

## REVIEWS

### Universities and Society: A Review Article on the History of Higher Education

K. A. PERCY

*Department of Educational Research,  
University of Lancaster, United Kingdom*

---

John W. Baldwin and Richard A. Goldthwaite, (eds.), (1972). *Universities in Politics: Case Studies from the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins 137 pp. £3.85.

E. G. W. Bill, (1973). *University Reform in Nineteenth-Century Oxford: a Study of Henry Halford Vaughan 1811–1885*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 274 pp. £6.50.

Vincent A. McClelland, (1973). *English Roman Catholics and Higher Education 1830–1903*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 453 pp. £7.00.

Michael Sanderson, (1972). *The Universities and British Industry 1850–1970*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 436 pp. £6.50.

---

Until recently the history of higher education in Great Britain has consisted in little more than institutional histories – celebratory histories of particular colleges or universities and necessarily parochial and atheoretical by nature. The publication in this country during the last two years of the four books reviewed here is not only welcome in itself, but helps to underline the large gaps which have yet to be filled in our knowledge of the history of higher education.

*Universities in Politics* is a collection of four scholarly lectures – two by British historians – delivered at John Hopkins University in 1970. There is an introduction by J. W. Baldwin which ingeniously attempts to link the four lectures to each other and to the contemporary political situation of the American university. Basically the book contains studies of episodes in the early history of four universities: Bologna in the twelfth century, when the students formed “universities” on the model of the townspeople’s communes; Paris in the fifteenth century, when through its own political naiveté the university emerged from the Hundred Years War with an increased dependence on the French monarchy; Prague in the fifteenth century, when the masters involved themselves in the Hussite Revolution and supported emergent Czech nationalism, but failed to foresee that the extremist fringe of the movement, the Taborites, would eventually destroy the university; and Oxford and Cambridge

between 1640 and 1660, when the two universities came under radical attack because, as the training schools for the clerical establishment, they were essential agents of political and social control.

The material in the four essays is wide-ranging and uneven. The last essay, that by Christopher Hill on seventeenth century Oxford and Cambridge, benefits from the wealth of Puritan literature of the period that is extant. By comparison the history of the early mediaeval Bolognese law schools must rely heavily on inspired hypothesis. The title of the collection *Universities in Politics* is meant to emphasise the close involvement of the mediaeval universities in both localised political conflict and the prevailing social structure. In his introductory essay Baldwin picks out two common themes. Firstly, the masters and scholars, while acting as an interest group in the political arena, generally failed to achieve their goals because of a professional orientation to theoretical principles rather than to concrete analysis and pragmatic activity. Secondly, the fates of the universities and of the mediaeval Church were closely tied together. As the Church became a servant of nation states and centralising monarchy, so the case studies of universities and politics show the increasing domination of the university by the political powers. Both themes seem familiar in the twentieth century.

One of the essayists, Jacques Verger, speculates on what he calls the “psychology of the university people” of Paris in 1430, but he admits that he has little hard evidence upon which to draw. It might seem reasonable to suppose that we know much more for certain about the values and attitudes of the masters and scholars of nineteenth century English universities. But it is not so. Our knowledge of the history of higher education in Great Britain is remarkably sketchy – mainly because much of the archival research has yet to be attempted. The ideas, institutions and conventions from which the British system has evolved were formed largely during the nineteenth century; and the debates and developments which accompany the contemporary expansion of higher education need to be placed in a rigorously researched historical context. Yet we remain content with paradoxical half-truths, thin generalisations and quaint myths about the universities and colleges of the nineteenth century.

Collectively, however, the books by Bill, McClelland and Sanderson make a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Victorian universities. It is true that Sanderson’s work stretches its timespan to 1970, but the weight of his research lies in the earlier period which ends with the First World War. In 1920 there were eleven universities and several university colleges in England and Wales; in 1820 there had been only two universities, Oxford and Cambridge. During that hundred-year period the English university system reacted laboriously to the social and economic changes consequent upon industrialisation. Oxford and Cambridge were weaned from the smothering protectiveness of high Anglicanism and opened to new students and new subjects; Catholics and dissenters were freed from antique prohibitions and admitted to state-endorsed higher education and hence to the professions; new universities were founded in the urban centres of industry and commerce. Above all, the assortment of concepts and values about research, teaching, learning, society, academic freedom and academic organisation which today seem naturally enough to make up the peculiar English “idea of the university” were collected together, debated and refined.

Bill's *University Reform in Nineteenth-Century Oxford* is the most straightforward and perhaps least original work of the three. It is an intellectual biography of H. H. Vaughan and an analysis of his increasingly isolated role as a radical critic of Oxford University in the 1840s and 1850s. The history of the Oxford reform movement is a narrow and well-worked theme, but Bill brings to it a study of Vaughan's published writings and private papers.

Vaughan was a brilliant and much respected Oxford don who achieved little. Eloquent, temperamental, hypochondriac, with a commanding presence and a cold, logical intelligence, he entertained doubts about certain received dogmas of the Anglican Church which led him to resent the clerical/collegiate monopoly of unreformed Oxford. He struggled to achieve election to one of the Oxford professorial chairs (eventually securing that of history) but was later obliged to resign because he refused to be resident in Oxford. He lived out the final twenty-five years of his life in obscurity in a Welsh castle attempting to produce a masterpiece on the origins of morality, and tragically punctuating his failure to do so with claims of completed manuscripts "lost" or "stolen" by servants. The one work for which he did secure publication in this later period, a book of Shakespearian readings, sold four copies.

