

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/46541611>

The Culture of Academic Disciplines and the Sociopolitical Attitudes of Students: A Test of Selection and Socialization Effects

Article in *Social Science Quarterly* · June 2009

DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6237.2009.00626.x · Source: RePEc

CITATIONS

42

READS

307

2 authors:



Mark Elchardus

Vrije Universiteit Brussel

87 PUBLICATIONS 782 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Bram Spruyt

Vrije Universiteit Brussel

97 PUBLICATIONS 985 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



VUB PhD Survey [View project](#)



SONO (Steunpunt Onderwijs) [View project](#)

The Culture of Academic Disciplines and the Sociopolitical Attitudes of Students: A Test of Selection and Socialization Effects*

Mark Elchardus, *Free University Brussels*

Bram Spruyt, *Free University Brussels*

Objective. Using cross-sectional and panel data, this article estimates to what extent the association between students' choice of academic discipline and their sociopolitical attitudes is due to socialization and selection effects. *Methods.* This is done on the basis of seven incoming cohorts of students and one panel of students. Changes in the panel are controlled for contextual influences by comparing them to a control group. *Results.* Both selection and socialization effects are observed. The first are, however, much stronger than the second. *Conclusions.* Although the literature, and particularly the more popular literature, highlights socialization effects, these turn out to be very modest. Future research should address the questions of how and why students select academic disciplines in a way that establishes strong relations between those disciplines and their sociopolitical attitudes.

The idea that teachers have a tremendous sociopolitical influence on their pupils is widespread. The United States regularly erupts in panic over the influence of radical professors. Hamilton and Hargens (1993:603) go so far as to explain the U.S. interest in the attitudes of the professoriate as due to fear that its leftist inclination will infect future generations. Whatever the motives for its funding, research on this topic has given rise to a number of interesting and important questions concerning the relationship between disciplinary paradigms and sociopolitical attitudes, and concerning the way students select academic disciplines and are influenced by the disciplines chosen. This research note uses panel data to test two different explanations for the relationship between the sociopolitical attitudes of students and the academic disciplines they pursue.

*Direct correspondence to Mark Elchardus, Vakgroep Sociologie, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussels, Belgium (Mark.Elchardus@vub.ac.be). Professor Elchardus will supply all data and coding information with those wishing to replicate the study. The authors thank the anonymous reviewers of *Social Science Quarterly* for their helpful comments.

Academic Disciplines as Subcultures

Various authors have empirically established systematic relationships between academic disciplines and sociopolitical attitudes, and have offered theoretical explanations for such a relationship. Lipset (1982), musing about the attitudes of professors, emphasizes the fact that academic excellence, however measured, is related to more liberal and leftist attitudes. He explains this in terms of the habitat of professors. They are trained to renew knowledge and are therefore less attached to the status quo or, quoting Schumpeter, "from the criticism of a text to the criticism of a society, the way is shorter than it seems" (Lipset, 1982:147). The habits of the mind that foster effective scholarly activity are supposed to also lead to sociopolitical attitudes that are critical of the status quo. In line with that thesis, Andersen (1999:93) observed that Danish researchers, regardless of discipline, vote more to the left than the population as a whole. Yet, regardless of such possible general effects of intellectual activity, a clear differentiation of attitudes along disciplinary lines is repeatedly observed (Selvin and Hagstrom, 1965; Emmerson, 1968; Ladd and Lipset, 1975; Lipset, 1982; Brint, 1984; Hoge and Hoge, 1984; Hamilton and Hargens, 1993; Nakhaie and Brym, 1999; Andersen, 1999; Kemmelmeier, Danielson, and Basten, 2005; Jacobsen, 2001; Webb-Halpern, 2003). Social science and liberal arts professors tend to be left or liberal leaning, natural scientists middle of the road, and business and engineering professors tend to be conservative or to the right.

How Do the Attitudes of Students Come to Resemble Those of Their Professors?

