

2703

SURVEY OF GRADUATE STUDENTS ON  
THE SELECTIVE SERVICE

Stuart Katz

Roy Ashmall

Research Center for Group Dynamics  
Institute for Social Research  
The University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

July, 1968

Submitted for Publication

## ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to assess graduate student opinion of the current draft system and of student deferments. A questionnaire was administered to 3,619 graduate students at the University of Michigan during the winter semester registration period. Results showed the following: (1) most graduate students oppose the current draft system but are predominantly in favor of student deferments, (2) more than one fourth of the students preferred that graduate school officials take a position of outright "non-cooperation" with the current draft laws, (3) two thirds favored either a form of national service or abolition of conscription altogether, (4) only small differences were found between sexes and between citizens and non-citizens, (5) large differences were found among the various draft classifications. A "self interest" hypothesis was given as an explanation of the apparent inconsistency between opinions about the draft system as a whole and opinions on students deferments while both a cognitive consistency hypothesis and an uncertainty hypothesis were offered as explanations of the differences in opinion among draft classifications.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors express their appreciation to those members of the Graduate Assembly who participated in both questionnaire construction and collection of data: Ron Cohen, Howard Brilliant, Jack Godwin, and Bruce Greenberg. Linda Rosevaar helped in questionnaire construction, and the following people made valuable contributions in the collection of data: Phil Vanderweg, Judy Brown, Alex Brown, John McGrew, Ed Bloomberg, David Shapiro, Arnie Weiner, Marsha Daigle, Terry Westerdale, Arno Spatola, and John Williams.

The authors are also grateful to Eugene Burnstein, Ron Cohen, Patricia Francisco, Bob Caplan, Peter Archibald, and Phil Shaver for their critical comments, suggestions and encouragement, and to Shirley Thomas for her skillful clerical and typing assistance.

Thanks are also due to Don Beach and to The Rackham Graduate School for their cooperation in helping us to organize the collection of the data during registration.

This investigation was supported by The Rackham Graduate School.

## INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of 1968, the position of graduate students in this country vis-a-vis the Selective Service System (hereafter referred to as "the draft") has been growing increasingly precarious.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the traditional security of a graduate education has suddenly been replaced by a nervous uncertainty as each graduate student ponders when and if his professional career will be interrupted or perhaps even terminated. As a result of this situation a number of important questions, long hidden just beneath the surface, have erupted and are now of major concern to social scientists, educators, federal government officials, and especially to students.

Some of these questions would be expected as a natural consequence of a growing threat. These are the questions of a clearly nitty-gritty nature such as: Are they going to get me; or Will graduate students go. Still other questions might simply reflect the curiosity of the outsider looking in: In general, what are the attitudes of graduate students toward the draft; Are there differences in attitudes among various sub-groups in the graduate student population; Are graduate students consistent in their opinions on the draft; finally, What is the connection, if any, between opinions toward the draft and commitment to the implementation of those actions implicit in these opinions?

The present authors, with the endorsement, interest, and aid of the Graduate Assembly<sup>2</sup> and the Horace H. Rackham Graduate School of The University of Michigan took a look at all of these questions by polling the on-campus graduate students at the University on the issue of the draft and student deferments.

---

<sup>1</sup>The primary reasons for this situation have been due to the passage of The Military Selective Service Act and the issuance of Presidential Executive Order 11360 (June, 1967) ending deferments for graduate students. The new law became a Selective Service directive on February 16, 1968. The law states that first year graduate students (i.e., students not having completed one year of graduate school by October 1, 1967) will lose their deferments upon completion of their first year. Second-year graduate students and higher will be granted a total of 5 years of deferments.

<sup>2</sup>Graduate Assembly is a graduate student organization representing all schools and departments at The University of Michigan.

## RESEARCH METHOD

Since the results of the poll were to be used not only for research purposes but also to advise the graduate school as to what its policies should be with regard to the draft, it was felt by the authors that a campus-wide referendum, rather than a sample survey, was more appropriate. Therefore, in order to obtain as large a response as possible we asked and were granted permission by the University to use registration facilities during the 1968 Winter semester registration period (January 3-5) and the late registration period (January 6, 9-13). Since all students are required to register for each semester, we felt that this was the best time and place to reach them.<sup>3</sup>

Response Information supplied by the Statistical Service Bureau, Office of the Registrar, allowed us to estimate the number of graduate students who registered at the on-campus facilities of the University. The total number, based on the Fall semester (1967) figures, was 8,329.<sup>4</sup> We collected 5,619 questionnaires so that 67.5 percent of those who passed through registration filled out the questionnaires. This figure generally exceeds other figures for comparable "voting" situations. We discuss in the appendix to this report why those who were able to vote did not.

## THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

We knew, prior to the collection of the data, that the use of the University registration period would permit collection of a large number of opinions;

---

<sup>3</sup> Further details on collection of the data appear in the Appendix.

<sup>4</sup> Since these figures are highly stable for graduate students in a given academic year, the figures cited above are an accurate estimate of the number of students who registered for the Winter semester (1968). The figure of 8,329 does not include 711 students who registered after the late registration period and who, therefore, had no opportunity to fill out the questionnaire.

however, it was also clear that collecting the data in this way would also impose two important restrictions: the questionnaire must be short, and each questionnaire item must be simple and unambiguous. In addition, we were somewhat limited by the constraint that the questionnaire provide the graduate school with certain specific information about graduate student opinion on draft deferments as a result of the new draft law. For these reasons, we formulated the questionnaire around items which met the criteria of brevity and simplicity, which gave the Graduate School the information it wanted, but which we thought would also give us interesting and revealing results of a more theoretical nature. The main items on the questionnaire appear below:

#### A. The Draft System

##### 1. The present draft system should

☐ be retained

☐ not be retained

##### 2. If the present draft system is not retained, which of the following alternatives should be used as a replacement?

☐ compulsory military service

☐ compulsory national service with substitution such as the Peace Corps, Vista, or similar service

☐ conscription should be abolished and military needs provided for by other means

☐ other (list) \_\_\_\_\_

## B. Draft Deferments

Assuming that some form of the draft system should be retained,

3. II-S deferments (student deferments) should be

\_\_\_\_\_abolished

\_\_\_\_\_retained

4. If II-S deferments are retained, they should be available

\_\_\_\_\_in accordance with present law (copies available)

\_\_\_\_\_to all graduate students provided satisfactory progress  
toward a degree is being made

\_\_\_\_\_other (list)

## C. Implementation

5. In order to implement the results of this referendum, the  
graduate school should

\_\_\_\_\_make a public statement which represents the position  
of the graduate student body.

\_\_\_\_\_make a public statement which represents the position of  
the graduate student body and exert informal political  
pressure

\_\_\_\_\_both of the above and, if a change is dictated, carry out  
a policy of non-cooperation with the present draft laws

\_\_\_\_\_other (list)\_\_\_\_\_

In addition to the above items we asked respondents to indicate their sex, citizenship, and draft status.

Although the content items contained a limited number of alternatives, these alternatives generally reflected the complete range of potential solutions to the problems of conscription and deferment; where appropriate, an "other" category was provided to allow for other alternatives. As it turned out, most responses

to this open-ended choice could have been placed easily into the content choices that we offered. Typically, these "other" responses reflected mechanisms by which one or the other of the offered alternatives could be carried out.

#### ATTITUDES TOWARD THE DRAFT

The responses to items 1-5 on the questionnaire appear in Table 1.

-----  
 Insert Table 1 about here  
 -----

Seventy-three percent of the respondents indicated that they were opposed to the present draft system and only 24 percent felt that it should be retained. When asked what alternative they preferred, 39 percent favored a system of compulsory national service with substitution, while 28 percent favored abolishing conscription and only eight percent favored compulsory military service. Eight percent chose the "other" category and their responses, as we pointed out earlier, were evenly distributed over a number of possible mechanisms for carrying out the three substantive alternatives that we offered. These responses ranged from pacificism, a voluntary army, and paid professionals to pay raises and a lottery, among others. In addition, 17 percent failed to answer this item.<sup>5</sup>

On the issue of student deferments, 73 percent felt that such deferments should be retained, while 21 percent indicated that they should be abolished. When asked how II-S deferments should be available if retained, 71 percent said they should be available to all graduate students, while only 10 percent indicated that they should be available in accordance with present law. Four percent checked "other" and 15 percent failed to respond to this item (see footnote 5).