A Victorian academic eccentric then – of which there were many. What made Vaughan different was that he was a spokesman of the radical group of Oxford reformers (which included Liddell, Stanley and Jeune, with Jowett and Pattison hovering on the fringes), a key witness to the Royal Commission which investigated Oxford 1850–1852, and the foremost antagonist in the 1850s of the redoubtable Pusey. The conservatives and the reformers in Oxford faced the same problem: how to provide the increasing amount of qualitatively superior teaching that was required in a university with more honours students, a more diversified curriculum and reformed examination statutes. The conservatives like Pusey were concerned that changed circumstances should not dilute the classical, college-based curriculum in which the college tutor (a cleric) exercised a pastoral function and ensured that new knowledge did not lead his charges to doubt old revelation. The reformers – Vaughan among them – regarded college teaching as inefficient and an undesirable monopoly; a university, extra-collegiate, system of teaching was proposed based on an extended professoriate. Where Vaughan parted company with his colleagues was over his conception of the university professor. He spoke of the "studying professor," pursuing knowledge and learning, who should not be burdened with more than eight or ten undergraduate lectures per year and should not be shackled by the need to reside at the University.

What Bill's study shows indirectly is how many of the ideas and values which we now associate with universities, and through which we now define the academic role, were being worked out in the mid-Victorian period. There were conflicting views of the university which stemmed from an acceptance or rejection of its traditional role as an organic part of the Anglican Church. Ideas which we now take for granted were developed out of that conflict: ideas like "critical thinking" as a goal of undergraduate teaching (whatever we take that to mean), the university as a place of research, the relevance of student residence to higher education, and the dependence of academic pedagogy upon a subtle combination of lectures and tutorials.

The weakness of Bill's book is that it remains at the level of ideas and personalities: Oxford reform is not placed within a historical framework, neither is it set in its social context nor analysed in terms of such factors as the social composition of the student body or the demands of the economy and the professions for qualified manpower. Such criticisms apply neither to *English Roman Catholics and Higher Education* nor to *Universities and British Industry*. McClelland's large tome is a published Phd. thesis. It examines the lengthy and complicated manoeuvrings and reversals throughout a large part of the nineteenth century, which eventually resulted in the approval of both Rome and the hierarchy of English bishops for the entry of Roman Catholic students to English Protestant universities. It is a weighty contribution to knowledge, using a variety of primary source material, and it opens up an interesting, if narrow, aspect of nineteenth century higher education history not previously researched. One of its significant features is the evidence it provides of contemporary perceptions of student life and the undergraduate curriculum in Oxford and Cambridge. Of course, the perceptions contradicted each other. Oxbridge students were seen as both scholarly and dissolute, the curriculum as both morally opprobrious and neutral on questions of faith. The Catholic bishops were left with their prejudices.

The English Cardinals loom large in the story. Newman stands out as an intolerant, melodramatic, vainglorious figure (not unlike H. H. Vaughan in some ways), a bad organiser whose ideas and attitudes contributed significantly to the failure of the Irish University venture in the 1850s. The Oxford imprint was very markedly on his "idea of a university;" McClelland rightly illustrates the contradictions in that idea and the aristocratic caste of Newman's educational thought. Cardinal Manning, on the other hand (on whom McClelland has published an earlier work), presided diplomatically over the extension of education to English Catholics at all levels. A many-sided, respected and active primate, politician and social reformer, Manning hoped that sooner or later the English Catholics would establish a Catholic University, after the model of the University of Louvain. But the entry of Catholics into higher education was a gradual and contentious development. In the earlier part of the nineteenth century the Catholic colleges (e.g. Downside, Ushaw, Oscott — basically secondary schools) had a few older students who studied for University of London degrees; and after the mid-century a trickle of Catholics were matriculating at Oxbridge. But the University of London was a "godless institution" and had philosophy in its curriculum; Oxford and Cambridge were reputed to encourage lax and dissolute student behaviour. Anyway, they were Protestant Universities. In the 1850s the Catholic hierarchy pinned their hopes on Newman's Imperial University in Dublin. In the 1860s there were schemes for a Catholic University in England, separate Catholic colleges at Oxbridge and a Catholic central board of examiners. In the 1870s there was an abortive start to the Kensington College of Higher Studies. By the 1890s the hierarchy accepted that the scions of the Catholic aristocratic families should go to Oxford and Cambridge and they established chaplaincies and Catholic colleges (so-called "affiliated institutions") there.

The story is told in considerable detail by McClelland, but generally he avoids the obscurantism and dullness which some published doctorates display. It would be better if sometimes the telescope could have been reversed: the focus throughout is

very sharply on Catholic deliberations, attitudes and prejudices. Developments in the Protestant universities are taken for granted and no real attempt is made to correlate them with the different phases of Catholic activity and opinion. Almost by the way, McClelland suggests that the compromise reached in the 1890s was related to the facts that university colleges had been established in the industrial cities during the previous 25 years and the sons (and even daughters) of the Catholic commercial classes had been slipping unobtrusively into them for a local higher education.

The history of those civic university colleges in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century forms the strongest part of Sanderson's *The Universities and British Industry 1850–1970*. Sanderson traces the origins and development of these universities – in cities like Birmingham, Bristol, Manchester – and suggests that they emerged to serve the needs of local industry and commerce and to educate the offspring of the local middle classes. In the late nineteenth century these institutions were not unlike the local technical colleges of more recent years. Sanderson's analysis is based upon a considerable depth of original research into the archives of the civic universities and makes available much new material. This depth of scholarship does not, however, apply throughout the book and Sanderson's treatment of the post Second World War years is decidedly sketchy.