The question how a systematic relationship between the attitudes of students and their courses of study emerges is answered in two mutually non-exclusive ways. The selection hypothesis states that students select the academic discipline that correspond to their already acquired sociopolitical attitudes and thereby establish a relationship between those attitudes, the academic discipline they pursue, and the attitudes of their professors. The socialization hypothesis states that students acquire, in the course of their studies, the attitudes prevalent among their professors and consistent with the culture of the discipline studied. We now briefly review these two general hypotheses.

The Socialization Hypothesis

The socialization hypothesis is by far the most widespread of the two. Early works dealing with the relationship between college education and

sociopolitical attitudes, such as Theodore Newcomb's *Personality and Social Change* (1943), emphasized the influence of the college experience, and concluded that students enter as conservatives and graduate as liberals. The socializing influence of teachers and of academic environments is indeed by far the easiest to envision. During their training, students are expected to acquire critical habits of the mind (Lipset, 1982), acquire the interest and concerns of their teachers (Ladd and Lipset, 1975), and/or generalize the general presuppositions, disciplinary paradigms, and cognitive convictions of their discipline into more general sociopolitical attitudes and styles of attribution (Guimond, Begin, and Palmer, 1989; Andersen, 1999). Guimond, Begin, and Palmer do in fact equate the pursuit of a course of study to socialization into a social group. They claim that such a socialization process "can be regarded as prescribing a code of cognitive conduct" (1989:135).

When the sociopolitical attitudes of the professoriate are discussed in popular or semi-popular media, it is done almost exclusively in terms of the political influence teachers exert on their students. This was, for instance, very much in evidence in the popular books that, at the beginning of the 1990s, tried to contribute to a more conservative climate on campus, such as Roger Kimball's *Tenured Radicals: How Politics Has Corrupted Our Higher Education* (1990) and Dinesh D'Souza's *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus* (1991). The leftists or liberal leanings of social science professors are often of great concern to conservatives and right-wingers because it is believed that these disciplines offer more frequent occasions for influencing students than, say, the teaching of chemistry, mathematics, or engineering. Worries about the influence of the sociopolitical attitudes of teachers are based on the proposition that teachers strongly influence the views of their students and do so more strongly in (social science) disciplines that offer frequent occasions for talking about society and politics.

The professoriate is, however, not the only influence to which the students can be exposed. Peers are also part of the academic environment and can amplify the influence of the professors (Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991). Furthermore, that influence can, but need not, be direct. Various authors conclude that students with values that are close to those of their instructors receive better grades and are more satisfied (Abrami and Mizener, 1985; Gottfredson and Holland, 1990; Kemmelmeier, Danielson, and Basten, 2005). The mechanisms accounting for such relationships can obviously promote value conformity.

Whatever the precise mechanism of socialization, different socialization effects are ascribed to different disciplines and various arguments are advanced to explain such an affinity between sociopolitical attitudes and academic disciplines. We focus here on differences within the human sciences, between the social sciences on the one hand, and economics, business, and law on the other.

Ladd and Lipset (1975:98) cite Patrick Moynihan's statement that "social scientists love poor people," and ascribe that disposition to the frequent and intense study of social problems. They assume that the academic involvement with poverty, inequality, and the reproduction of both breeds liberal and leftist attitudes. The affinity between discipline and attitudes is thus situated at the level of specific problem formulations and observations. Ladd and Lipset describe academic disciplines as subcultures, centered around specific subject matters, with the attendant kinds of professional experience and interests (1975:69).

Guimond, Begin, and Palmer (1989) frame their view of the affinity between attitude and discipline in terms of attribution theory. They want to investigate to what extent the cultural or ideological context (of the discipline practiced) influences attribution. They distinguish between blaming poverty (1) on the individuals concerned, (2) on social causes, and (3) on fate. This distinction, particularly between situational or social explanations and internal or individual attributions, is politically relevant and closely related to leftist-liberal and rightist-conservative positions. Guimond, Begin, and Palmer hypothesize that the paradigmatic assumptions of the disciplines pursued influence the style of explanation or attribution preferred by the students. Social science students are expected to opt more readily for situational explanations, while students of business administration will, in keeping with the Protestant philosophy to which they are exposed, more often opt for explanations in terms of personal responsibility (1989:128). In this case, the affinity between sociopolitical attitudes and the culture of academic disciplines is situated at the level of the general presuppositions or cognitive convictions that are used in the various disciplines. The argument does in fact posit a continuity between the metaphysical grounding and presuppositions of academic disciplines and everyday attitudes and discourses. Andersen (1999) also situates the affinity between academic discipline and attitudes at the level of general presuppositions or cognitive convictions. According to this author, systematic relationships between political discourse and academic paradigms can come about through a hermeneutic affinity between the cognitive convictions implied by the paradigms and the sociopolitical attitudes that sensitize for the political discourse.