---

<sup>5</sup> Since 82 percent of the non-respondents was accounted for by those who had favored retention of the present draft system on the first item, it is possible that these same people thought that responding to the second item was contingent upon a "not be retained" response on the first. It should be noted, however, that these respondents may simply have avoided dealing with a set of alternatives inconsistent with their earlier responses whether they felt that there was a contingency or not. Incidentally, this same problem arose in item 4.



And finally, on the issue of implementation of the results, 33 percent indicated that the graduate school should make a public statement representing the position of the graduate students and also exert informal political pressure, while 27 percent asked that in addition the graduate school not cooperate with the Selective Service laws. Twenty-five percent asked that only a public statement be made, while four percent chose "other" responses such as "do nothing", "contact legislators", "publish results with no interpretation", and "resist". Eleven percent failed to respond.

In summary, then, the majority of graduate students were opposed to the present draft system, favored either a form of national service or no service at all, but at the same time strongly favored II-S deferments for all graduate students.

#### Further Remarks

There are at least three possible ways of interpreting these overall results. First, it could be argued that the opinions expressed in this referendum represent a well thought out and socially oriented perspective concerning the draft. The preference for a compulsory national service or the abolition of the draft altogether might be an expression of the belief that forcing people to fight is not the only way to get them to serve their country or humanity and, furthermore, that service through militarism or service through force per se is inconsistent with our notions of freedom or the notion that service can really mean something only when it is voluntary. On the other hand, these same people would argue that student deferments are important because they allow for maximum development of particular human resources which are vital to the nation or the world (e.g., scientists, educators, technicians). Presumably, without such protection during matriculation many such people would be temporarily or permanently lost.

A second interpretation might be that the results represent a conscious attempt, at two levels, to protect the individual from military service. Thus, thinking in terms of the future, people would favor national service or abolition of the draft so as to avoid military service (as opposed to some other form of service). At the same time their current status would induce them to favor student deferments as protection both from immediate confrontation with the military and from interruption of educational goals. This perspective, like the first, is rational in the sense that most aspects of this belief system are well thought out. What most characterizes this point of view is the pervasive self-interest of the student.

A third interpretation of the results might be that in fact the position graduate students take with respect to the draft is inconsistent with their position on student deferments. This would be especially so were their opposition to the present draft system due, at least in part, to its perceived inequities. Since student deferments might well be considered the most inequitable of all aspects of the current draft system, even by students themselves, the respondents' positions on the draft would be diametrically opposed, in spirit, to their positions on student deferments. One might argue further that this inconsistency is due not only to a relative lack of understanding of the issues but also because when such issues confront graduate students directly (as, for example, student deferments do) they will tend to act in their own self-interests.

Which interpretation most closely approximates the true state of affairs? Our guess would be that the third interpretation is the most likely. We argue this on the assumption that graduate students, like most other people, have very little understanding of the draft, both in its factual detail and in its moral and social implications. Although they express disfavor with the current draft system, their overwhelming support for student deferments shows an unawareness or suppression of the well-founded arguments concerning the inequities of such

deferments. In a way, the results might be seen as reflecting a two-facedness in the intellectual community: strong and frequent criticism of certain institutions on the one hand, and a lack of concern (or a concern in the other direction) about one's personal role being played in supporting these institutions on the other.

As to the question concerning the implementation of graduate student opinions, a surprisingly large number of students, more than one-fourth of the respondents, called for non-cooperation by the graduate school if opinions differed from current policy. This appears to be a strong indication of the growing uncertainty and frustration surrounding military deferments and in increasing acceptance of "non-legitimate" channels as a means of instituting change. We shall have more to say later about the relationship of this "action" item to the other items.

#### COMPARISONS AMONG SUB-GROUPS OF THE GRADUATE STUDENT POPULATION

It is of further interest to explore potential differences among various sub-groups whose composition and character we might intuitively expect to yield differences in opinion on the draft issue. For this reason we looked for differences in sex, citizenship, and various draft status categories.

##### Male versus Females

Responses to the five main items according to sex appear in Table 2.