Sanderson provides a great deal of interesting information about the content of curricula, the social composition of student populations, careers of graduates, industrial research and endowment of universities. His general argument is that historically one can reject contemporary assertions that British universities are, and have been, "ivory towers" unresponsive to the manpower and research needs of industry and commerce. He is certainly perceptive and convincing over the role of the World Wars in encouraging a rapprochement between industry and the universities in the field of applied research. But, beyond that, Sanderson's historical scholarship does not seem to be matched by his explanatory power, by a systematic attempt to link his wealth of interesting facts into a theoretical model which would explore the interaction between universities and the economy. What is offered is a weak sort of functionalism: industry "needed" applied research, graduates etc. and the universities responded to fulfil those "needs". What are not explained are the exceptions and dysfunctions (e.g. there were undersupplies of some types of engineer and oversupplies of other types); the relationship between "real" economic needs (judged historically) and contemporary perceptions of those needs; and above all, the extent to which higher education curricula which qualified graduates as, for example, economists and engineers actually related to the job demands of those vocations. Sanderson's book would be much more useful if it was tightly argued, if his discussions of the "needs of industry" showed more clearly what he included in the term "industry" and how he defined "needs". It is much easier to know what the argument is in, say, the work of the Israeli sociologist Joseph Ben-David on the history of European universities and the professions, than it is in *Universities and British Industry*.

All four of these works on the history of higher education are valuable, then, in their respective ways. But historical enquiry into higher education in Britain remains at an embryonic stage. Much archival material remains to be exploited. What valuable work there is has yet to be systematised into a general history of higher

education. The insights of sociological explanation need to be incorporated with the precision of historical scholarship. As A. H. Halsey wrote recently: "The plain fact is that a convincing history of higher education as a collection of working and evolving intellectual organisations involved in exchange relations with the wider society has yet to be written and is a challenge for historians to exploit the sociological imagination."

Ingvar Werdelin (1972). *Quantitative Methods and Techniques of Educational Planning*. Beirut: Regional Centre for Educational Planning and Administration in the Arab Countries. xvi + 344 pp. (Litho).

This is another volume in the recent crop of books on educational planning. Yet one cannot tell, just by looking at the title, what these books are really about. For "educational planning" and "quantitative methods and techniques" mean very different things to different people working in this field.

For example, this particular author adopts the point of view that, among other things, educational planning is "meant to allow the system to meet *needs*" (p. 11, italics mine). But note that once a "need" is agreed upon, we can no longer talk of planning. We simply have to cater for that "need", whatever the social costs or benefits associated with satisfying this need. In my opinion, planning has to do with choice among many feasible alternatives; once a need is adopted the number of choices is reduced to zero and "planning" is reduced to simple provision.

What "quantitative techniques" mainly means to this author is ways of enrolment projections. But what projections miss is another element of genuine planning, namely an objective function or criterion for *changing* an observed trend.

The book contains a 26-page bibliography in which Unesco appears with forty-one entries, the author himself with nine entries and Bowles with one entry. In fact, the book I consider to be a classic in "educational planning" and its "quantitative methods and techniques" is not mentioned at all (Bowles, (1969), *Planning Educational Systems for Economic Growth*, Harvard University Press).

On the positive side, the book goes a long way into modelling the flow of students in the educational system, and the factors influencing repetition and dropping out. It should be particularly useful to those who wish to apply the social demand model.

George Psacharopoulos  
*London School of Economics*

G. Boalt, H. Lantz and E. Ribbing (1972). *Resources and Production of University Departments: Sweden and the U.S.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

The authors of this work want to contribute to our understanding of resource allocation within academic departments, and more generally to our understanding of how and why such departments grow. The presentation is divided into four parts. First, a ten-page introduction by Lantz on "Social factors affecting the growth of university departments." Then two empirical parts on the nine social science departments (72 pages, by Boalt) and the nineteen art departments, (89 pages, by Ribbing) in the five Swedish universities (for most purposes only four of which are included). Finally, a seven page summary which is a joint product.

It is very unlikely that anybody will refuse to accept Lantz's major point in the introduction, that in order to understand resource allocation we have to take into consideration both internal and external factors. The introduction is a series of notes on an important subject. The notes, however, do not present any new insights, nor does the author make any serious attempt to integrate his points of view into a more comprehensive model of how the different factors are connected under different circumstances.

The empirical sections of the book are concentrated around internal (departmental) factors. The organising idea is that university departments have several inconsistent goals, and given a certain level of resources, they cannot stress each goal dimension to the same degree. Teaching and research especially will compete for resources. A department can *expand* its resources either through doing good research or through performing well in undergraduate education. The authors expect a compensation pattern: departments doing well on some dimensions will do less well on others.

Traditionally, universities have argued that teaching well is impossible if not based on good research; here the authors take it for granted that the two tasks are in strong competition. A serious discussion of this complex relationship, however, is lacking.

The choice of indicators or variables increases the problem. Boalt uses 27 variables. Eleven are labelled student variables and measure such things as total number of students, number of new students, and number of students getting their exams, at different undergraduate levels. The next cluster is labelled "recruitment and performance of the researcher," and includes staff salary per student together with different measures on numbers and ratios of MA and Ph.D students and graduates, the percentage getting state stipends and the percentage of females among the MA graduates. Finally, there is a cluster labelled "teachers in the department," referring to such things as the ratio of teachers to students, the ratio of teachers with a Ph.D with honours, the ranking of the chairman according to his assignment to the state, and the income level of the professors.

Ribbing uses 47 variables, following basically the same pattern as Boalt, but also including several indicators of the percentage of females at different student levels, and of different characteristics of the departmental chairman.