A somewhat similar position is developed by Gabennesch (1972), who attributes authoritarianism to a lack of "breath of perspective" and to the tendency to "reify" the existing cultural mores and societal arrangements. Advanced education is supposed to broaden one's perspective and to stimulate sensitivity to the contingency of specific institutions, values, and practices. Although all advanced education can have those virtues, Gabennesch expects advanced education in the humanities and the social sciences to contribute particularly to such a broadening of perspective. The general presupposition that social reality is contingent is expected to inspire anti-authoritarian attitudes in everyday life.

The socialization hypothesis has in fact become so dominant that Dey bluntly states: "Although other theories have been advanced to explain the apparent effect of education on attitudes, the most commonly accepted view suggests that socialization processes are at work" (1996:536). This helps to explain why correlations between attitudes of teachers and students, as well as differences between students pursuing different academic disciplines, are sometimes without further ado attributed to socialization effects (Weidman, 1989; Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991).

Socialization effects can, of course, only be observed on the basis of panel data. Such research concerning the affinities between disciplinary cultures and attitudes is rare. An available example does in fact lend only weak support to the socialization thesis. Dey (1996:551) concludes that his results "suggest that popular concerns about faculty creating an environment that produces political clones are incorrect."

The Selection Hypothesis

Positions for and against the socialization and selection theses are often taken on the basis of belief in the primacy of early socialization versus belief in continued socialization (Sigel, 1989; Easton and Dennis, 1969; Jenssen, 1993). The first of these suggests that a correlation between academic discipline and sociopolitical attitudes is a consequence of attitudes that are already acquired by the time the academic field of study is selected and that therefore are likely to influence the selection, rather than to be influenced by it. The belief in continued socialization allows for a socialization effect of higher education.

The theory of the primacy of early socialization favors the selection hypothesis, but begs the question how attitudes concretely guide the selection of academic disciplines. One can envision different ways in which a relationship between attitudes and selected discipline can occur. It is possible that background variables, for instance, related to the socioeconomic status of the family of origin, influence both the sociopolitical attitudes of the students and their choice of discipline and create a (spurious) relationship between the two. Selection effects can also come about through the ideas the future students have concerning the career paths and the professional and institutional settings in which the graduates of the different disciplines are likely to work, as well as concerning the professional interests likely to prevail in those milieus (Ladd and Lipset, 1975). One of the more interesting possibilities, from the point of view of cultural sociology and the sociology of knowledge, is based on the continuity between the metaphysical grounding and presuppositions of academic disciplines (Alexander, 1982:2–5) and of everyday attitudes and discourses (Guimond, Begin, and Palmer, 1989; Andersen, 1999). The relationship between the attitudes and the discipline selected can, of course, also come about because students have

general ideas about the affinities between disciplines and attitudes, without necessarily conceiving those (or being able to articulate them) in terms of the cognitive convictions underpinning the disciplinary paradigms (Pike, 2006).

In this research note we want to answer three questions.

- Do selection effects exist?
- Do panel data reveal socialization effects?
- Do the socialization effects differ between the academic disciplines pursued, and do those differences conform to the prevailing view of “leftist” or “progressive” social sciences and “rightist” or “conservative” students of law and economics?

Selection Effects: Do Sociopolitical Attitudes Influence the Choice of Academic Discipline?

To test the selection hypothesis, data collected at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (Free University of Brussels) are used. Almost every year, in the second week of the academic year, new students in the sociology course fill in a written questionnaire. All students wanting to obtain a diploma in law, economics, psychology, education, pedagogy, social pedagogy, political science, media studies, and sociology are required to take Sociology I. About 500 to 600 students fill in the questionnaire each year. To determine whether there are selection effects, we use the data on the incoming cohorts from 1999 to 2007 (no surveys were taken in 2004 and 2006).