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

On item 1, females showed greater opposition to the present draft system than males, 79 percent choosing "not be retained" to 70 percent for males. On item 2, 50 percent of the females chose compulsory national service as against only 36

percent for the males, while the latter were slightly higher on both compulsory military service and abolishing conscription. On item 3 both sexes were virtually identical in their responses while on item 4 females were slightly more equitable in deciding how II-S deferments should be administered. On item 5, 32 percent of the females chose non-cooperation while a smaller number of males, 28 percent, picked that alternative. Males were slightly higher in choosing a "public statement only" on this item.

These results show that females were slightly more anti-draft than males and favored stronger action against the current draft system. However, although the authors frequently heard the argument that the females would pad the results in a more radical anti-draft direction (for any number of reasons, the primary one being that they are unaffected by the draft) the differences between the sexes in most cases were slight. Therefore, it is clear that the overall results were not affected in any significant way by the opinions of females.

Considering that females can't be drafted, the finding that they are just as much in favor of II-S deferments as males is somewhat puzzling, especially if favoring II-S deferments is thought of as a position which is self-protective in nature. To take this into account we might, perhaps, note that the concept of "self-interest" includes not only protection of oneself but also of others with whom one has special ties or interests, the general notion still being that the issue of student deferments is less abstract and more personally relevant than the issue of the draft system itself.

#### Citizens versus Non-citizens

A breakdown on the five main items according to citizenship can be seen in Table 3. The data indicate that a much larger percentage of non-citizens failed

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

to respond to each of the items than did the citizens. This high no response rate was probably due, in part at least, to uncertainty and ignorance among foreign students about conscription in this country. Our experience during the actual collection of the data makes this the most likely explanation since many foreign students expressed concern to us both about their unfamiliarity with the draft and with II-S deferments and about their uncertainty in taking positions on the domestic policies of another foreign country. It is, of course, difficult to know what the results would have been had this uncertainty not been present or if it had been substantially reduced. However, if we distribute the no responses of these foreign students across the other responses proportionate to their original frequency of occurrence, it appears that, at least for items 2 and 5 where there were more than two possible substantive choices, non-citizens would have been more prone to choose the more "extreme" responses; i.e., those responses having less of an element of compromise.<sup>6</sup> The reason for this is not at all apparent to us. However, even assuming this to be true, the differences would not be directional; i.e., one group would not appear to be more or less anti-draft than the other. It is probably safe to say, then, that this variable, like sex, fails to show any major within population differences.

#### Draft Classification

Twelve draft classifications emerged from the data. These included respondents who were on active duty,<sup>7</sup> in the reserves, or had completed military service as well as those with student deferments, dependents, and occupational deferments,

---

<sup>6</sup>In distributing the no responses in this way we are assuming, of course, that the reasons for not responding are unrelated to any particular choice but are due rather to a generalized uncertainty about the entire issue of the draft and deferments which equally affects all responses. We should recognize that the "intermediate" responses might well be the ones most affected by such an uncertainty.

<sup>7</sup>The students who were on active duty were generally commissioned officers continuing their education under the aegis of one or another of the branches of the military. Several of them were graduates of one of the military academies.

conscientious objectors and others. In order to assess differences in opinion, if there were any, among all the draft classifications, we first looked at the range of differences between them on the most "anti-draft" responses to each item.<sup>8</sup> Table 4 presents the range of opinion for each of the five main items.

---

Insert Table 4 about here

---

It can be seen that the maximum range, in percent, among the classifications varies from 19 percent on item 3 to 53 percent on item 2. These differences appeared large enough for us to take the next step of ranking the various classifications according to opposition to the draft. Again we picked the most anti-draft response for each item and ordered the draft classifications according to the percentage favoring such a response. Ranks were then assigned to all classifications for every item, the most anti-draft classification receiving a rank of 1, the next most a rank of 2, and so on down to the least which received a rank of twelve. A median rank was then found for each classification across the five items producing a final median rank ordering of classifications from most anti-draft (lowest median rank) to least (highest median rank). Table 5

---

Insert Table 5 about here

---

shows the separate ranks and median rank of the classifications for each of the five items. Table 6 indicates the actual percentages. It can be seen that the ordering produces a wide spread among the various classifications. The conscientious objectors, IV-Fers, and theology students are the most anti-draft, those

