teaching a business course and less often the general economics course. But even among the Business School group, 52% are giving the basic economics course.

A little over half the instructors teach one or two courses; a little under half teach three or more. At the extremes, only one in five (19%) limits himself to one course; 7% say they teach five or more. There are no substantial or consistent differences between the AEA groups and subscribers or between Liberal Arts and Business School teachers.

Almost four out of five (78%) of the AEA group interviewed are on a full-time teaching schedule, and about half of these (53% of the group) are teaching a minimum of 10 hours a week (Q.2). Subscribers are somewhat more likely to carry a heavy teaching load. Business School instructors are a little less likely to have full-time teaching assignments, but those who do are more likely to say they teach 10 hours a week or more.

The considerable amount of full-time teaching reflects our original sample design which excluded from our lists "lecturers" and administrative and research personnel whose primary concern was not teaching. This was in line with our study goal of obtaining experienced judgments of and reactions to the current undergraduate economics curriculum, but it probably skewed the distribution of our sample toward full-time teaching schedules more than would be found in a different sample of undergraduate economics instructors.

The one instructor in five who is not on a full-time teaching schedule most usually reports his other duties as research or administrative responsibilities. Business School teachers more often mention research.

Table 12 shows the substantial differences between the AEA and Subscriber samples with respect to teaching rank at the college, length of time taught there, and years of teaching experience.

TABLE 12

TEACHING RANK AND EXPERIENCE

	AEA	Subscribers
Full professor or department head. . . .	28%	45%
Associate professor.	28	30
Assistant professor or instructor. . . .	41	24
Other.	3	1
At present school less than 5 years. . .	45%	20%
At present school 5 years or more. . . .	55	80
Less than 10 years' teaching experience.	52%	27%
10 or more years' teaching experience. .	48	73

These differences are undoubtedly accounted for in large part by the age differential and the manner of substitution referred to in the previous section. Usually only those subscribers could be interviewed who were still teaching at the place they were when the lists were compiled. If a subscriber was no longer at that school, his substitute had to be someone from the same list who had <u>not</u> changed schools.

But if a designated AEA respondent was no longer teaching at the school, his substitute was usually the man who succeeded him. The AEA sample thus reflects more accurately the age, experience and amount of mobility within the undergraduate economics teaching profession.

No particular field of economics was mentioned by more than a third of the teachers when they were asked to describe their major areas of interest (Q. 6-A). "General Economics," Economic History or Development, Income and Employment Theory, and Money, Credit and Banking were all mentioned by slightly over 30% of the AEA group.

Subscribers differed chiefly in their greater interest in Labor Economics (30% to 16%) and Labor-Management Relations (19% to 12%). They were somewhat less likely than the AEA group to express an interest in Income and Employment Theory, and in Price and Allocation Theory. They differed not at all in their interest in such fields as Business Finance, Business Organization or Government and Business.

Professional Membership and Activities

Five percent of the AEA group belong to no professional organization (Q.38). The median number of such memberships is three, with one teacher in five belonging to five or more professional associations.

Seven out of eight hold membership in the American Economics Association, a figure which probably is inflated by the fact that the AEA sample was originally drawn from that organization's directory of members. The 13% who are not members are of course substitute respondents or persons who have not kept up their membership.

Subscribers are equally likely to belong to AEA (88%) and, because of their greater age, to have joined at an earlier date.* More than half the subscribers have been AEA members for more than 15 years. Subscribers, too, are more likely to belong to many professional organizations, 30% to as many as five or more. Business School teachers also claim more professional group memberships. Thirty-one percent of these belong to five or more, in contrast to only 18% of the Liberal Arts instructors.

Thirty-one percent of the AEA sample, and 45% of the subscribers, claim to have held office at one time or other in a professional organization (Q.42).

Four out of five of these economics teachers attended a professional conference during the preceding 18 months, though most attended only one or two (Q. 39). (Normally we would have asked for the extent of such activity during the preceding year, but since interviewing was conducted in December and January, the period was extended to include the earlier academic year and the summer preceding it.)

Over half say they attended an AEA convention during the prior 18 months. The other conferences attended covered a wide range and no one was mentioned by as many as 20%. Subscribers are slightly more likely to attend many conferences but do not differ from the AEA group as to type of conference attended.

---

* This figure is also inflated somewhat because Steelways and Steel Facts subscribers were checked against the AEA Handbook to assure their eligibility for interview.

Professional Reading and Writing

All respondents claim to read one or more professional journals; in fact, half of them read as many as five or more regularly (Q. 44). There are no significant differences in this respect between the AEA and subscriber groups, or between Liberal Arts and Business.

By far the most frequently mentioned journal is the American Economics Review, which 92% say they read regularly. Following in order are the Journal of Political Economy (41%), Quarterly Journal of Economics (37%), Review of Economics and Statistics (31%), and Economics Journal (27%). One out of three college economics teachers includes an international journal or one oriented to foreign affairs in his regular reading.

Subscribers read just about as many professional periodicals as the AEA group, but make less frequent reference to the above journals. Instead they more often mention labor and labor relations periodicals (22% to 13%), banking publications (31% to 23%), and miscellaneous technical publications (14% to 7%). Business School teachers read about the same number of professional journals as Liberal Arts, but not surprisingly they tend to mention more often journals of accounting, marketing, finance, and taxation, and management and trade publications.

In addition to his professional reading, the undergraduate economics teacher seems to do quite a bit of writing (Qs. 40, 41). Almost three-fourths of them have published at least one professional paper, and half claim to have published three or more. Almost a third have authored or co-authored a book on some phase of economics.

Subscribers appear to have published somewhat more than the AEA group. 60% claim three or more professional papers; half, one or more books in the field. But this finding is probably a function of the greater age of the AISI subscribers who were interviewed.

Business School teachers have published more professional papers than Liberal Arts, but there are no significant differences between these two groups when it comes to authorship of books.

Professional Activities in the Community

Though we have seen that the college economics teacher takes less part in community organizations than we might expect and does not often have a wide range of social contacts outside the university, almost half of the AEA sample have on at least one occasion taken some part in community discussions of an economic nature (Q.48). A quarter of the group have participated in such discussions more than once.

The most frequent occasion for this activity was a meeting of some civic or community group or a request to speak on some aspect of economics. Thus, one teacher in five mentioned such activities as participation in a YMCA panel discussion, a local radio series on problems of inflation, or talks before such groups as the Rotary Club, the League of Women Voters, or political or church groups.

One in ten referred to his participation in some event sponsored by industry or company management: a seminar on business or economic problems, a management training course, or a "public relations forum." The same proportion spoke of similar activities at events sponsored by labor groups: talks before union meetings, labor institutes and forums, etc. Six percent of the AEA sample have participated in labor-management negotiations or have served on an arbitration board.

There are no significant differences between the subscriber group and the AEA sample, or between Liberal Arts and Business School teachers, in either the frequency or nature of such activities.

Additionally, three teachers out of five in the AEA sample have served as consultants to some organization outside the college (Q. 49). Two out of five have been retained by business or industry in this capacity, and about a third have been consulted by some government agency. Consultation with labor groups is mentioned by only 6%.

Business School teachers are more likely than others to serve as consultants to industry; almost half of them claim such experience. Subscribers, more often than the AEA sample, say they have served in impartial mediation and arbitration between management and labor, though the actual proportions are small (10% vs. 2%).

Work Experiences

Two out of three college economics teachers spent last summer working (Q. 50). Thirty percent were employed in teaching, 24% were writing or doing research, and 12% were editing, consulting or advising. Half of those who worked (29% of the AEA sample) had a 12-month appointment or were otherwise employed by their college or university. The others found jobs with government (8%), at some other college (6%), in private industry (5%), through a foundation (5%), with a business management or consulting agency (4%) or with a private research agency (4%).

Subscribers were more likely to have spent the summer teaching and less likely to have been engaged in writing or research, but otherwise the AISI group does not differ from the AEA. Three-quarters of the Business School instructors, as compared with 61% of Liberal Arts, said they were working last summer.