On the basis of Andersen's (1999) findings and our knowledge of the different curricula, the different disciplines were grouped into three categories: “social sciences” (comprising sociology, political science, communication and media studies, psychology, pedagogy, and social pedagogy), law and economy, and criminology. The latter discipline was considered as a separate category because it is offered within the law department but comprises elements of a social science curriculum. To test the selection hypothesis, the students opting for social sciences are compared to those choosing law or economics.

To see whether there is a relationship between sociopolitical attitudes and the academic discipline selected, two dimensions of sociopolitical attitudes are used. The first gauges attitudes with regard to equality and redistribution. It is close to the traditional conception of the left/right divide as concerned with issues of allocation (information concerning the scale is provided in a technical appendix available at www.vub.ac.be/TOR/academic_disciplines). It is called the “old left/right cleavage” or “old cleavage” for short. A high score indicates a leftist position in favor of greater equality and redistribution. The second dimension tries to capture the alignments of attitudes that separate the new right from other political positions and from the new left. Taking the different attitudes that have

been found to be specific for the electorates of the extreme right as a starting point, a search was undertaken to identify a coherent discourse typical of the new right-wing parties (Elchardus, 1994, 1996; Elchardus and Pelleriaux, 1998). The thesis derived from this approach is that the rise of those parties is related to a specific alignment of attitudes. This alignment is measured as a meta-factor based on scales measuring ethnocentrism, authoritarianism, anti-politics, and utilitarian individualism or the belief that human action is always oriented by the pursuit of self-interest (see the technical appendix). The meta-factor is called the “new cleavage” and a high score indicates a new rightist position in favor of ethnocentrism, authoritarianism, anti-political feelings, and utilitarian individualism (the general properties of the different scales are given in the technical appendix). For the analysis, standardized summation scales are used for both the old and new left/right cleavages. The correlations between the summation scales and the factor scores are always higher than 0.97 (see the technical appendix).

Table 1 shows that in all seven years in which the survey was taken, the position on the old cleavage quite strongly and significantly influences (or is related to) the choice of academic discipline. Young people denouncing inequality and coming out in favor of redistribution are more likely to opt for the social sciences, while incoming students with a more rightist position on the old left/right divide are more likely to opt for law or economics. The effect of the new cleavage is less constant. It is insignificant in 2001, barely significant in 2005, but quite strong and clearly significant at the other five observation points. Students with a new right orientation are more likely to opt for law or economics; students with a new left orientation are more likely to select a social science discipline. There clearly are selection effects, and they follow the by now familiar pattern of more leftist-oriented social sciences students and more rightist-oriented students of law and economics. Yet, it seems necessary, in order to capture the existing affinities, to take into account both the more conventional definition of the left/right cleavage, centered around issues of allocation, and the newer definition, centered around issues of life politics.

Does Higher Education Influence Sociopolitical Attitudes?

To test for socialization effects, the student cohort of 2001, entering in the academic year 2001–2002, served as a panel. Those students were interviewed again, almost four years later, during the second semester of the academic year 2004–2005. Panel data provide information at the individual level and allow us to measure “net change” in the attitudes of the same respondents. These panel data will be used to ascertain whether there are socialization effects, and whether these are different for the different disciplines. The first interview was taken in class, the follow-up interview was done either by mail questionnaire or online (whatever was most convenient