---

Insert Table 6 about here

---

in active duty, in the reserves, or who have completed military duty are the

---

<sup>8</sup> In using the term "anti-draft" here we refer to that type of response which is most opposed to, and in a sense, most distant from, current draft policies including II-S deferments. For item 1, such a response would be "not be retained"; for item 2, "abolish conscription"; for item 3, II-S deferments "abolished"; for item 4, "available to all graduate students"; and for item 5, "non-cooperation".

least anti-draft, and the remaining classifications fall somewhere in between these polar positions.<sup>9</sup>

How can these results be interpreted? One possible explanation is simply that the classifications on both ends of this continuum of opposition to the draft reflect groups very uniform in their attitudes toward the draft, while the classifications ranked toward the middle reflect not so much uniform groups but heterogeneous aggregates having very little in common except a selective service classification. Presumably, then, the opinions of such aggregates would represent a pooling of diverse opinions and, therefore, an intermediate ranking on our scale. However, such an argument would demand that the distribution of choices for the intermediate classifications approach a more nearly rectangular form when compared to the polar classifications, thus producing a larger variance of choices. That this is not the case can be seen by looking at the distribution of choices on items 2 and 5 (the two items having three substantive alternatives) for the II-S and II-A classifications. The distribution of choices for these classifications, which, incidentally, represent 56 percent of the entire male sample, shows a greater percent picking the intermediate item compared to the polar classifications. For example, the II-S and III-A classifications picked the intermediate choice for item two 37 and 38 percent of the time, respectively, while the extreme polar classifications, I-O and I-C, picked this intermediate choice 31 and 35 percent of the time respectively. For item 5 the difference is even more revealing. The II-S and II-A classifications picked the intermediate choice 40 and 35 percent of the time, while I-O and I-C classifications both made this choice eight percent of the time. Thus, instead of the distributions of these middle classifications approaching a more

---

<sup>9</sup> The top and bottom three classifications are referred to as most or least anti-draft for descriptive purposes only. No natural trichotomy is intended by such a description.

rectangular form, there seems rather to be a migration of choices from the extreme to the intermediate position with little change in variance.

There are other possible interpretations which appear to be both more tenable and theoretically more interesting. The first of these contends that the differences in opinion reflect a need to maintain a cognitive consistency of some sort. For example, it could be argued that the categories lying at both ends of the continuum reflect a commitment to a way of life that would necessitate choosing opinions consistent with this weltanschauung. On this basis, one would hardly expect a career officer in the military to urge abolition of conscription since this might be thought of as a rejection of the military in toto. (It should also be noted that respondents on active duty more strongly favored compulsory military service than any other classification). On the other hand, one would not expect conscientious objectors or divinity students to reject this anti-draft choice for another one which calls for some form of compulsory service, since it would be inconsistent with a commitment they have made to their weltanschauung (i.e., opposition to militarism or involuntary servitude). The other classifications are not so clearly defined by any such commitment regarding the military and for this reason show less polarization of opinion.

A third explanation might be that those draft classifications which lie at the ends of the continuum are ones in which uncertainty of the future, at least with respect to the military, is least, while draft classifications toward the middle reflect a great amount of uncertainty of this nature. The effect of this uncertainty would be to mask or suppress strongly held opinions on issues which bring it about. Conscientious objectors, divinity students, and those not qualified for military service (IV-F) can be, at the very least, reasonably certain about where they will be within a period of six months or a year. The same is true of those students who are on active duty, in the



reserves (although currently, this may be changing) or have completed military service. This would not be true of classifications like student deferments, deferments except in time of war or national emergency (I-Y), and I-A's (currently available for military service) among others. As Table 5 shows, the last mentioned classifications fall somewhere in the middle, while the others lie at the ends.

These last two explanations are, of course, post hoc though this does not make them any less interesting. Both appear about equally plausible.

One final note should be made concerning item 3 of this questionnaire. It can be seen that when the categories are ranked according to this item alone, an interesting reversal occurs relative to the median ranking of the classifications across the five items. Those on active duty and those who completed military service (and were generally less anti-draft on the other items) more strongly favored abolishing II-S deferments while those with II-S deferments (and generally anti-draft on the other items) most strongly favored retention of II-S deferments. As before, those having completed military duty or those on active duty appear to be supporting a personal commitment to military life by favoring an opinion likely to place others in a similar situation. Students with II-S deferments, on the other hand, seem to be acting clearly in their own interests. We again encounter the picture drawn earlier, namely that of a dichotomy between opinions on a more abstract issue whose direct effects upon the self are less clear, and opinions on an issue whose direct effects are very real and imminent.