We asked respondents if they had ever participated in an industry sponsored summer employment program. Only 6% of the AEA sample, which is broadly representative of all undergraduate economics teachers, reported such experience. Among subscribers the proportion was 14% (Q. 50-B).

Reactions of the 38 respondents who had been exposed to industry sponsored summer employment programs were not tabulated statistically, but were observed to be uniformly favorable. Analysis of responses shows that 31 of the 38 made some general favorable comment ("It was a good experience"); three appreciated the opportunity to earn money; and the others spoke of the value of getting to know the operations of industry through actual participation, and of seeing how theory is translated into practice.

Only 5% of the AEA sample ever tried combining a full-time job with their regular teaching position, while another 31% have held additional part-time jobs at one time or another in the course of their careers (Q. 52). Consulting for government or industry, research and additional teaching are the kinds of outside work reported most frequently.

Again perhaps because of their greater age, subscribers (48%) more often than the AEA group (36%) reported having once held a second job. There were no differences in this respect between Liberal Arts and Business teachers, although the latter group were more likely than the former to have held consulting jobs with government or industry.

About half of those who ever held outside jobs (18% of the AEA sample) are holding one now. Half of the remainder (9%), making a total of one out of four, have had a second job at one time or another during the last five years.

Largely as a result of their extracurricular professional activities, seven economics teachers out of ten have outside sources of income (Q. 51). The other three-in-ten are dependent entirely upon their teaching salaries.

Twenty-nine percent report current income from consulting activities; 11% from publications and royalties, 9% from lectures and speeches, 6% from additional teaching, 3% from research activities, and 3% from government stipends.

In addition, many have non-professional sources of income. Most common of these is income from investments and securities, reported by 17%. Eight percent cite their wife's earnings, while 6% have a business or farm, and 2% have a private professional practice in law or insurance.

THE PROGRAMS OF ECONOMIC INTEREST GROUPS

Interest in the Materials

The potential success of even the most useful materials directed to the college economics instructor will be limited by the degree to which he is resistant to such materials when they come from private and/or non-academic sectors of the economy.

Before asking for reactions to materials from particular industry groups, we first determined the amount of interest in industry materials as a whole. This question was followed by identical inquiries about interest in materials prepared by labor and farm groups. The data are summarized in Table 13.

TABLE 13

PROPORTION OF SAMPLES WHO ARE "VERY" OR "FAIRLY" INTERESTED IN MATERIALS OF ECONOMIC INTEREST GROUPS

N =	AEA (263)	All Subscribers (162)	Steel-Ways (45)	Steel Facts (55)	IPPS (62)	Lib. Arts (233)	Business (192)
Industry materials. .	46%	56%	62%	46%	60%	50%	48%
Labor materials . . .	41%	53%	53%	38%	65%	49%	41%
Farm materials. . . .	30%	26%	30%	13%	35%	29%	35%

A number of things are clear from this table. First, there is significantly less interest on the part of all groups in farm materials than in materials from industry and labor. Fewer than a third express much interest in farm information, while upwards of 40% of the AEAgroup and more than half the subscribers are interested in both business and labor materials.

Secondly, differences in interest between industry and labor materials are not substantial. In all groups, except IPPS, there is a slight preference for industry materials, but none of the differences are significant. Actually, teachers who are interested in one are normally interested in the other as well.

Thirdly, subscribers are more likely than the AEA sample to express interest in both industry and labor materials.

And finally, close to half of all college economics instructors seem to be potential users of such materials -- this being the proportion who say they are "very" or "fairly" interested in them. If we include those who say they are "slightly interested," 80% of the AEA sample (and 91% of the subscribers) evidence at least some interest in industry materials (Q. 21).

Table 14 shows that instructors most often want these materials for both personal and class use, a finding which is perhaps important in determining the level and approach to be taken in their development. If we combine the percentages on the second and third lines of the table, it is apparent that 56% of the AEA sample, and 71% of the subscribers, could put such materials to use in the classes they teach.

TABLE 14

"Are you interested in (educational materials produced by industry) only for your own use (either for your own personal background or for preparing class presentations), or are you interested in them for use by the class as well?"

	AEA	Subscribers
For own use	24%	20%
For class use	17	25
For both own and class use	39	46
Not interested at all	20	9
	100%	100%

When asked "For which topics are you most interested in industry prepared materials?", almost all respondents had a ready reply (Q. 21-B). Mentioned most often, by a quarter of the AEA group and almost a third of the subscribers, was material on corporate finance and investments, accounting procedures and financial statements.

The following topics were all mentioned by approximately 10% of the AEA sample:

Production processes and techniques, product change, technological innovations and improvements. (One subscriber in six expressed special interest in this area.)

Industrial organization, structure of the industry, overall market structure, competition.

Industry statistics, production figures, statistical reports

Pricing policy, how prices are set, rates of return on sales and capital, profit margins, productivity trends

Industrial management, decision-making; decision to invest, decisions on plant location, production control, etc.; computer applications.

Business forecasting, business cycles, economic growth and development

Industry's viewpoint on public issues, on regulation of business, relationship with government

One instructor's reply managed to cover a number of these topics at once:

> "In my principles course, probably material describing the structure of an industry, which might include share of markets by different firms, the rates of return on capital and sales, technological changes in the product itself or in the process of production - perhaps some idea as to direct and indirect taxes which industry must pay. As a final catchall, something defining the field in which firms compete. In other words, how could you define competition in this industry? If they could do that, they'd be doing more than anyone has done yet!"

As for suggestions for topics "for which you would like to see industry put out more or better materials," the economics instructors had fewer ideas. Twenty-nine percent of the AEA sample and 37% of the subscribers couldn't think of any.

The two areas in which more or better materials were most often requested related to pricing policy, profit margins and productivity trends; and to industrial management and decision-making processes. Both were mentioned by about one teacher in ten (Q. 21-C).

When asked in what form they prefer to receive industry materials, the economics teachers show a strong preference for the printed word (Q. 21-E). About two out of three ask for pamphlets, brochures, bulletins; almost one in ten request statistics, reports, tables. Only 5% of the AEA group (but 12% of subscribers) state a preference for films.

Criticisms and Reasons for Lack of Interest

One out of five of the AEA sample and one out of every ten subscribers said they were "not interested at all" in industry prepared materials. This is a very small group (actually only 14 subscribers), and not much can be done with them statistically, but analysis of their responses makes clear that there are two main reasons for their lack of interest.

First is a feeling that industry materials are useless because of their special pleading, advocacy of industry's viewpoint and general bias in the way they are presented. And second is the irrelevancy of such materials to the particular courses which some of the instructors teach.

But these are not complaints registered uniquely against industry's materials, for as Table 15 shows, they are raised with equal frequency by those who explain their lack of interest in materials prepared by labor.

It is perhaps not unexpected that the AEA group are more likely to reject these materials because of their alleged bias, while the uninterested AISI subscribers are more likely to explain that the materials are not relevant to the courses they teach.

TABLE 15

REASONS FOR LACK OF INTEREST IN INDUSTRY/LABOR MATERIALS

Industry Materials	AEA	Subscribers
Bias, propaganda, special pleading	8%	2%
Unrelated to courses taught.	5	4
Other reason	7	3
Total not interested in industry materials	20%	9%
Labor Materials		
Bias, propaganda, special pleading	11%	3%
Unrelated to courses taught.	9	8
Other reasons.	7	4
Total not interested in labor materials.	27%	15%

Among the great majority of economics teachers who do express some interest in industry materials, about a third of both AEA and subscriber groups can recall at least one example of materials "which were not at all appropriate for use in college economics programs" -- almost all of these because of their biased or promotional nature. The words of one respondent, when asked to recall such inappropriate materials, are illustrative:

> "Oh, the Tobacco News - a letter that comes out - also Steelways. There is some useful factual material but it is also surrounded by propaganda. Result is you don't use many of these things with students. I want students to make up their own minds."

Cited most often in this connection were public relations statements and partisan materials of all kinds. Speeches by industrial leaders and materials issued by the National Association of Manufacturers were also mentioned unfavorably.