TABLE 1

Logistic Regression Study Choice (Social Sciences Versus Economics, Law, and Business Engineer) According to Political Attitudes	Year					
	2007	2005	2003	2002	2001	2000
Dependent Variable: Study (0 = Social Sciences; 1 = Law, Economics, and Business Engineer)	exp(b)	exp(b)	exp(b)	exp(b)	exp(b)	exp(b)
Constant	0.419***	0.498***	0.359***	0.332***	0.363***	0.413***
Old cleavage ^a	0.550***	0.667***	0.529***	0.547***	0.609***	0.586***
New cleavage ^a	1.510***	1.275*	1.499***	1.505***	1.171 ns	1.425***
Model χ^2 (df)	68.235 (2)	28.122 (2)	65.454 (2)	62.177 (2)	30.295 (2)	56.333 (2)
Nagelkerke R^2 (%)	15.8	7.6	16.9	15.9	8.5	13.7
N (N: law, economics)	570 (180)	583 (173)	521 (150)	533 (146)	611 (119)	552 (170)
Pearson correlation old versus new cleavage	- 0.228***	- 0.234***	- 0.304***	- 0.221***	- 0.183***	- 0.253***

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.010$; * $p < 0.050$; ns: $p > 0.050$.

^aA description of the items and of the reliability of the scales can be found in the technical appendix, available at (www.vub.ac.be/TOR/academic_disciplines).

for the respondent). Of the 611 students who completed the questionnaire in 2001, 421 filled in the follow-up questionnaire. The attrition rate (31 percent) is largely due to students who dropped out of the university. Much effort was invested in tracking them. The analysis is based on those students who spent at least three years in institutions for higher education: the students who in 2005 were still studying at the VUB, who had changed university and were pursuing their studies at another university, or who in the meantime had completed or were completing higher education in an institution other than a university. Two groups are excluded from the analysis because it is not certain that they spent at least three years in institutions of postsecondary learning: students who dropped out without going to another university or without spending at least three years in institutions of higher education and students whose academic career could not be reconstructed in sufficient detail. Due to these selections, the comparison between 2001 and 2005 is based on 365 students.

Due to various selection mechanisms, young people going to a university and selecting the same university are quite homogeneous as far as socioeconomic and ethnic background is concerned. As a consequence, the number of control variables in our analysis is limited. The number of students from a socially disadvantaged background and/or from minority groups is so small that no reliable estimates can be obtained for these groups separately. Gender is the only standard background variable that shows great variation in this population.

Because the scales measuring the position on the old and new cleavage will be used to look at changes over time, we tested those scales for temporal invariance. Such invariance can be assumed in both cases. The models in which the parameters (linking the items to the construct) are set free to vary between 2001 and 2005, and the constrained models in which the corresponding parameters for 2001 and 2005 are forced to be equal, do not differ significantly from each other ($p = 0.45$ for the new cleavage and 0.96 for the old cleavage). This means that the scales used to gauge the positions on the cleavages measure the same thing in 2001 and in 2005. Observed changes are, in other words, due to changes in the population, and not to variations in the measuring instrument.

When the cohort's position on the cleavages in 2001 and 2005 is compared (see Table 2a), it is clear that the students shifted toward the right, both on the old and the new left/right cleavage. This seems to indicate a socialization effect, but one that goes against all expectations. On the basis of the hypotheses and findings that were reviewed, one expects a shift toward the left, not toward the right.

Before drawing conclusions from that observation, one should, of course, consider the fact that students do not experience only the influence of their educational environment. They continue to be members of the society at large, and are exposed to influences impinging on the (young) population as a whole. It is possible that over the period considered, the latter shifted

TABLE 2
Estimated Differences for the New and Old Cleavage, 2001–2005

	Moment	Mean	Standard Error
a. Estimated Difference for the New and Old Cleavage (Summation Scale 0–100), 2001–2005: Longitudinal Data			
New cleavage (<i>N</i> : 365) <i>F</i> : 6.855; <i>p</i> : 0.009	2001	26.5	0.86
	2005	28.6	0.89
Old cleavage (<i>N</i> : 365) <i>F</i> : 7.112; <i>p</i> : 0.008	2001	62.7	0.92
	2005	60.4	0.88
b. Comparison of the Attitudes Related to the New and Old Cleavage (Summation Scale, 0–100) First-Generation Students 2001–2002 with First-Generation Students 2004–2005			
New cleavage (new students ^a) (<i>N</i> : 604)	2001	26.2	0.50
New cleavage (new students) (<i>N</i> : 585)	2005	29.9	0.52
Difference <i>F</i> : 25.797; <i>p</i> : 0.000		3.7	
Old cleavage (new students) (<i>N</i> : 604)	2001	62.6	0.73
Old cleavage (new students) (<i>N</i> : 585)	2005	59.4	0.69
Difference <i>F</i> : 10.569; <i>p</i> : 0.001		– 3.2	