Other highly anti-draft classifications such as the theology students and ministers, and IV-F'ers have also moved away from an anti-draft position on

this item (though not to the extent of the II-S people). Their predicament may be likened to that of the females--not directly affected by II-S deferments but, nonetheless, empathic because significant others are directly affected. Curiously, conscientious objectors did not move at all toward a less radical position on this item. It may well be that they feel no sympathy for those who "hide behind" II-S deferments although there are reasonable arguments to show how conscientious objector deferments are no different than student deferments in this respect.

#### IMPLEMENTATION AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF MEANS TO ENDS

Item 5 on the questionnaire asked graduate students in what ways they felt that the graduate school should implement the results of the referendum. One significant result, already noted, was that 60 percent of those who answered the question favored, minimally, a public statement and informal political pressure by the graduate school and nearly half of these further supported non-cooperation with the present draft laws if the graduate students urged a change in these laws. However, we were also interested in the relationship between this "means" or action-oriented item to the other items on the questionnaire--those that more closely represented goals or ends concerning the selective service. Therefore, we compared the implementation item against items 1, 2, and 3. The results of this comparison appear in Table 7.

---

Insert Table 7 about here

---

Close examination of this table will show that with one exception a definite pattern emerges between the two types of items compared. If we assume that "be retained" for item 1, "compulsory military service" for item 2, and "retained"

for item 3 most closely represent positions of a status quo nature, and "not be retained" in item 1, "conscription abolished" in item 2, and "abolished" in item 3 represent positions which are most distant, in some sense, from the status quo, and "national service" in item 2 represents an intermediate position between these two end points, then it appears that the more distant or apparently unattainable the goal, the stronger the action favored to make the goal a reality.<sup>10</sup> This pattern, which would appear to be in accord with common sense, nonetheless does run counter to the established belief that individuals in this society ought to and do redress grievances through "established channels"; i.e., through channels specified by law. Since this is not the case here, we are probably safe in saying that graduate students on the whole do not treat the "established means of redress" in the ways others do but consider them as only one potential source of change which, if ineffective, should be ignored for other stronger means of implementation.

#### CONCLUSION

The findings of this referendum leave little doubt that there is much dissatisfaction among the graduate student body as a whole concerning the current draft system in this country. Not only does a very large majority support a change in the system, but many (more than 25 percent) advocate non-cooperation with these current laws. The finding that there is little difference between

---

<sup>10</sup> The one exception for this hypothesis occurs in item 3. We would predict, here, that for those supporting II-S deferments, most should favor the weakest means of implementation, the next most an intermediate form of implementation, and the least the strongest means of implementation. In this item, however, there is a shift toward the intermediate means; i.e., a public statement and informal political pressure as the most frequent choice. This could be explained by the fact that, as we have already seen, item 3 appears to be an anomaly; a large number of respondents who were clearly anti-draft on items 1 and 2 supported II-S deferments on this question. For this reason we might then expect a shift toward a stronger form of action (even though the opinion on the issue itself supported the status quo) because of some "carry over" from the earlier items where stronger action was urged.

the sexes and also between citizen and non-citizen as well as the evidence that students support II-S deferments, suggests that this dissatisfaction is being expressed at a level which is not likely to affect students directly or immediately. For this reason, perhaps, we would not be likely to expect general and widespread student dissent on this issue. Nevertheless, with regard to the possibility of this dissatisfaction being channeled into overt resistance, the following important point should be made: This questionnaire was used at a time when the new laws on the draft had already been passed. However, our referendum was conducted prior to the selective service directive, this directive being absolutely necessary to convert the laws into an active, functioning draft policy. So, even though the present authors have found it difficult to cast the present data into terms of a perceived direct threat to students, the selective service directive may since have created such a context leading, perhaps, to direct resistance against these laws in the near future, should the war in Vietnam continue. Given the limitations of the present data, the only conclusion that can probably be reached with any degree of certainty here is that graduate students with II-S deferments are likely to be a source of dissatisfaction but not active dissent on the issue of the draft.