Instructors who had indicated any interest at all in industry-prepared materials (80% of the AEA sample and 91% of the subscribers) were asked in what way these materials could be made more useful to them (Q. 21-D). One in three could volunteer no suggestions for improvement, but another one-third, of both subscriber and AEA groups, asked that industry materials be made more factual and objective and less promotional in nature.

> "Generally by taking a broader position"
> "Most of the material I'm familiar with is heavily biased and because of this it's really useless"
> "They should avoid presenting their side as though it were the only one and use a minimum of their own company propaganda"
> "If they would stress reliable data and give less emphasis to points of view"

The next most frequently offered suggestion, voiced by one in five of the AEA group, was to put the materials on a more analytical and scholarly level and thus gear them more closely to the college audience. There were complaints that industry prepared materials were often superficial, sketchy, and technically below the students' level.

Other suggestions were to provide more case studies and concrete examples of actual problems and operations, and to improve the distribution of the materials. Several teachers complained that they had no idea what was available. The following comments may also be of interest:

> "They might prepare it with reference to a particular section of a particular textbook, and then attempt distribution to those who are using that book"

> "Seems to me that one point such materials could make is the complexity of operations, which few students appreciate to any degree. They could also be much more frank about their own bias and interest. They do themselves a disservice by presuming the fact would prejudice the public against them."

This latter point is apparently subscribed to by the overwhelming majority of instructors. When we asked, "And what do you think is the best way to develop and to channel these materials -- Should they come directly from the economic interest group, or not?", four out of five of both AEA and subscriber groups answered affirmatively (Q. 24). Among the minority who think otherwise, the most frequent suggestion is some sort of impartial professional clearing house which would evaluate or channel, or even develop, the materials in question.

Thus, while the most frequent suggestion for improving industry prepared materials is to make them less propagandistic and more objective, all but a minority of our samples see nothing wrong with the frank distribution of such materials and indeed welcome them for class use.

Exposure and Reactions to Private and Government Materials

After questioning the teacher about his interest in and attitudes toward industry, labor and farm materials generally, the interviewer handed the respondent a sheet of paper listing 25 specific non-academic sources of materials on economics. The teacher was asked to indicate for each of the 25 whether he had seen any of that organization's materials, or knew of them by hearsay, or had never heard of them.

Then, for each one he had heard of, he was asked to evaluate the usefulness of the materials on a 4-point scale ranging from "essential" to "of little use." Detailed figures for each organization are shown in the various Appendix Tables under Q. 25. Here we summarize the results in Table 16.

It is a finding of some importance that approximately 80% or more of the college economics instructors are personally familiar with the publications of no fewer than 15 of the 25 organizations listed. Indeed, the materials of only four of the organizations had been seen by fewer than half of the respondents -- an indication of the amount and range of materials to which the average economics teacher is exposed.

TABLE 16

KNOWLEDGE AND RATINGS OF MATERIALS
ISSUED BY SPECIFIC GROUPS AND AGENCIES

Source:	Have Seen Materials		Rate Materials "Essential" or "Very Useful"		Rate Materials "Of Little Use"	
	AEA	Sub.	AEA	Sub.	AEA	Sub.
Bureau of Labor Statistics. .	98%	98%	91%	91%	1%	1%
Committee for Economic Development	97	97	86	81	3	3
Brookings Institution	95	95	86	87	1	2
AFL-CIO	95	94	26	31	23	21
U.S. Chamber of Commerce. . .	92	97	24	30	28	23
National Association of Manufacturers	92	99	14	22	41	33
Twentieth Century Fund. . . .	92	97	74	78	5	4
U.S. Department of Agriculture	88	90	71	65	6	7
New York Stock Exchange . . .	87	89	32	38	22	17
National Planning Association	84	84	60	53	10	9
Joint Economic Committee. . .	84	80	75	74	3	3
U.S. Steel.	83	92	12	22	31	27
American Iron & Steel Institute	82	96	20	24	29	24
Institute of Life Insurance .	79	87	24	21	24	21
American Petroleum Institute.	79	88	15	18	33	31
General Motors.	73	78	9	16	32	27
U.S. Dept of Health, Education & Welfare	73	79	62	56	7	11
Organization for European Economic Cooperation. . . .	73	77	57	56	7	6
Foundation for Economic Education	57	80	10	18	37	36
E.I. DuPont de Nemours, Inc..	56	66	7	10	35	26
Joint Council on Economic Education	51	66	29	39	13	14
American Economic Foundation.	39	49	8	16	29	24
Textile Workers Union of America	35	40	6	9	25	30
Institute for Economic Affairs	28	36	11	14	11	15
Committee for Education in Family Finance.	9	8	5	5	5	8

Subscribers tend to be slightly more familiar than the AEA group with most of these materials, and more particularly with those published by industry (U.S. Steel, N.A.M., DuPont) and by groups with a conservative economic viewpoint (American Economic Foundation, Foundation for Economic Education). The similarities between the two groups in their exposure to these private and governmental materials are, however, more noteworthy than the differences.

Though the educators seem to be familiar with the majority of these materials, they do not grant them equal esteem. Of the entire 25 organizations listed, nine issue materials which half or more of our respondents describe as "essential" or "very useful." These are, in descending order:

Bureau of Labor Statistics.	91%
Committee for Economic Development.	86
Brookings Institution	86
Joint Economic Committee.	75
Twentieth Century Fund.	74
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture.	71
U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare	62
National Planning Association	60
Organization for European Economic Cooperation. .	57

It should be noted that the above figures, as well as all others cited in Table 16, are based on the total sample, and not just those who are familiar with the particular materials. If we consider the latter group only, two more organizations would be added to the list. Thus, while 51% of the sample have seen publications of the Joint Council on Economic Education, 29% consider them very useful; and while only 9% were familiar with the materials of the Committee for Education in Family Finance, 5% say these are very useful.

All, or almost all, of the organizations listed above, whose materials are widely regarded as "essential" or "very useful" to the college economics teacher, will be observed to have an aura of independence, authority, and/or nonpartisan research. Probably few, if any, would be generally identified as special pleaders or axe-grinders.

When we rank the organizations whose materials are most often deemed "of little use," on the other hand, we observe the opposite finding. All, or almost all, of these are frankly special interest groups with a particular point of view. The two foundations listed, while ostensibly nonpartisan and educational in nature, have apparently been identified by many instructors as mere spokesmen for a particular economic viewpoint.

National Association of Manufacturers	41%
Foundation for Economic Education	37
E.I. DuPont de Nemours, Inc.	35
American Petroleum Institute	33
General Motors.	32
U.S. Steel.	31
American Iron and Steel Institute	29
American Economic Foundation.	29
U.S. Chamber of Commerce.	28
Textile Workers Union of America.	25

Again, these figures represent the proportion of all economics teachers (the AEA sample) who find the materials "of little use." If we consider only those familiar with the materials, more than two instructors out of three reject the publications of the American Economic Foundation (74%) and the Textile Workers Union (71%); while majorities describe as "of little use" the materials of DuPont and of the Foundation for Economic Education.

AISI seems to rank about in the middle of these 25 groups, all things considered, and in our view should be pleased with the results. The AISI materials have achieved surprising penetration. Four out of five teachers have actually seen them, and almost all the others are at least aware of them. This is significantly better distribution than has been obtained by General Motors, for example, or by DuPont, the Foundation for Economic Education, or even the Joint Council on Economic Education.

Quite obviously a special interest group, AISI can scarcely expect its publications to be rated as useful to college economics instructors as those of government agencies or of the major foundations engaged in economic research. Yet 20% of the teachers say the AISI materials are "essential" or "very useful," and another 47% regard them as "moderately useful" -- a total of two out of three who find them of at least occasional help.

This achievement would seem particularly noteworthy, since the AISI publications have generally been prepared for a broader audience and few if any of the materials have been directed specifically at the population of undergraduate economics teachers. We have seen that the teachers do not reject special-interest materials out of hand, but rather stand ready to welcome the kinds of useful materials and information which industry can provide. They ask only that it be presented in an objective manner and on a level suitable to the serious student of economic forces and behavior.