^aTo avoid selection effects, we use the total group of incoming students and not only those who participated in the longitudinal part of the research.

toward the right, and that the students, net of the effect of their postsecondary training, participated in that general shift in opinion. To control for such a possible contextual change, we compared the students who first came to the university in the academic year 2001–2002 with the new students who entered in the academic year 2004–2005. The latter appeared to be by far the best possible control group. They were young in the same time period, 2001–2005, as the research group and, more important, they selected the same university. In the case of Flanders, it is very likely that the choice of university is related to sociopolitical attitudes, so that a control group that opts for a different university would most likely be worthless.

When comparing the incoming students of 2001–2002 with the new arrivals of 2004–2005, all students (*N* = 604) who filled in the questionnaire are taken into account (see Table 2b).

The students of the first cohort had an average score of 26.2 on the new cleavage. The average score of the new students of 2004–2005 on that cleavage equals 29.9. The increase of 3.7 points is consistent with the thesis that the population as a whole shifted toward the right on the new cleavage between 2001 and 2005. On the old cleavage, the average score also shows a shift toward the right, as expressed in a decline of 3.2 points, from 62.6 to 59.4. It is quite likely that the population as a whole, or at least the younger members of the population, shifted toward the right. One should take such a

shift into account when estimating the socialization effect. To do so, we assume that all members of the cohort underwent this contextual change and add 3.7 points to their initial score on the new cleavage and subtract 3.2 points from their initial score on the old cleavage. The thus transformed data are then analyzed, controlling period, gender, and course of study (distinguished into three groups: social sciences, law and economics, and criminology). Gender is controlled for in the models in order to avoid specification errors. Gender has been shown to be related to differences in sociopolitical attitudes (Dey, 1996), as well as differences in the academic disciplines pursued (Bradley, 2000). The model takes into account the possible interaction effects between gender and time and between the academic discipline and time. The conditional means in the table are the means reproduced by ANOVA repeated measures analysis and the *F* value measures the significance of the shifts over time.

As far as the new cleavage is concerned (see Table 3), there is a slight, but significant, shift toward the left as a consequence of university training. This shift is greater for students of the social sciences than for students in law and economics. In the case of the latter, the shift is small and of debatable statistical significance. The students in criminology show a nonsignificant shift toward the right. The fact that there are differences between the disciplines, when corrected for contextual changes as well as in the case no correction is applied, supports the socialization hypothesis and the thesis that different disciplines act as subcultures.

As far as the old cleavage is concerned, no significant shifts are observed after correcting for contextual changes (Table 4). This is possibly due to the contemporary lack of salience of this cleavage, which is nearly absent in social and political debates in Flanders. Residents of Flanders are much more concerned with issues (such as fear of crime, multicultural society, immigration, and political corruption) for which the new cleavage is far more salient.

Conclusions

Using the old and new left/right cleavages as attitudinal variables, we observe both selection and socialization effects of postsecondary education, as well as significant differences of such effects between different academic disciplines. The observed socialization effects are, however, weak and only observed for one of the two attitudinal dimensions considered. The dominant view, ascribing the affinities between academic study and academic disciplines on the one hand, and attitudes on the other, primarily to socialization effects is not supported by our findings. The socialization effects that occur do, moreover, reveal great differences between the disciplines. These conform to the dominant view of more leftist-oriented social sciences and more rightist-oriented law and economy students (and faculty). The

TABLE 3

Estimated Differences in the Position on the New Cleavage Between 2001 and 2005, with Correction for Contextual Trend Effect