## APPENDIX

Data Collection and Methodology

We attempted to reach all graduate students registering during the standard registration period for the Winter semester. Small teams of Graduate Assembly members were located at two places in the registration. At the first location we passed out the questionnaire to the respondents who then entered a large room where they were able to fill out these forms. After they emerged from another entrance to the room we collected the forms and stopped those who had failed to fill them out, asking them to do so.

Early in this paper we raised but did not discuss the issue of respondent loss. Our problems in this respect merited serious concern not so much because of the size of the loss, which amounted to some 32.5 percent of the total population, but because of the thoroughness with which we reached all potential respondents. As reported above, our teams of data collectors directly confronted each graduate student who passed through the registration line, and it required much will power and intransigence on the part of a student to refuse to fill out the questionnaire. Nonetheless, many graduate students either ignored us or stated that they would not fill out the referendum. Some students had fearful or contemptuous looks, others made hostile remarks about what they thought we were trying to do. For these reasons, it may well be that many potential respondents, possibly less opposed to the current draft system than the typical respondent, became suspicious of the referendum because they perceived it to be, by its very nature, a product of troublemaking student activists who would probably use it as a polemic

against the government or the University. If this type of person did systematically avoid answering the questionnaire, then the present results might well contain an anti-draft bias.

We also looked at the possibility that females and non-citizens, who sometimes refused to fill out the questionnaire because they felt that they were ignorant of the issues or ought not to take a position on the draft, were significantly underrepresented in our data. If this were the case, and assuming that the reasons cited above for not filling out the referendum are uncorrelated with any particular position on the draft, we might conclude that the loss of respondents in our study did not systematically affect the results. The results of Table 8, however, show only a slight underrepresentation of

-----  
Insert Table 8 about here  
-----

females in our data, and virtually no underrepresentation of non-citizens. Clearly then, little of our loss could be attributed to a reluctance of the sort we described for these respondent types.

In summary then, considering the thoroughness with which all potential respondents were reached, we should be aware of a potential anti-draft bias, though the extent of such a bias is uncertain.

TABLE 1

ATTITUDES OF GRADUATE STUDENTS  
TOWARD THE DRAFT AND II-S DEFERMENTS  
(N = 5619)

Item	Response	Percent
1. The present draft system should	be retained	24
	not be retained	73
	no response	3
2. If the present draft system is not retained, which of the following alternatives should be used as a replacement?	compulsory military service	8
	compulsory national service with substitution	39
	conscription abolished, military needs provided for by other means	28
	other	8
	no response	17
3. II-S deferments (student deferments) should be	abolished	21
	retained	73
	no response	6
4. If II-S deferments are retained, they should be available	in accordance with present law	10
	to all graduate students provided satisfactory progress toward a degree is being made	71
	other	4
	no response	15
5. In order to implement the results of this referendum, the graduate school should	make a public statement which represents the position of the graduate student body	25
	the above <u>and</u> exert informal political pressure	33
	both of the above and non-cooperation with the present draft laws	27
	other	4
	no response	11

TABLE 2

## ATTITUDES ON THE DRAFT AND II-S DEFERMENTS, BY SEX (in percent)

Item	Sex <sup>a</sup>	
	Male(N= 3738)	Female(N= 1472)
1. Present draft system retained	27	17
Present draft system not retained	70	79
No response	3	4
2. Alternatives:		
Compulsory military service	9	4
Compulsory national service	36	50
Abolish conscription	29	27
Other	8	5
No response	18	14
3. II-S deferments abolished	21	20
II-S deferments retained	73	74
No response	6	6
4. II-S availability:		
Present law	11	6
All graduate students	71	73
Other	5	4
No response	13	17
5. Implementation:		
Public statement	28	25
Public statement and informal political pressure	35	36
Both of the above and non-cooperation with the present draft laws	28	32
Other	5	2
No response	4	5

<sup>a</sup> Not included here are 409 respondents who failed to indicate their sex.