One wonders *why* each variable has been included and what it really measures. At the same time one cannot help noticing the absence of other indicators, especially

those concerned with research output. The answer is given by the authors when they tell us that the choice of variables had to be limited to those available within a month or so (Boalt, p. 19) and that "we admit that we have grasped the variables most easily measured and made little or no effort to have the most important aspects of academic output represented if they were very difficult to obtain." (p. 48). The authors also admit that "the majority of variables cannot be predicted to belong either to the teaching or research cluster" (pp. 160–161).

The analysis of the data is simple. First, the different departments within each university are analysed one at a time. Then, the same department is studied across universities. Rank correlations are used, and all intercorrelations are presented in matrices. The authors are aware of the problems of this method and several times warn us against taking the data too seriously. They do not, however, discuss any alternative methods, for instance related to recent advances in cluster-analysis.

What, then, are the findings? Those who expect a comparative study of academic departments in Sweden and the United States will be disappointed. There are no references to American data. As far as the Swedish material is concerned, the variable "number of new students" is seen as the key measure of teaching output and the base of "the teaching cluster". It may be argued that this is more an indicator of departmental input than output. More serious, however, is the fact that the majority of other student measures are *not* included and that the authors cannot tell us why.

The ambiguity and inadequacy of the theoretical framework "forces" the authors to make several ad hoc assumptions about such things as the students' intelligence and motivation at the different universities, the ecological aspects of the universities, and so on. It thus "allows" the authors to use very different "explanations" of the same phenomenon at different points in the book. Consider the variations in the grades obtained by the students. In different places the distribution is interpreted in terms of the intelligence and motives of the students; the motives of the teachers for giving high/low degrees ("research departments are more interested in giving higher grades on theses and dissertations than teaching departments," p. 182); and in terms of the differences in resources, (for instance, public grants).

The book provides some information of great interest, for instance the covariations between total number of students within a field and the percentage of women. It is argued that the more meagre the resources, the smaller the percentage of females. These ideas are consistent with a more general expectation that groups on the periphery of our system of higher education (those with lower income, females, those from the geographical periphery, etc.) will always be most hurt in times of contraction in the educational system. It is more difficult to follow the authors when they assume that small departments are also those with fewest resources (p. 113).

The publishers of this book tell us that it has a "powerful impact and significance for the academic world of today" and that "it should be considered required reading for anyone concerned with the dynamic structure of the university community."

Let me summarise the major reasons why I strongly disagree. The theoretical framework seems inadequate and loosely connected to available social, political, and organisational theory. The choice of variables is determined by what university administrators have taken an interest in, not what the theoretical framework demands.

The data analysis is simple and not related to recent advances in cluster-analysis. While some interesting correlations are discovered in the many matrices presented, it is difficult to say whether they are spurious or not. They are not integrated into any consistent, theoretical framework.

University organisation and science policy have for the last 6–7 years been considered highly “relevant” by people both inside and outside higher education. A major effect seems to be that many authors have been willing to forgo the demands of quality, and to weaken the connections back to the traditional disciplines and their arsenals of theoretical ideas and methodological insights. It has to be expected that such “relevant” books soon will be forgotten when higher education is not a major “fashion” any more, when the interest in higher education fades away in many external groups.

Since there are so many signs of reduced interest already, it is more important than ever to increase our understanding of how universities work. If we do not, it is likely that external pressure will increase, demanding that the university should be governed by organisational models developed in the context of the firm, the army and other organisations fundamentally different from our institutions of higher education. It would nevertheless be foolish to believe that it is possible to make a relevant contribution towards solving these problems in any *easy* way.

Johan P. Olsen  
*University of Bergen*

Terry Nichols Clark (1973). *Prophets and Patrons: The French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP. x + 282. pp. \$12.00

The hierarchical structure and centralized administration of the French educational system, designed under Napoleon and virtually unchallenged until 1968, were notoriously inimical to innovation. In higher education, the Napoleonic division into Faculties (Arts, Sciences, Law, Medicine and, initially, Theology) and *grandes écoles* hampered the addition of new subjects to the curriculum, both because of strict specialization – uncondusive to pedagogic experiments and to interdisciplinary cooperation – and because of the rigid formal requirements governing appointment to chairs. Hence the expansion of the social sciences, ignored in the initial Napoleonic blueprint and indeed largely unacknowledged at the time as academic disciplines, was restricted to those establishments where research was granted priority over teaching, such as the Collège de France and the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes. The importance of these institutions was a corollary of the administrative rigidity prevailing throughout the rest of the educational system. They provided some counter-balance for its vocationalism and partly offset its resistance to new intellectual trends, inseparable from the absence of competition between establishments placed under the same central control and benefiting from the same educational monopoly.

The author provides an interesting description of the context in which the social sciences were gradually and almost grudgingly accepted by the French University. In his view, the pattern of their development through clusters – grouping about “a dozen persons who shared a minimal core of beliefs about their work and who were prepared to collaborate to advance research and instruction in a given area” derives from the

French academic organization. He argues that its centralism led to the concentration of prestige and influence in central chairs – generally at the Sorbonne and occasionally at the Collège de France. Their incumbents became patrons, influenced appointments to provincial chairs, to teaching posts in higher educational institutions, as well as to *lycées* (in former times, before secondary establishments had become “massified”), and, more recently, to research institutes. In addition, a patron usually edited a series and/or a journal which served as a forum for the whole cluster. Durkheim and *Année Sociologique* are the best known example of this pattern, although *Le Play* and *La Revue Sociale*, the social statisticians and *Revue d’Economie Politique*, and Worms’ *Revue Internationale de Sociologie* provide other cases which are described in a detailed historical section. The incorporation of the social sciences, and particularly of sociology in higher educational curricula is thus documented, though the concept of cluster is then used for labelling rather than tested.