	<i>N</i>	Moment	Conditional Mean (s.e.)	Observed Mean (s.e.)	<i>p</i> Value
General Difference: Time <i>F</i> : 3.764; <i>p</i> : 0.053					
	365	2001	30.14 (0.86)	29.33 (0.62)	0.000
		2005	28.57 (0.89)	26.80 (0.63)	
Gender * Time <i>F</i> : 0.015; <i>p</i> : 0.901					
Men	118	2001	31.64 (1.46)	32.10 (1.25)	0.001
		2005	30.18 (1.50)	28.13 (1.26)	
Women	247	2001	28.63 (0.91)	28.03 (0.69)	0.004
		2005	26.97 (0.94)	26.17 (0.72)	
Study * Time <i>F</i> : 3.140; <i>p</i> : 0.044					
Social sciences	227	2001	29.55 (0.86)	28.73 (0.77)	0.000
		2005	25.78 (0.88)	25.62 (0.74)	
Law, economics	85	2001	30.86 (1.28)	30.75 (1.34)	0.084
		2005	28.56 (1.32)	28.51 (1.31)	
Criminology	50	2001	30.00 (2.07)	30.13 (1.71)	0.752
		2005	31.38 (2.13)	29.59 (2.25)	

very weak, maybe insignificant general socialization effects imply that our observations lend little support to theories explaining such effects in terms of the general, cognitive properties of higher education. Theories emphasizing the specificity of academic disciplines, viewing these as subcultures or pointing to the specificity of social science studies, seem empirically more promising.

The selection effects are very strong. There clearly is a relationship between the sociopolitical attitudes students have before embarking on higher education and the academic disciplines they select. The nature of that relationship (still) corresponds to the familiar pattern, with leftist-oriented social science students and more rightist-oriented students of law and

TABLE 4

Estimated Differences in the Position on the Old Cleavage Between 2001 and 2005, with Correction for Contextual Trend Effect

	<i>N</i>	Moment	Conditional Mean (s.e.)	Observed Mean (s.e.)	<i>p</i> Value
General Difference: Time <i>F</i> : 1.629; <i>p</i> : 0.204					
	365	2001	57.34 (1.23)	59.50 (0.92)	0.281
		2005	58.86 (1.17)	60.43 (0.87)	
Gender * Time <i>F</i> : 0.131; <i>p</i> : 0.717					
Men	118	2001	56.31 (2.07)	57.43 (1.80)	0.428
		2005	58.27 (1.97)	58.69 (1.77)	
Women	247	2001	58.36 (1.34)	60.45 (1.05)	0.449
		2005	59.45 (1.27)	61.24 (0.98)	
Study * Time <i>F</i> : 0.313; <i>p</i> : 0.731					
Social sciences	227	2001	61.72 (1.28)	62.20 (1.17)	0.708
		2005	62.15 (1.21)	62.61 (1.08)	
Law, economics	85	2001	52.97 (1.89)	52.98 (1.88)	0.448
		2005	54.42 (1.79)	54.44 (1.76)	
Criminology	50	2001	57.32 (2.91)	58.32 (2.10)	0.441
		2005	60.00 (2.77)	60.14 (2.40)	

economics. Further research concerning the relationship between academic disciplines and sociopolitical attitudes should therefore focus on the processes of selection and try to unravel the relationship between sociopolitical attitudes and the way academic disciplines and their paradigms are perceived.

REFERENCES

Abrami, Philip C., and Deborah A. Mizener. 1985. "Student/Instructor Attitude Similarity, Student Ratings, and Course Performance." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 77:693–702.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. 1982. *Theoretical Logic in Sociology. Vol. 1 Positivism, Presuppositions and Current Controversies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Andersen, Heine. 1999. "Political Attitudes and Cognitive Convictions Among Danish Social Science Researchers." *Sociometrics* 46:87–108.

Bradley, Karen. 2000. "The Incorporation of Women into Higher Education: Paradoxical Outcomes?" *Sociology of Education* 73:1–18.

Brint, Steven. 1984. "New Class and Cumulative Trend Explanations of the Liberal Political Attitudes of Professionals." *American Journal of Sociology* 90:30–71.

Dey, Eric L. 1996. "Undergraduate Political Attitudes. An Examination of Peer, Faculty, and Social Influences." *Research in Higher Education* 37:535–54.

D'Sousa, Dinesh. 1991. *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus*. New York: Free Press.

Easton, David, and Jack Dennis. 1969. *Children in the Political System*. New York: McGrawhill.