TABLE 3

ATTITUDES ON THE DRAFT AND II-S DEFERMENTS, BY CITIZENSHIP  
(in percent)

Item	Citizenship <sup>a</sup>	
	Citizen(N= 4779)	Non-Citizen(N = 424)
1. Present draft system retained	24	23
Present draft system not retained	73	63
No response	3	14
2. Alternatives:		
Compulsory military service	8	8
Compulsory national service	40	30
Abolish conscription	28	26
Other	8	6
No response	16	30
3. II-S deferments abolished	21	22
II-S deferments retained	74	56
No response	5	22
4. II-S availability:		
Present law	10	6
All graduate students	72	58
Other	4	2
No response	14	34
5. Implementation:		
Public statement	27	26
Public statement and informal political pressure	36	28
Both of the above and non-cooperation with the present draft laws	29	29
Other	4	1
No response	4	16

<sup>a</sup>Not included here are 416 respondents who failed to indicate their citizenship.

TABLE 4

## RANGE OF PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS CHOOSING MOST "ANTI-DRAFT" RESPONSE

Item	Highest percent	Lowest percent	Range
1. Present draft system should not be retained	85	46	39
2. Alternatives: abolish conscription	57	4	53
3. II-S deferments abolished	35	16	19
4. Availability: to all graduate students	81	50	31
5. Implementation: public statement <u>and</u> informal political pressure <u>and</u> noncooperation with present draft laws	53	8	45

TABLE 5

SEPARATE RANKS AND MEDIAN RANK OF DRAFT CLASSIFICATIONS  
ACCORDING TO MOST "ANTI-DRAFT" RESPONSE

Classification	Rank Item No.					Median Rank
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
Conscientious objector (I-O, I-W) N=15	1	2	1	6	2	2
Theology student, minister (IV-D) N= 23	3	1	9	2.5	1	2.5
Not qualified for any military duty (IV-F) N=79	2	3	5	4	3	3
Student deferment (II-S) N= 1666	5	4	12	1	6	5
Qualified for military duty only in time of war or national emergency (I-Y). N= 130	4	6	7	8	4	6
Available for military service (I-A) N=183	8	5	10	7	5	7
Extreme hardship or dependents deferment (III-A) N= 404	6	7	8	5	7	7
Occupational deferment (II-A) N= 111	10	8	11	2.5	8	8
Overage (V-A) N=70	7	9	2	10	10	9
Completed military service (IV-A) N= 209	9	10	3	11	9	9
Reserves (I-D) N= 47	11	11	6	9	11	11
Active duty (I-C) N= 26	12	12	4	12	12	12

TABLE 6

## PERCENT OF DRAFT CLASSIFICATIONS CHOOSING MOST ANTI-DRAFT RESPONSE

Classification	Item No. <sup>a</sup>				
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Conscientious objector (I-O, I-W)	85	54	36	69	52
Theology student, minister (IV-D)	79	57	22	74	53
Not qualified for any military duty (IV-F)	81	37	27	73	38.0
Student deferment (II-S)	76	35	16	81	31
Qualified for military duty only in time of war or national emergency (I-Y)	77	30	25.4	65	37.7
Available for military service (I-A)	67	33	20	68	34
Extreme hardship or dependents deferment (III-A)	72	28	25.0	72	27
Occupational deferment (II-A)	62.2	26	19	74	23.4
Overage (V-A)	69	20	34	59	17
Completed military service (IV-A)	66	18	32	55	22.5
Reserves (I-D)	61.7	9	26	60	13
Active Duty (I-C)	46	4	31	50	8

<sup>a</sup> When ranking, ties in percent were broken by taking figures to the nearest tenth percent. In all but one case, ties were broken in this way.

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF "IMPLEMENTATION" ITEM WITH ITEMS 1, 2, AND 3<sup>a</sup>  
(in percent)

Item	Make a public statement	<u>Implementation</u>	
		Make a public statement and exert informal political pres- sure	Both of above and non- cooperation
1. Present draft system retained	46	27	7
Present draft system not retained	19	34	35
2. Alternatives:			
Compulsory military service	47	21	9
Compulsory national service	25	42	22
Abolish conscription	11	28	49
3. II-S deferments abolished	24	25	34
II-S deferments retained	26	36	25

<sup>a</sup>Item 4 was excluded here. In addition, the "other" and no response choices were excluded from all items presented.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON of INCIDENCE of FEMALES AND NON-CITIZENS IN THE DATA  
WITH THEIR INCIDENCE IN THE TOTAL POPULATION  
(in percent)

	Respondents	Total population
Females	26.2	29.5
Non-citizens	7.5	7.7