The cross-national comparisons with other educational systems do not provide much clarification on the *differentia specifica* which demarcates the cluster from other forms of academic patronage. The contrast with Germany focuses on the absence of centralization and the dysfunction between secondary and higher education. Yet the German “school” bears a considerable resemblance to the French cluster despite these organizational discrepancies, and the analogy between the prestige of Berlin and that of Paris seems to have been underestimated. The United States, with the less rigid authority structure of the academic department, the greater degree of lateral mobility facilitated by the proliferation of academic institutions and the importance of professional organizations for standard setting, differ much more profoundly from the French or indeed from any European pattern. The case of England is not considered – although a more comparative approach might well have yielded valuable information about the specificity of the cluster to the Napoleonic system. For instance, Kuper’s recent work on the development of British anthropology from LSE outwards seems to point to the existence of a cluster in an uncentralised system. It would have been interesting also to ascertain whether higher educational institutions based on an imitation of the Napoleonic model, e.g. in Latin countries, have also resulted in the emergence of clusters. Without such a comparative approach, the basic assumptions from which this study is derived remain uncorroborated. As a result, it outlines the history of the social sciences in French higher education, but does not substantiate the hypothesis which the author had set out to demonstrate.

Michalina Vaughan  
*University of Lancaster*

*The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges.* A Special Report and Recommendations by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill. (1970). \$1.25.

Leland L. Medsker and Dale Tillery (1971). *Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges.* Fourth in a Series sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, with a commentary by Joseph P. Cosand. New York: McGraw-Hill. 183 pp. \$5.95.

K. Patricia Cross (1971). *Beyond the Open Door: New Students to Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 200 pp. \$8.75.

Community college is the name for an institution that offers a wide variety of educational options for high school graduates and adults. These options include the first two years of a BA or BS degree (transfer programs), a terminal two year degree (the Associate of Arts) in general or vocational education, community service programs such as mini-courses or fine arts programs, and adult education programs such as non-credit evening classes or up-dating of vocational skills training. The relatively low cost and open-door admissions policies have made these institutions very accessible to anyone with a high school diploma or an equivalent. Though these institutions have been in existence for over sixty years, only after World War II did they begin to attract attention from educators and students. The overall assumption built into these two-year colleges is that everyone should have the possibility of attending some kind of post-secondary school at public expense.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, created by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to review all aspects of American higher education over a five-year period, has published over forty books of research, recommendations and commentary. Basically, the Commission has produced two kinds of products: reports of research and analysis by specialists not on the Commission; and recommendations by the Commission for higher education policy. *Breaking the Access Barriers* by Leland Medsker and Dale Tillery is an example of the first type and *The Open-Door Colleges Policies for Community Colleges* an example of the second. Both books were published at about the same time and both deal with similar information on two-year colleges. They serve the important purpose of drawing the attention of educators to an often-ignored segment of higher education.

In *Open-Door Colleges*, the Commission promotes comprehensive community colleges (meaning those serving academic, vocational and other general education in one institution) to a key role in the accomplishment of the national policy that sees post-secondary education for all the US in this century. Specifically:

Community colleges should be available within commuting distance to all persons throughout their lives, except in sparsely populated areas which could be served by residential colleges. This will require 230 to 280 new colleges by 1980. Prospectively more than 95 percent of all Americans will be within commuting distance of a community college.

To make such educational opportunity attractive and feasible for students, the Commission makes several other recommendation, including a continued policy of no or low tuition; full transfer rights to senior institutions of graduates from two-year colleges; and increased student services such as counseling.

Providing the opportunity of post-secondary education for all high school graduates and other qualified persons would be a mammoth undertaking, and the report provides some details of the necessary steps. It describes the present number of two-year colleges in each state in relation to its population. Funding for the construction and support of new community colleges is not seen as primarily a state function

but rather should be a combination local/state/and federal responsibility. States would have the task of establishing master plans for state-wide junior college systems, and some responsibility for their coordination.

At the time that this book was published, the prospect of the public support for higher education necessary to enact the Carnegie Commission's recommendations was greater than it is now. Changes in federal spending priorities, loss of enthusiasm for public higher education, and other pressing domestic problems competing with education for public money have played a part in this change. Consequently, the predictions for the number of colleges to be built by 1980 seem inflated.

Other factors led to questioning of the Commission's predictions. For one thing, young people are not attending colleges at the rate expected by the Commission's researchers. Not only are the potential numbers of eligible youth beginning to decline as we see the end to the post-World War II "baby boom" reaching college age, but the great demand on the part of young people to go to college has diminished. These kinds of unforeseen changes in demand wreak havoc with predictions.

Thus *Open-Door Colleges* can be seen as a product of an era in higher education which has abruptly ended — an era characterized by great public financial support for higher education, especially two-year colleges, and great student numbers and demand for higher education. The question remains, however. What will happen to the goal of that era of an opportunity for post-secondary education for all eligible persons, now that funding has declined.

*Breaking the Access Barriers* provides a more detailed profile of the evolution and recent dramatic growth of two-year colleges, documenting the extent and nature of their expanding role in higher education and their contribution to society. Accepting the Carnegie Commission predictions in *The Open-Door Colleges* for future growth of community colleges, Medsker and Tillery offer their own recommendations on how this future development should occur. Thus parts of this book suffer from the same irrelevancies to present-day problems as did *The Open-Door Colleges*. Fortunately, the authors do more than recommend continued growth for community colleges.