Elchardus, Mark. 1994. "Over de ontdebelling van links en rechts." *Samenleving en politiek* 1:5–17.

———. 1996. "Class, Cultural Re-Alignment and the Rise of the Populist Right." Pp. 41–63 in Angus Erskine, ed., *Changing Europe. Some Aspects of Identity, Conflict and Social Justice*. Avebury: Aldershot.

Elchardus, Mark, and Koen Pelleriaux. 1998. "De polis verdeeld. Hoe de kiezers links en rechts herdefiniëren." Pp. 183–210 in Marc Swyngedouw, Jaak Billiet, Ann Carton, and Beerten, eds., *De (on)redelijke kiezer. Onderzoek naar de politieke opvattingen van Vlamingen*. Verkiezingen van 21 mei 1995. Leuven: Acco.

Emmerson, Donald K. 1968. *Students and Politics*. New York: Preager Inc.

Gabennesch, Howard. 1972. "Authoritarianism as World View." *American Journal of Sociology* 77:857–75.

Gottfredson, Gary D., and John L. Holland. 1990. "A Longitudinal Test of the Influence of Congruence: Job Satisfaction, Competency Utilization, and Counterproductive Behavior." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 37:389–98.

Guimond, Serge, Guy Begin, and Douglas L. Palmer. 1989. "Education and Causal Attributions: The Development of 'Person-Blame' and 'System-Blame' Ideology." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 52:126–40.

Hamilton, Richard F., and Lowell L. Hargens. 1993. "The Politics of the Professors: Self-Identifications 1969–1984." *Social Forces* 71:603–27.

Hoge, Dean R., and Jann L. Hoge. 1984. "Period Effects and Specific Age Effects Influencing Values of Alumni in the Decade After College." *Social Forces* 62: 941–62.

Jacobsen, Dag I. 2001. "Higher Education as an Arena for Political Socialization: Myth or Reality?" *Scandinavian Political Studies* 24:351–68.

Jenssen, Anders T. 1993. *Verdivalg - Ny massepolitikk I Norge*. Oslo: Ad botam Gyldendal.

Kemmelmeier, Markus, Cherry Danielson, and Jay Basten. 2005. "What's in a Grade? Academic Success and Political Orientation." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 31:1386–99.

Kimball, Roger. 1990. *Tenured Radicals: How Politics Has Corrupted Our Higher Education*. New York: Harper Collins.

Ladd, Everett C., and Seymour M. Lipset. 1975. *The Divided Academy: Professors and Politics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lipset, Seymour M. 1982. "The Academic Mind at the Top: The Political Behavior and Values of Faculty Elites." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 46:143–68.

Nakhaie, Reza M., and Robert J. Brym. 1999. "The Political Attitudes of Canadian Professors." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 24:329–53.

Newcomb, Theodore M. 1943. *Personality and Social Change*. New York: Dryden.

Pascarella, Ernest T., and Patrick T. Terenzini. 1991. *How College Affects Students*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pike, Gary R. 2006. "Vocational Preferences and College Expectations: An Extension of Holland's Principle of Self-Selection." *Research in Higher Education* 47:591–612.

Selvin, Hanan C., and Warren O. Hagstrom. 1965. "Determinants of Support for Civil Liberties." Pp. 494–518 in Seymour M. Lipset and Sheldon S. Wolin, eds., *The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretations*. New York: Anchor Books.

Sigel, Roberta S. 1989. "Introduction: Persistence and Change." Pp. i–vii in Roberta S. Sigel, ed., *Political Learning in Adulthood: A Sourcebook of Theory and Research*. Chicago, IL: University Press.

Webb-Halpern, Leah. 2003. *The Effects of Higher Education on Tolerance: An Investigation of Political and Cultural Attitudes of College Students*. Available at http://www.hsu.edu/uploadedFiles/Faculty/AFO/21/Webb_Halpern.pdf.

Weidman, Jerome. 1989. "Undergraduate Socialization: A Conceptual Approach." Pp. 289–322 in John Smart, ed., *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research (Vol. 5)*. New York: Agathon.