Reactions to Educational Exhibits

All but 10% of the AEA sample and 4% of the subscribers say they attend professional meetings and conventions at least occasionally. Of those who do attend, two-thirds of the AEA group and three-fourths of the subscribers say they "usually look at the educational exhibits" (Q. 36). These latter respondents were then asked: "Can you recall offhand any exhibits that particularly impressed you -- either favorably or unfavorably? What exhibits were they? What did you like or dislike?"

A little over 60% of the group, both among the AEA and subscriber samples, either couldn't think of any particular exhibits, or said they weren't especially impressed by any of them, or explained that though they usually look at them they really don't think much of exhibits as an educational device.

The only exhibits which came in for special mention (23% of the AEA group and 21% of the subscriber group) were those of the publishing houses:

> "Publishers' exhibits that show new books that are out"
> "Book exhibits of the large publishers like McGraw-Hill and Prentice-Hall"
> "Textbook exhibits - a favorable opportunity to examine new books"

Thirteen respondents remarked on AISI or steel industry exhibits, six favorably and seven unfavorably. The following comments are representative:

"The steel exhibit at AEA in St.Louis - it had good pictures - I was very favorably impressed"
"An exhibit by U.S. Steel was very well presented and very useful"
"The steel industry had a good one in St.Louis this Christmas. Interesting, colorful moving picture"
"I was unfavorably impressed by the steel exhibit. Just purely too much of an exhibit"
"Steel - the money was thrown away. Most unimpressive. Particularly last month in St.Louis"
"There was an Iron and Steel exhibit showing film strips. It was for school, not college level"

Few teachers had any ideas for improving exhibits to make them more valuable. Five out of six of those who look at them had no suggestions, and no one idea received any considerable number of mentions.

Attendance at Economics Workshops

Twelve percent of the AEA group and 20% of the subscribers say they have at one time or another attended a summer economics workshop (Q.35). Not only have proportionately more subscribers attended at all; they seem to have attended on more than one occasion more often than the AEA sample. Again our analysis is handicapped by small numbers of cases; in this instance only 32 individuals in each group have had experience with summer workshops.

Two of the 32 subscribers with such experience said the workshop was sponsored by AISI. None of the AEA group referred to AISI sponsorship. The type of sponsorship most often reported -- by 12 of the AEA group and 9 subscribers -- was that of a college or university. It is possible that some of these might have been sponsored by AISI, although when both a college and some other sponsor was mentioned, the answer was coded only in terms of the "other" sponsor, as in the case of the two AISI mentions above.

Seven of the AEA group and two subscribers referred to a workshop sponsored by Republic Steel Corp; four of the former and six of the latter mentioned the auspices of the Joint Council on Economic Education; four of each group cited workshops sponsored by private industry other than steel. Among the miscellaneous workshops attended were a few banking conferences, a couple sponsored by the N.Y. Stock Exchange, and by Merrill Center of Economics.

The great majority of teachers who had attended one or more summer workshops termed them very helpful or fairly helpful. Half of the group cited their self-development through interchange of ideas about teaching methods and subject matter. About one in five of those who attended stressed the usefulness of the workshop in acquainting them with practical problems.

All respondents, including those who indicated they had never attended one, were asked for suggestions as to how summer workshops could be improved, but few ideas were volunteered. Four out of five expressed general satisfaction or said they didn't know enough about them to reply.

The two most frequent specific criticisms were that the workshops are on too elementary a level and serve no useful purpose, and that they are merely propaganda tools for special interest groups. Each of these criticisms was voiced by about one teacher in 25.

Miscellaneous suggestions for improvement of summer workshops or conferences, none of them receiving more than a few mentions, were: make the scheduling less tight, don't try to cover so much ground, make them more rigorous, and try to get better speakers.

In summary, it may be said that the minority who have attended summer workshops have found them helpful, but that the great majority are largely indifferent. Only five or ten percent appear hostile to the idea, but two instructors out of three simply have no opinion.

V

THE A.I.S.I. PUBLICATIONS

Readership

A little more than halfway through the interview, after the open ended inquiries about special interest group materials generally, and after discussing the programs of the 25 specific organizations, the teachers were asked directly about four publications of the American Iron and Steel Institute. These were Steel Facts, Steelways, Charting Steel's Progress, and "Inflation, Productivity, Profits and the Steelworker." (It should be remembered that three of these four publications provided the lists from which our subscriber sample was drawn.)

We placed these questions immediately after those concerning the 25 specific organizations in order to disguise the survey's particular interest and thus avoid the response bias which would inevitably result if the respondent were aware of the sponsorship of the study.

As a further precaution, we interspersed among our questions about the AISI publications a comparable series of questions about five other publications selected to represent a variety of interests and orientations. These five were: Monthly Review, issued by the Federal Reserve Banks; Economic Trends and Outlook, prepared by the AFL-CIO; Economic Intelligence, a Chamber of Commerce publication; Challenge, issued by the Institute of Economic Affairs at New York University; and Business Horizons, a publication of the Bureau of Business Research at the University of Indiana.

Since we were not concerned with detailed evaluation of these five other publications, only those data were processed which could serve as points of comparison with the teachers' reactions to the AISI materials.

The Monthly Reviews are by all odds the most frequently read of the nine publications inquired about (Table 17). Over half read these regularly, and better than nine out of ten see them at least "from time to time." In contrast, no other single publication is read regularly by more than 18% of the AEA sample, and none is seen at all by as many as half of the group.

Steel Facts, however, comes close to reaching half the instructors on at least an occasional basis. A total of 48% of the AEA sample say they read it either regularly or from time to time. In contrast, only 17% ever read Steelways or Charting Steel's Progress.

It is not surprising, as we see from the table, that the AISI group contains more readers of Steel Facts and Steelways than does the AEA sample. We must remember that approximately one-third of the subscriber sample was drawn from the mailing list of each publication. It is perhaps unexpected, however, that as many of the AEA sample as of the AISI subscribers have read the "Inflation, Productivity. . ." leaflet and are either regular or occasional readers of Charting Steel's Progress.

In addition, we note a tendency, consistent but never quite reaching statistical significance, for the AISI subscribers to be more frequent readers of the non-AISI publications inquired about. The sole exception here is Economic Trends and Outlook, read by approximately equal proportions of both groups. Each of the other four periodicals is more often reported as read by the AISI sample.

TABLE 17

READERSHIP OF SPECIFIC PUBLICATIONS

	Read It Regularly	Read It Occasionally	Never Read It	
Monthly Review				
AEA sample.	55%	37	8	= 100%
AISI subscribers.	64%	32	4	
Steel Facts				
AEA sample.	13%	35	52	
AISI subscribers.	34%	44	22	
Economic Trends & Outlook				
AEA sample.	6%	20	74	
AISI subscribers.	10%	18	72	
Economic Intelligence				
AEA sample.	18%	15	67	
AISI subscribers.	26%	20	54	
Challenge Magazine				
AEA sample.	6%	24	70	
AISI subscribers.	12%	27	61	
Steelways				
AEA sample.	5%	12	83	
AISI subscribers.	21%	16	63	
Business Horizons				
AEA sample.	3%	18	79	
AISI subscribers.	7%	24	69	
Charting Steel's Progress				
AEA sample.	5%	12	83	
AISI subscribers.	3%	14	83	
"Inflation, Productivity. ."				
AEA sample.	23%	(a)	77	
AISI subscribers.	24%	(a)	76	

a) Since this is not a periodical, the total readership is given in the "Read it Regularly" column.

Only three of the nine publications showed differences between Liberal Arts and Business School instructors. The former were more likely to report readership of Challenge magazine, while Steelways and Business Horizons appear to have a higher proportion of Business School readers.

Among readers of the AISI publications in the AEA sample, about two-thirds say they receive their own copies of the periodicals. The figures are 69% for Charting Steel's Progress, 65% for Steelways, and 61% for Steel Facts. Comparable figures among subscriber readers are 74%, 85% and 81%. Among both groups, those readers who do not receive their own copies say they see it at the library or read a friend's copy.

About half of the Steel Facts readers in the AEA sample, about a third of the Steelways readers, and about a fourth of the Charting Steel's Progress readers have been reading the publication for five years or more. The comparable figures among the total group of AISI subscriber-readers are somewhat higher: 63%, 58% and 30%, respectively.