While community colleges have succeeded remarkably well in a number of states (including the so-called pacesetter states of California, New York, Illinois, Michigan, Florida, Texas, and Washington), the national growth of community colleges has been uneven. Besides pointing out a need for more colleges, the authors add that it is essential that there be better planning and coordination of two-year institutions with local secondary schools and the four-year colleges and universities in a given region. They recommend that local financial support be supplemented increasingly by the states and federal government. At the same time, the community colleges must be left operationally free to experiment and innovate as their roles and the changing times require.

If they are to assume the responsibilities in American post-secondary education that many people see for them, junior colleges must be subjected to continuous examination so that those in charge of local, state, and national planning can have adequate information about them. To this end, the book, in addition to presenting a statistical portrait of junior colleges, reports much valuable data on many topics including:

- students and their diversity, comparing college parallel with vocational-technical students, two-year to four-year students, and briefly discussing ethnic and older students and characteristics of future students;
- the relation of junior colleges to the urban life; minority and undereducated students, the community outreach program, and problems involved in remedial education;
- the faculty, its characteristics, issues, and problems;
- control and support of community colleges, focusing on the two basic state patterns, internal plans of college governance, financing, sources and expenditures of funds, and the responsibility of the federal government;
- the independent junior college, its nature, problems and future.

The book is extremely useful in presenting the facts and figures on two-year colleges. The authors are concerned especially about the gap between the rhetoric of providing equal opportunity for all and the reality that unless the colleges change their curriculum and programs, the colleges will be revolving doors for many students. Thus, they realistically recommend that “the junior colleges – specifically members of governing boards, administrators, and faculty – should reassess their goals and the means of attaining them.” For example: “The ostrich stance regarding such matters as high student attrition rates is not tolerable in these times.”

K. Patricia Cross in *Beyond the Open Door* presents the thesis that there is a New Student to higher education, that traditional education has failed him in the past, and unless substantial changes are made, it will fail him in the future. *Beyond the Open Door* is directed toward practitioners who have the critical task of developing and improving programs to properly educate these New Students – those ranking in the lowest third of their high school graduating classes on tests of academic abilities. The book, while agreeing that specialized academic training is appropriate for a minority of community college students, argues persuasively that most post-secondary institutions should gear up for the talents and interests of these New Students.

Cross built her study on data collected in four major research projects conducted between 1960 and 1969, each of which were based on large, nationally diverse, but not necessarily representative, samples of students. Three used longitudinal designs following high school students into post-secondary education, and one was a collection of data on students entering two-year colleges.

First, she analyzes the changing philosophies over the years with regard to who should go to college, discusses who is going to college now, and finally, predicts who will be going to college in the future. After describing the differences in school experiences between New Students and traditional students, she suggests that the failure experience of the former have resulted in a different approach to learning from that used by the more successful traditional students.

The central portion of the book provides a research description of the New Students – their personalities, previous and expected education experiences, and future aspirations. Using data from a national sample of youth who were retested one and five years after their high school graduation, she describes how well their education prepared them for what they are doing now. Also included is a brief discussion of two other groups of students in higher education – ethnic minorities and women – who have special problems not common to all New Students.

In the final and most important section of this book, Cross points out how the curriculum and structure of higher education must change if the non-traditional students are to have successful college experiences and learn the skills and knowledge they seek. Basically she is arguing for changing the purpose of higher education from sorting students to developing individual differences, from comparing and ranking students in one curriculum to presenting a diverse range of subjects requiring a wide variety of skills. "I propose that we reverse the present trends to certify that all students were exposed to the same curriculum, certifying instead that students are high performers in quite disparate areas of accomplishment" (p. 164). This is not a revolutionary idea; she is not claiming, as many educational reformers have done, that changing our educational institutions will correct social injustices. She argues for her reforms simply on the basis that graduates will be happier. "Once we get out of school, we choose the areas in which we will display our competencies. Only in school do we require students to display – more or less publicly – their weaknesses. Human dignity demands the right to be good at something" (p. 164).

*Beyond the Open Door* is a well written book and contains important ideas. The reforms put forth by Cross should be the first steps to humanizing open door higher education institutions.

Leslie Purdy  
School of Education  
University of California at  
Los Angeles

Susanne Hoerber Rudolph and Lloyd I. Rudolph (eds.), (1972). *Education and Politics in India: Studies in Organisation, Society and Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard UP. 470 pp. \$20.00

The editors of this work and nine other contributors of eminence in Indian education present a four-part study relating educational and political systems and analysing their interactions. Starting from historical beginnings the writers take us through regional and federal grounds with their public interests; on to the political, social and educational environments; to the realms of professionalism and the politicisation of education, and finally, to revivalism and modernisation. The book highlights those policy problems which are of great importance in modern India, and makes two contributions to the study of the politics of education. The first identifies problems regarding the relationship between politics and education generally, and explores concepts and methods for their investigation. The second contributes to our understanding of those problems.

The editors begin by saying: "Our concern in studying the politics of education is to identify and analyse the institutions and processes that shape educational policy and performance." They point out the difficulty in trying to assess the sort of expectations that the non-educational world has of education in the name of social needs and how much autonomy institutions should have in the choice and implementation of policies fashioned to achieve those ends.

Part One forms an introduction and an analytical framework for the other three parts, and in it the joint editors, Professors of Political Science and Social Science at

the University of Chicago, give the historical background leading into a contemporary regional and federal view. Part Two deals with the interaction of primary and secondary institutions in their political and social settings.