Asked how they first started reading the three AISI periodicals, half of the AEA readers replied in each case, "It was sent to me in the mail." Among subscriber readers, the proportion was somewhat higher (about three in five), except for Steel Facts (about half).

We show in Table 18 a separate tabulation of the subscribers to Steel Facts and and Steelways with respect to their readership of those periodicals.

TABLE 18

READERSHIP OF "STEEL FACTS" AND "STEELWAYS" BY SUBSCRIBERS TO THOSE TWO PUBLICATIONS

	Subscribers to Steel Facts (55)	Subscribers to Steel-Ways (45)
Steel Facts		
Read regularly	44%	53%
Read from time to time	38	40
Never read	18	7
Steelways		
Read regularly	14%	51%
Read from time to time	13	29
Never read	73	20

Steel Facts seems to reach almost all Steelways subscribers, and is in fact read both regularly and occasionally by a higher proportion of the latter than of the Steel Facts list itself. In contrast, only about a quarter of the Steel Facts mailing list ever reads Steelways.

Knowledge of the AISI Publications' Source

In the course of inquiring about the readership of each AISI publication, we included the question, "Do you happen to know who published it?" As shown in Table 19, the proportion of readers who make a correct or substantially correct identification of the American Iron and Steel Institute varies from one publication to another and from one group to another.

Steel Facts is most commonly identified as an AISI periodical. Two-thirds of its readers in the AEA sample, three-fourths of the AISI subscribers who read it, and 85% of the respondents on the Steel Facts list who read it, correctly name the publisher. Eighteen percent of the AEA readers and 10% of the subscriber readers "don't know" who publishes it.

Charting Steel's Progress is next most often identified as an AISI publication. This list was not included among those from which we sampled AISI subscribers, but better than two-thirds of the AISI subscribers we did interview who read Charting Steel's Progress correctly named its publisher. About half of the AEA readers made the correct identification, though about one in ten thought it was published by U.S. Steel.

TABLE 19

PROPORTION OF READERS IN VARIOUS SAMPLES WHO MAKE CORRECT OR SUBSTANTIALLY CORRECT IDENTIFICATION OF AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE AS PUBLISHER *

	AEA Sample	All Subscribers	The Relevant List
Steel Facts.	67%	77%	85%
Charting Steel's Progress. . .	48%	70%	-
Steelways.	37%	66%	75%
"Inflation, Productivity.." . .	26%	16%	(13%)

* Included as "correct or substantially correct identification," in addition to AISI, are: The Iron and Steel Institute (or Institution), American Steel Institute, or Steel Institute.

Three-fourths of our subscriber-readers on the Steelways list identified AISI as the publisher; two-thirds of all the AISI subscriber-readers made the correct identification; but in the AEA sample, only about one Steelways reader in three knows that it is published by AISI. A quarter of these latter readers believe it is sponsored by U.S. Steel or by Bethlehem Steel.

AISI sponsorship of the "Inflation, Productivity. . ." leaflet was found to be least generally known. Unfortunately, only 15 of the sample of 62 representing the "IPPS" list said they had read the article; of these only 2 identified AISI as it s publisher. (This 13% figure is shown in parentheses in the table because of the small number of cases on which it is computed.) Six of these 15 readers thought the leaflet was put out by U.S. Steel.

Among the AISI subscriber group as a whole, only one in six attributed publication of "Inflation, Productivity. . ." to the proper source, while one in three thought it was a U.S. Steel publication. The AEA readers of the article are better informed in this case; one in four named AISI as the publisher and only one in five credited U.S. Steel.

Evaluations of AISI Publications

In studying instructors' attitudes toward particular AISI publications, we must of course confine our analysis in each case to individuals who are familiar with the publication. Unfortunately, this sharply reduces the number of cases at our disposal and makes it difficult to place full confidence in the percentaged results.

For example, only about one teacher in six ever reads Charting Steel's Progress. In the AEA sample, therefore, we have only 44 individuals who evidence any familiarity with this publication, and among AISI subscribers only 25. In the latter case, each answer is "worth" 4 percentage points, and we may be sure that if some other sample of 25 readers were selected in exactly the same way, the distribution of responses might well vary by as much as 25 or 30 percentage points simply because of random fluctuations in successive samples of this size.

For samples of 40 to 60 readers, we usually need differences of around 20 percentage points to be confident that we would get a similar difference in 99 samples in 100 of that size. For samples of 100 readers, we would require differences of about 13 percentage points to meet the same standard of confidence.

For the objectives of this study, however, for which we seek broad descriptive data rather than precise statistical estimates, the 99% confidence level seems unduly rigorous, and we may still be interested in smaller differences even though we can't be certain that they are not due to chance. We can, moreover, take somewhat greater assurance from smaller differences when these tend consistently in the same direction.

We interpose this word of caution lest the hasty reader become unduly impressed by a particular percentaged figure based on only 50 cases, or lest he accept uncritically a difference of only 5 or 10 percentage points between one publication or one group and another.

With these considerations in mind, we present Table 20, which shows the proportion of readers of each publication who find it "very helpful" or "fairly helpful" to them as college economics instructors. For comparative purposes, we asked the same question about Economic Trends and Outlook and about Challenge magazine, and the comparable figures are shown for these two periodicals. The figures in parentheses represent the number of cases on which the percentages are based.

Of the four AISI publications, the "Inflation, Productivity. . ." article seems to have been most helpful to the college economics instructors. Half of the subscriber group and 39% of the AEA sample say it was at least fairly helpful. Among the other three, differences are small, and inconsistent as between subscribers and AEA, and we had better not make any firm statements about them.

Subscribers, more than the general AEA sample, tend to find the AISI publications helpful to them. The differences are consistent for each publication, and in some cases approach statistical significance.

TABLE 20

PROPORTION OF READERS OF EACH PUBLICATION
WHO FIND IT "VERY HELPFUL" OR "FAIRLY HELPFUL"

	AEA	All AISI Subscribers
Steel Facts.	26% (127)	30% (127)
Steelways.	22% (46)	36% (60)
Charting Steel's Progress.	18% (45)	36% (27)
"Inflation, Productivity. . ."	39% (61)	51% (39)
Economic Trends and Outlook.	49% (67)	42% (46)
Challenge.	50% (80)	38% (61)

The reciprocals of the percentages shown (e.g., for Steel Facts, 74% of the AEA readers and 70% of subscriber readers) represent teachers who find the publication only "slightly helpful" or "of no help at all." If we look only at the latter group, it is clear that Steelways and Charting Steel's Progress are least useful to the instructor. Thirty-nine percent of the AEA readers of both these periodicals describe them as "no help at all."

The three AISI periodicals are used most often for the teacher's own information, "to keep informed about steel" (Qs. 27-F, 31-F, 33-E). Only about 10% of the AEA readers, and somewhat more of the subscribers, spontaneously say they put these publications to class use.

Asked what there is about the various AISI publications that they particularly like, or don't like so much, few instructors had strong views. From 30% to 40% of the AEA readers could think of nothing special they liked, and the great majority (from 70 to 90%) could think of nothing they particularly disliked (Qs. 27-HI, 31-HI, 33-GH). Such findings are commonplace in survey research when people are asked to come up with spontaneous criticism of things they have seldom given any particular thought to in the past.

The three periodicals are most frequently admired for the statistical data they contain and for the factual, current information they provide about the steel industry. A fourth of the AEA readers and a third of the subscriber readers called special attention to the style and format of Steelways, though we have seen that this particular publication is not often regarded as "helpful."

The patterns of response concerning the "Inflation, Productivity. . ." article were of a slightly different order. We have seen that this was regarded by both AEA and subscriber readers as the most helpful of the four AISI publications inquired about, and its special value seems to have been its effective presentation of the steel industry's point of view on a fundamental economic issue.

Thus, when asked why the article was helpful, a third of the AEA readers and almost half of the subscriber readers explained that it "presented the steel industry's side of the question very intelligently," "showed one point of view on steel wages and prices," "rounded out knowledge of the different points of view," etc. Approximately a third of the readers volunteered the information that such material on this topic was needed and useful.