The case studies which form Part Three of the book make interesting and valuable reading on the forces which have helped to shape the character and quality of Indian higher education. Three of India's reputable colleges are presented as case studies, and the motives that led to their diverse foundations discussed, together with the influences, both of personalities and other academic and legal institutions, that have resulted in the present-day structure. In addition, two of India's universities are examined, showing their growth from early incorporation up to the present, and again analysing the personalities and their motives and methods which have shaped the development and character of the institutions. Reduced to simple comment, the value of these five case studies is that autonomy and consensus are themselves shaped by a number of legitimate forces and that the interplay between them determine the outcomes.

In Part Four the effects of professionalism on both politics and education are discussed. Each part is linked by introductory essays which serve to integrate the whole work. There are copious notes at the end of the book which contain excellent explanations and bibliography.

The book sets the educational system in its environment, particularly its political environment. The authors have treated education aggregatively and disaggregatively, as the educational system on one hand and as educational institutions on the other. More attention is devoted to higher education than to school and primary education. The educational system is disaggregated not only by educational institutions and levels of education, but also by regions.

The tone of the work is refreshingly modest, honest and realistic; it is a serious and masterly exposition of its subject.

K. C. Mukherjee  
*University of London*  
*Institute of Education*

Gert Elstermann (ed.), (1971). *Ausbildungskapazität: Eine Zwischenbilanz*. Göttingen: Schwartz. 253 pp.

This book is a product of the present-day trauma of university policy, the *numerus clausus*. It consists of a collection of various papers on *Kapazitätsplanung* — the planning of staff and student numbers in higher education. The individual contributions are of differing level and applicability, some of them going no further than to recognise that numbers have to be planned.

*Kapazitätsplanung* is part of the new academic discipline of higher education research and planning, and as Blauhusch (p. 211) says:

Ein offenkundiges Dilemma Hochschulplanung ist, dass wirksame und auch kurzfristig einsetzbare praktikable Massnahmen durch den Mangel an unzureichenden empirischen Materialien und an ausreichenden sozialwissenschaftlich gesicherten Erkenntnissen erschwert werden. Für das Kapazitäts-

problem bedeutet dies, dass kaum Überlegungen oder gar wissenschaftlich ausreichend fundierte Untersuchungen über die Leistungsfähigkeit des Systems Hochschule (und nur dies kann der Sinn von Hochschulkapazität sein) vorliegen . . .<sup>1</sup>

Studies on the microlevel such as those presented here may be considered valuable primarily from a methodological point of view. The problem of the *numerus clausus*, however, can be successfully tackled only from a macropolitical standpoint. This implies the necessity for the evaluation of social needs and macroeconomically oriented control of academic growth. A prerequisite for the solution of the problems of educational policy is therefore the enlargement of the temporal planning horizon. A large part of the time series of various statistical parameters in education show stochastic variations. A basis for decision-making in educational planning should therefore be sought in broad-based simulation studies. Only measures taken on such a basis could prevent gross misplanning of the kind which has led to the introduction of the *numerus clausus*.

Some of the contributions in the book do however present interesting detailed investigations and can furnish essential structural data needed as input for a systems analysis of an overall university planning model oriented towards social and economic criteria. But a great deal of data is still lacking and investigations of the kind reported in this book could at least serve the purpose of drawing attention to such prerequisites.

The book is well-presented insofar as a great variety of views and methods is offered. In this respect it rightly claims to be an interim account – as the sub-title asserts – on the state of development of the problem in the German Federal Republic. It can be recommended as a special reader on university planning.

Max Streit  
*Universität Graz*

*Register of Research into Higher Education in Western Europe 1973*  
London: Society for Research into Higher Education. 227 pp. £3.00.

Bringing together for the first time information on over 170 projects, this work affords us a very clear conspectus of ongoing and recently completed higher education research in Western Europe. One finds the familiar concerns of unit costs, administrative reform, course evaluation, career choice, and so on, together with more unusual ones such as an analysis of student budgets and an examination of the relationship between cognitive style and instructional media. In terms of overall distribution, themes related to students – social background, selection and performance, coun-

---

<sup>1</sup> “A well-known dilemma of current higher education planning is that effective and even short-term practicable measures are hindered by the lack of adequate empirical material and sufficient sociologically sound findings. As far as the ‘capacity’ problem is concerned, this means that hardly any reflections or indeed adequate scientifically based investigations are available for the efficiency of the higher education system (and only this can higher education ‘capacity’ mean.”

selling — predominate, as one would expect, followed by studies of the teaching-learning situation, particularly of small-group and project work. As for the relative importance of particular research areas in individual countries, one finds little to distinguish them apart from a slight bias towards sociological concerns in France and towards teaching and learning problems in Germany.

The Register shares with its sister publication on UK research a classification into broad and overlapping subject areas (and no detailed subject index), together with a stereotyped format which does not lend itself to rapid scanning. More importantly, all the entries are in English, material originally submitted in other languages having been translated, (not always as accurately as one would hope\*). This seems more than a little eccentric in a publication sponsored by the Council of Europe and covering all Western European countries *except* Britain. Communication might also have been more readily promoted if an indication had been given of the languages in which the project members had at least a working competency.

D. J. Hounsell  
*University of Lancaster*

Khateeb M. Hussain (1973). *Development of Information Systems for Education*. Englewoods Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. 419pp.

The recent and rapid influx of management systems concepts and concomitant developments of complex computer-based information systems in higher education (and education in general) have spawned two extremes of literature for the administrator interested in learning more of these developments; one is the highly technical and/or mathematical treatment of the topic by systems analysts, computer scientists, or operational researchers, and the other is the very general treatment of the broad administrative, political, social, and value issues raised by these developments. The gulf between these two extremes is extensive and contains little which can inform or introduce the administrator or student of education to the basic ideas, concepts, processes, and terms associated with management information systems developments. It is this interface or gulf which Dr. Hussain's book addresses.