Responses to "In what way was it useful to you?" were almost identical. Again approximately half of the readers praised it as an effective summary of the industry's viewpoint. And in reply to the question, "Was there anything about it you particularly liked?", the most frequent types of response referred to its well written presentation of the position of the industry.

The Question of "Bias"

Not unexpectedly, the most frequent "thing disliked" about all AISI publications is their "steel industry propaganda":

> "It just attempts to glorify the steel industry"
> "They hammer at rising labor costs too much"
> "The usual bias"

It should be remembered, however, that only a third or fewer of the readers had any special criticisms at all, and these complaints about "propaganda" were made, on the average, by only about one reader in every six or seven.

At the close of the questioning concerning each publication, however, each reader was asked directly: "And would you say that (name of publication) presents its material with a very high degree of bias, with a fairly high degree, a slight degree, or with no bias at all?" The question was also asked concerning two non-AISI periodicals, Challenge and Economic Trends and Outlook, for control purposes, and the results are shown in Table 21.

TABLE 21

PROPORTION OF READERS OF EACH PUBLICATION WHO CONSIDER IT "VERY" OR "FAIRLY BIASED"

	AEA	All Subscribers
"Inflation, Productivity. . ." . . .	56% (61)	53% (39)
Steel Facts.	40%(127)	39%(127)
Charting Steel's Progress.	26% (45)	11% (27)
Steelways.	26% (46)	36% (60)
Economic Trends and Outlook.	24% (67)	37% (46)
Challenge.	1% (80)	5% (61)

Those who perceived some bias in the AISI publications were asked in what way they considered the material to be biased. The most frequent type of response was vague and general: "Toward management," "In favor of industry," etc. Sometimes bias was seen in the way facts were selected or presented. Steel Facts was accused by some respondents of bias in discussion of labor matters, while "Inflation, Productivity. . ." was sometimes charged with biased interpretations and conclusions.

It is significant, however, that when asked in what way the publication was biased, a small group in each case went on to explain that such bias is only natural and not to be criticized: "They have a point of view and they present it," "That's inevitable if they want to tell their story."

We have seen that in most cases the readers of these publications are aware that they come from a special interest group -- if not AISI, from the steel industry generally or from some particular company such as U.S. Steel. In these circumstances, it is not surprising that, when asked the question, from a quarter to a half of the readers should say, "Yes, they are baised."

More indicative, we believe, of the true amount of objection to the materials because of bias are the spontaneous replies to the question, "What about the publication don't you like so much?" And in response to this question, as we have stated, only about one reader in every six or seven complains about bias.

The point is illustrated by a comparison of Tables 20 and 21, in which it is shown that although a majority of readers perceived at least a fair amount of bias in "Inflation, Productivity, Profits and the Steelworker," this same publication was nevertheless the most helpful of all the AISI publications to the college economics instructor. And the main reason it was helpful was precisely that it provided a clear and effective statement of the (biased) position of the steel industry.

One instructor's comment, which was cited in the preceding section of this report, should perhaps be quoted again:

> "They could be much more frank about their own bias and interest. They do themselves a disservice by presuming the fact would prejudice the public against them."

VI

EVALUATION OF THE ECONOMICS CURRICULUM

Areas Needing Greater Attention

Early in the interview, before any discussion of the various economic interest groups and their educational programs, each instructor was asked, "Are there any areas in the Introductory Economics Curriculum which you feel should be given more attention than they are being given now?" The majority of teachers answered affirmatively, 56% of the AEA sample and 61% of the AISI subscribers agreeing that certain areas deserved greater emphasis. Business School teachers did not differ at all from Liberal Arts in this respect.

But though the majority expressed less than full satisfaction with the introductory economics curriculum, there was no consensus on the particular areas most deserving of greater attention. Opinions varied widely, with no one area mentioned by more than 10% of the sample (Q.7).

Problems surrounding economic growth and development were most often cited as insufficiently stressed in the introductory course. Nine percent of the AEA sample gave this reply, while 8% referred to international economics, with particular attention to the economic growth of underdeveloped countries. As one professor said, "Many students take only beginning courses and need more orientation in the international field to understand problems today."

Two other areas were mentioned by 6% of the AEA sample. One of these was price theory and allocation of resources. "I feel students have very little comprehension of the allocative mechanism through prices. Price determination is not given enough emphasis." The other was money and banking, public finance and fiscal policy.

Five percent thought more attention should be devoted to economic history and the development of economic thought; an equal proportion would place more emphasis on comparative economic systems such as socialism and communism; while another 5% believe insufficient stress has been placed on income theory and the distribution of the gross national product.

There were virtually no differences at all in the proportions of AEA vs. subscriber respondents, or of Liberal Arts vs. Business, who mentioned one or another of these various areas.

Theoretical Economics vs. Applied

The majority of teachers seem satisfied with the balance struck between theoretical principles and applied problems in the introductory economics classes given at their schools. A separate question was asked about each, and responses were surprisingly similar on the two questions.

Fifty-nine percent of the AEA sample said there was "the right amount" of attention given to theory and principles; 61% said the right amount of attention was given to applied problems. For AISI subscribers, the comparable figures were 61% and 66% (Qs. 8-9).

Twenty-two percent of the AEA sample said there was too little attention given to theory and principles, and about the same proportion (24%) felt that too little was devoted to applied aspects of economics. Fifteen percent considered that too much attention was given to theory, and 10% that there was too much emphasis on applied problems. Again, subscribers showed no differences from the broader sample.

Business School teachers, however, were slightly less likely than Liberal Arts to express satisfaction on either point, although a majority of them answered "right amount" on both questions. They tend a little more than the Liberal Arts group (23% to 18%) to complain of too little theory, but the difference is not statistically significant.

It is difficult to draw from these findings any conclusion that college economics instructors in general would prefer a different balance between applied problems and theory in the introductory course. The majority is presently satisfied, and there is no clear consensus among the critics.

When those who think there is too much theoretical emphasis are asked in what areas this is true, about half refer to price, distribution and allocation theory; the area mentioned next most frequently is national income policy and theory. But when those who think there is too little theoretical emphasis are asked the same question, the same answers are given. The largest number refer to price, distribution and allocation theory, and the second largest to national income policy and theory.

Overemphasis on applied problems is most frequently thought to occur with respect to money and banking, and monetary and fiscal policy; and to management economics. But aside from a general complaint that there is "too little emphasis on the application of theory to real problems," money and banking, and monetary and fiscal policy, is also the specific area most often cited in which there is not enough applied emphasis.

In their own teaching, the majority of instructors say they tend to emphasize theoretical principles more than the applied aspects of economics. Table 22 shows the distribution of these responses, and also reveals a significant difference between the AISI subscribers and the AEA sample.

TABLE 22

"Considering all the undergraduate courses you teach, would you say that there is greater emphasis on the theoretical principles or on the applied institutional aspects of economics in your classes?"

	AEA	Subscribers
Theoretical principles.	61%	50%
Applied aspects	23	27
Equal emphasis on both.	13	21
Depends, Don't know	3	2
	100%	100%

Economic Viewpoints

In attempting to explore attitudinal factors which might predispose some instructors more than others to be receptive to AISI materials, a series of questions was asked concerning the teaching of economic viewpoints. The first of these was: "Now, thinking in terms of what is taught in your own classes, which economic viewpoints generally are discussed in your classes?"

The question was deliberately phrased in these broad terms, and interviewers of course were not permitted to explain or illustrate what was intended by the phrase, "economic viewpoints." Our purpose was to obtain a spontaneous reply which would indicate the kind of economic viewpoints salient to the professor; e.g., ideological, theoretical, or interest group.

Three teachers out of ten said they did not present or stress any particular viewpoints at all, or said they couldn't answer because they did not know what we meant by "economic viewpoints" (Q.11).

> "I don't know what that means. I discuss the analytical apparatus developed by economics over the last 75 years"

> "None, since they're really not germane. Classical economics is discussed as it developed historically"

Another three in ten (actually, 33% of the AEA sample) referred to economic theorists and clearly had in mind analytic or scientific viewpoints.

> "We take up both macro and micro economics. We're emphasizing Keynesism which is macro."