To accomplish this purpose the author has packaged (or programmed) his text in a logical sequence, approached the material more descriptively than analytically, and attempted to suggest step-by-step procedures to clarify or simplify areas of information system development which are often confused or complex in real situations. The text introduces the reader to the terms and concepts of operations research, information theory, computer sciences and management systems with adequate definitions and without jargon-laden discussions. The author's style — both in an overview and in each chapter — is to tell the reader what he is going to say, to say it, and then to summarize it. The end of each chapter is further buttressed with a set of key terms

---

\* For example, "Akademiker" has been translated as "academics", while "Centre for Research and its Educational Applications" is given as the translation of "Centre de Recherches et d'Application Pedagogiques en Langues".

used in the text (defined in a glossary at the end of the book), a series of review questions, and a selected bibliography for further explanation.

The book itself is organized into five major sections. Part One provides an overview of the book and a description of operations research techniques of flow charting, network diagramming, and construction of decision tables which are the basis of information systems analysis and are utilized later. Part Two deals with basic systems concepts, the notion of an information system and the functions of such a system as it relates to administration or decision-making. Part Three discusses the basic concepts of data organization, coding, and file design. Part Four is an extensive description of the process of and stages in the development of an information system. The fifth and final part of the book deals with the uses of an information system.

The strength of the book is in the breadth of its coverage of this area, the clear and straightforward descriptive treatment which assumes little knowledge on the part of the reader, and its organization. In a sense the strength is also a weakness in that it occasionally reads like a programmed text. The perspective of the book is very clearly bureaucratic or mechanistic. It assumes rational, hierarchical and goal-oriented decision-making and information. The book only deals – and perhaps appropriately – with the information system as a rational technological subsystem of an educational institution or organization. The implications or impact of information systems on institutions, which may be as much professional, collegial, and/or political as bureaucratic, are not treated. Some of the major issues and concerns of administrators dealing with management information systems development are at most recognized but not dealt with. How do we protect against invasion of privacy? Who has control and access to information? How does one insure that information is used? What are the implications of comparable data at the supra-institutional level? Finally, while the book has a 1973 publication date, the references are comprehensive but primarily dated prior to 1970 and examples of applications in higher education are very limited or general in nature.

In summary, Mr. Hussain has produced a comprehensive, detailed, and descriptive introductory text which fills a void in the literature on information systems in higher education. It should be most useful as a text for undergraduates in educational administration. For graduate students in organization and administration, institutional research, or related areas in higher education with limited background it would be an appropriate introductory reference. Lower and middle level administrators with little knowledge of systems analysis, computers, or information systems development who are in primary contact with this area should find it very informative. The top level administrator with little knowledge of the area may find it useful to skim but will not find it adequate for dealing with the complex administrative questions, interinstitutional issues, and other potential implications raised when faced with decisions regarding the extent and nature of his or her institution's developments in this area.

Marvin W. Peterson  
*University of Michigan*

*Diversifying Post-Secondary Education in Europe* (Paedagogica Europaea, 1972). 148 pp. *Guidance and Assessment in European Education* (Paedagogica Europaea, 1973). 183 pp. DM18. 's-Hertogenbosch: Malmberg; Braunschweig: Westermann.

The first of these volumes includes articles by S. J. Eggleston on patterns of diversification in European post-secondary education, B. Holmes on a comparative survey of the development of higher education, two papers on post-secondary education in Norway by, respectively, K. Eide and Kr. Ottosen, and an account of the development of polytechnics in the UK by G. S. Brosan, together with a number of more general contributions on university organisation and course innovations. The second volume is rather loosely concerned with guidance and assessment, particularly in schools, but contains papers on sandwich courses and teacher education. Both volumes contain informative summaries of each paper in English, French and German.

Robert F. Arnove (1971). *Student Alienation: A Venezuelan Study*. New York: Praeger. xxiv + 211 pp.

Based on a study of the provincial Universidad de Oriente in Venezuela, this book examines the ways in which an institution's social structure – patterns of student–faculty interaction and reward systems – influence student identification with and commitment to occupational and political roles, concentrating principally on the theme of alienation.

I. Savický (compiler) (1973). *European Selective Bibliography on Adult Education, 1966–1971*. European Centre for Leisure and Education, Jilska 1, Prague 1, Czechoslovakia. 108 pp.

Presents over 160 abstracts of the more important general works together with material on individual countries. Includes sections on international conferences, bibliographies and directories, and journals.

Francis Wong Hoy Kee (1973). *Comparative Studies in Southeast Asian Education*. Kuala Lumpur: Heinemann. viii + 191 pp.

An introduction to the comparative study of education in Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. Following background chapters on the educational structure of these five countries, there are case studies on some of the major problems confronting educationists with respect to population increase, economic growth, the development of national unity and a national language, and religion. The book concludes with a description of regional cooperation in education. The author is Associate Professor of Education at the University of Malaya and co-editor of the *Malaysian Journal of Education*.

D. J. Thomas (1973). *Universities*. London: Batsford. 96 pp. £1.30

Intended for the general reader, this is an account of the government, finance, and curriculum of British universities with particular emphasis on their development from the twelfth century through the “seats of ignorance, infidelity, corruption and debauchery” described by Knox in the late eighteenth century, to the founding of the “green fields” universities in the 1960s. The writing lacks grace but the illustrations are lively and for the most part well-chosen.