> "Primarily the neo-classical price and allocation theory"

> "An eclectic approach. I don't adhere to any particular school"

Another group, amounting to one teacher in six, indicated hospitality to all kinds of viewpoints without restricting them to theoretical, ideological or interest group.

> "I try to present all major alternatives and then evaluate them"

> "I would presume we discuss all viewpoints, any and all"

Among the special interest group viewpoints, that of government or public policy, and of private industry, business or management, were each mentioned by 9% of the AEA sample. Five percent referred to the public or consumer viewpoint, 4% to the labor viewpoint, and 1% to the farm viewpoint. Many teachers mentioned more than one of these, as illustrated below; their answer was included in the total of each group named.

> "Various viewpoints - government, business, labor"

> "The businessman's and the government administrator's"

Finally there was a group of responses which referred to ideological viewpoints. Eight percent of the AEA sample, for instance, said they presented a "liberal" philosophy or viewpoint.

> "I present all sides of every question weighed and considered from a liberal point of view"

> "I'd say the liberal viewpoint is given emphasis"

Seven percent said they discussed the viewpoint of capitalism or free enterprise.

> "Obviously there is a capitalistic viewpoint"

> "I teach pure capitalism, the viewpoint of a free enterprise economy"

And 4% stressed a conservative economic philosophy.

The AISI subscribers were more likely to refer to interest group viewpoints such as government, business and labor; and less likely to answer in terms of analytical or scientific viewpoints, or to say that they strove to present all viewpoints. Business School teachers differed hardly at all from Liberal Arts in their replies to this question, save for a somewhat greater tendency to emphasize industry's viewpoint.

After this general question, we asked respondents specifically how they felt about the amount of emphasis given, first to the industry viewpoint and then to the labor viewpoint, in today's college economics curriculum. The replies are shown in Table 23.

TABLE 23

"Do you feel that the industry/labor viewpoint generally is given too much emphasis or too little emphasis in today's college economics curriculum?"

Industry Viewpoint	AEA	Subscribers
Too much emphasis.	18%	20%
About right amount	51	47
Too little emphasis.	16	17
Don't know	15	16
	100%	100%
Labor Viewpoint		
Too much emphasis.	11%	12%
About right amount	51	56
Too little emphasis.	24	18
Don't know	14	14
	100%	100%

It is clear first that about half the teachers believe there is appropriate emphasis today on both the business and the labor viewpoint, and that only about a third of the total sample are dissatisfied with the balance. But the dissatisfied group themselves are divided on the remedy for the situation. Approximately as many complain that there is too much emphasis on the business viewpoint as complain that there is too little.

With respect to labor, about a quarter of the AEA sample feel there is too little attention paid to their viewpoint, and only one in ten says there is too much. The second finding, therefore, is that there is more feeling that labor's point of view is underrepresented in today's college economics teaching than there is that the business point of view is receiving insufficient attention.

Thirdly, we see that the AISI subscribers differ scarcely at all from the AEA sample on these questions. Only one subscriber in six feels that the industry viewpoint is not being stressed enough, and only one in eight believes there is too much emphasis on labor's point of view in today's economics courses.

Objections to the amount of emphasis on the industry viewpoint most often center on its alleged narrowness and lack of concern for the general welfare. Some complain that the industry viewpoint is too job-centered and tends toward mere vocational training for the students, rather than teaching the scientific and analytic aspects of economics.

Those who feel there is not enough emphasis on industry's point of view frequently explain the situation on the basis of the average instructor's lack of familiarity with business problems. A few respondents singled out current economic texts as not designed to do an adequate job of presenting industry's viewpoint.

In explaining what they regard as overemphasis on labor's viewpoint, instructors who take that position most often blame their fellow teachers and economists, whom they see as a liberal group who are basically more sympathetic to labor than to business.

But the greater number who believe labor's viewpoint is not adequately presented in today's college economics courses take precisely the opposite stand. They see their colleagues and their schools as pro-industry and basically unsympathetic to labor.

Basic Values in Economics Teaching

In trying to set attitudes toward the use of private industry materials into a larger attitudinal framework, we explored briefly the instructors' reactions toward the teaching of basic values in economics. Our questions were: "What do you consider to be some of the basic values in economics? Do you think that basic values should be brought out in teaching economics?" (Q.15).

Taking the second question first, it is clear that almost all of the teachers believe that basic values should be brought out in teaching economics. Eighty-six percent of the AEA sample and even more of the subscribers (93%) answer "Yes" to the question. Only about one instructor in twenty gives a negative reply.

The difference between the AEA and subscriber groups is just large enough to satisfy the confidence limits for statistical reliability, as was the variance between Liberal Arts (92%) and Business School (85%) instructors. Thus, it may be said that the AISI subscribers and the Liberal Arts teachers, even more often than their counterpart samples, believe in limning basic values in their teaching of college economics.

When asked what some of these basic values are, the largest group of respondents gave answers along the lines of developing enlightened citizenship or, more specifically, objectivity, a critical perspective, and an analytical framework for confronting economic problems.

> "I would say training in analysis to give a more intelligent grasp of economic problems. Training also in reasoning and logic is another basic value"

> "It should lead to better informed citizenship and a more rational approach to social problems"

> "Understanding of how our economic system operates, which gives them an ability to judge public issues on a factual rather than an emotional basis"

Such replies were given by 40% of the AEA sample, and even more often (49%) by AISI subscribers. This answer, however, seems to describe the <u>educational</u> values of economics, rather than the particular values adhering to economics as a system of knowledge.

Our question was designed, just like the broad question on "economic viewpoints," to gather the instructor's own interpretation of the term "values" without structuring it for him in any way. From the responses, we see that the term lends itself to a variety of meanings -- from educational results, as illustrated in the examples cited above, to politico-philosophical concepts of freedom and free choice, justice and the interdependence of men, to socio-economic values of the general security and welfare, efficiency and economic growth, and recognition of the human and personal elements motivating economic phenomena.

From a fifth to a quarter of the teachers mentioned as a basic value in economics some idea about individual freedom and individual choice expressed in work and consumer roles, sometimes including free enterprise as an extension of the concept.

> "The main value is the belief in individual choice on the part of both consumers and producers in the operation of the economy. I would expand this to give it a non-economic value which coincides with the furtherance of a liberal democracy"

> "Recognition of individual differences. .Individual freedom of action"

Exactly the same proportion saw the basic value of economics in terms of the efficient allocation and utilization of resources or of economic growth.

> "Efficiency. Getting the most from given resources"

> "It enables us to discover the principles of resources allocation so we can most efficiently use our resources to increase our levels of living"

Somewhat similar were the responses made by 18% of the AEA sample and 14% of the subscribers, who answered that the basic value in economics is the general welfare, the good of the people.

> "To improve the living and welfare of the people"

> "Public needs. Security from all kinds of physical and psychic ill"

Mentioned by twice as many subscribers as AEA teachers (15% to 6%) was the concept of equal opportunity and justice: the fair distribution of income and wealth, equality of rewards for productive effort, equal opportunity for initiative and creativity, etc.

Also more often mentioned by subscribers than by the AEA sample (9% to 5%) was the concept of social interdependence and cooperation.

Twelve percent of the AEA sample, and 9% of the subscribers, could find no basic values in economics or were unable to answer the question.

VII

USE OF PARTICULAR TEACHING AIDS

Use of Community Resources in Economics Teaching

As measures of the use of community resources in college economics teaching, we asked about how often the instructors invited outside speakers to come in and address their classes, and how often they arranged class visits to companies or organizations in the local community (Qs. 17-18).

While only one instructor in twenty says he "frequently" has outside speakers talk to his class, more than half the AEA sample (53%) and close to two-thirds of the AISI subscribers (63%) adopt this procedure at least occasionally. The organization of class visits to local companies is far less usual, but again the subscribers are more active than the average economics teacher in this respect. Almost a third of the subscribers (31%), but only 18% of the AEA sample say they ever do this.

Differences between Liberal Arts and Business School instructors in their answers to these questions are much smaller and do not come close to statistical significance.

Outside speakers are used at least occasionally in a wide variety of economics courses, with no single course accounting for as many as one-fourth of the mentions. Introductory economics, labor or labor relations, and money and banking were the courses referred to most frequently; and labor economics, labor-management relations, and money, banking, investments and savings were most often cited as the subject of their talks.

The outside speakers, too, come from a wide variety of sources and seem to represent many different interests. A third of the teachers who have used outside speakers during the last two years say they were drawn from business and industry; 28% say they were from some government agency, 22% used speakers representing banks or brokerage houses, and 20% say they brought in spokesmen for labor. Twenty-eight percent have presented guest lectures by colleagues from their own or other universities. (The percentages add to more than 100 because most instructors who have used outside speakers obtained them from more than one source.)

The AISI subscribers have more often used speakers representing business and representing labor than the AEA group, and less often rely on fellow academicians. Of the entire sample, two AEA respondents, but none of the subscriber group, specifically referred to the steel industry as the source of a speaker.

Few instructors reported any difficulty obtaining outside speakers when desired, and almost all say they were satisfied with the speakers' presentations. The qualities most often praised in outside speakers were their expertise and knowledgeability, and their contribution of practical, real-life experiences and understandings.

So few teachers report organizing class visits that no detailed analysis was attempted of their replies and the responses were not coded or tabulated. Examination of some of their answers, however, reveals the wide range of organizations and institutions to which some instructors introduce their undergraduate students.

"An all night tour of commodity markets for general background"
"Exchanges, banks and local brokerage houses"
"The Federal Reserve Bank, the Proctor & Gamble plant, the Lincoln-Mercury assembly plant"
"The Farm Credit Administration"
"A different one every year. This year the Borden Corp. (precision ball bearings)"
"The San Francisco produce market, the stock exchange, many processing plants"
"The tax assessor's office"
"To a labor organization"

Reactions of the relatively few teachers who follow this practice were almost uniformly favorable. "The students respond. . .It's rewarding to them. . .They can equate what they learn in the classroom with everyday business activities . . .It's learning in a direct way."

Student Debates

In the thought that special interest group materials might be useful as subjects for student debates, we included a short series of questions about this teaching technique.

The questions were not productive, simply because the great majority of instructors said they never engage in this practice (Q.16). Only 3% of the AEA sample have student debates "frequently" and only about one in seven ever have them. Again, the AISI subscriber group is more active in this respect, but even among subscribers, the proportion who ever use debates as a teaching method is but one in five.

Use of Audio-Visual Aids

As with student debates, the use of outside speakers and the organization of class visits, the AISI subscribers are more likely than the average economics teacher to employ some audio-visual technique in the classroom (Q.19). Only 29% of the AEA sample, but 43% of the subscribers, say they sometimes use such aids in their courses.

Of the various forms of audio-visual aids, movies are most often used, with film strips second. Exhibits are the type least often employed. A majority of the users of each technique find it "very useful" or "fairly useful," but the number of users is too small to permit critical evaluations of the relative usefulness of the various media.

The majority of instructors who do not make use of the audio-visual techniques most often explain that such devices are not appropriate to the subject matter of their courses, or merely state a preference for some other teaching method as more efficient or instructive.

> "Not much use for visual aids here because of the nature of my courses. They are theory courses"
>
> "(Audio visual aids) are usually too far removed from the purpose"
>
> "If we present film strips we lack the flexibility we get with the blackboard"
>
> "My own feeling is to try to give ample opportunity for student participation, for example the case method and discussion periods"

The second most frequent objection leveled by non-users of audio-visual aids was their lack of familiarity with any good ones or, in some cases, doubt as to whether good ones exist.

> "I'm not familiar with them - mainly because no one has bothered to familiarize me with them"
>
> "I don't believe I've seen any that looked particularly suitable and I don't have the time to look for them"
>
> "The ones we have access to in the film library are just no good"

The third main group of criticisms, less frequent than the first two, was of the time it takes to use audio-visual materials as balanced against the benefit derived from them.

Other reasons for failure to use these techniques were the feeling that they were too elementary, not up to college level; and lack of equipment, facilities or funds for such aids.

Attitudes Toward Film Strips

A sizable majority of all respondents (73% of the AEA sample and 80% of the subscribers) have seen at least one film strip dealing with economic problems (Q. 20). The most frequently mentioned subjects of these film strips were money, credit, banking; supply and demand, income, prices; principles of economics or introductory economics; and industrial organization or production processes.

Only nine respondents in the AEA sample and four in the subscriber group had ever seen a film strip dealing with the steel industry.

The strips referred to most frequently were those put out by commercial publishers such as McGraw-Hill, Prentice-Hall or the Encyclopedia Britannica. One-fourth of those who had seen a film strip had no idea who produced it. Among the other types of producers mentioned were the Federal Reserve System, a private business or industry, labor organizations and trade associations.

Reactions to the film strips seen were more frequrntly unfavorable than favorable, an unusual finding in public opinion surveys since respondents are generally undisposed to criticize in the absence of strong feelings or first-hand experience.

But only one instructor in six said the film strips he was aware of were "very helpful" or even "fairly helpful" to him in his teaching. About a third of the AEA sample called them only "slightly helpful", and almost half said flatly that "they do not add to the teacher's knowledge or teaching techniques." Subscribers were less likely to take the extreme view and more likely to term them "slightly helpful," but otherwise there was no difference in the attitudes of the two groups.

The teachers named a variety of reasons for the ineffectiveness of film strips, most usually stating that they are too elementary or superficial and that the students get no real learning from them. When asked how film strips might be made more useful, half the sample had no ideas and another 17% spontaneously expressed a complete lack of interest in the medium.

The main suggestions for improvement, by the few instructors who had suggestions, were to make them more advanced, to try to gear them to theoretical or analytical problems, and to develop them in consultation with college economics instructors rather than with business or labor economists.

It seems clear from these data that the attitude of teachers toward the economics film strips which are currently available is that most of them are not appropriate for college-level teaching. There is an apparent need to develop material in greater depth and to gear it more closely with the content of the course and the other classroom materials available. Even with these improvements, however, it is not certain that film strips would be a medium of interest to a great number of college economics instructors.

APPENDIX A - BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Economics Association. 1956 Handbook.

2. Albert L. Ayars and Bertis E. Capehart, Survey of Secondary School Economics Teaching and Materials. Hill and Knowlton, Inc. (1961)

3. J.H. Dodd and C.W. Hasek, Economics: Principles and Applications. South-Western Publishing Company, 1957.

4. Joint Council on Economic Education. Annotated Bibliography of Materials in Economic Education, Vol. 39, pp. 243-248, Dec. 1954.

5. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr. The Academic Mind, Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1958.

6. C.W. McKee and H.G. Moulton, A Survey of Economic Education, Brookings Institution, 1951.

7. Walter Scott Monroe (ed.), Encyclopaedia of Educational Research, Third edition, New York, Macmillan, 1960.

8. C.F. Phillips, "By Their own Petard...", Association of American Colleges Bulletin, V. 39, pp. 243-248, May 1953.

9. R. Powers, "Point of View in the Study of Economics," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, V. 40, pp. 582-585, Dec. 1954.

10. Horace Taylor, "On Teaching Undergraduate Economics," Supplement to the American Economic Review, Dec. 1950.

11. H. Thomassen, Trends in Economic Education, Washington, Public Affairs Press, 1956.

12. "Undergraduate Teaching of Economics: Symposium," American Economic Review, V. 36, pp. 845-863, May 1946.

13. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, University Teaching of Social Sciences: Economics, New York, Columbia University Press, 1954.

14. United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, College and University Faculties, Bulletin 1959, No. 27.

15. United States Department of Health,Education and Welfare,Office of Education, Faculty and Other Professional Staff in Institutions of Higher Education. OE-53000.

16. United States Department of Health,Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Opening (Fall) Enrollment in Higher Education, 1959: Analytic Report, OE-54007.

17. United States Department of Health,Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Opening (Fall) Enrollment in Higher Education, 1959: Institutional Data, OE-54003.

18. Charles R. Wright and Herbert H. Hyman, "Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Evidence from National Sample Surveys," American Sociological Review, Vol. 23, No. 3, June 1958.