

BOOK REVIEWS

Edmund J. King, Christine H. Moor and Jennifer Mundy (1974–75). *Post-Compulsory Education I: A New Analysis in Western Europe*. 397 pp. *Post-Compulsory Education II: The Way Ahead*. 197 pp. London and Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

The term ‘post compulsory education’ has become very quickly one of the modish phrases amongst educational planners, administrators and experts. Institutes have been nurtured on it. Reputations raised on it. So it is only appropriate that close attention be paid to the study that originally coined the felicitous phrase.

King’s investigation, originally directed towards the implications, both social and educational, of the spiralling enrolments at the 16–20 age range in the ‘upper secondary’ school and in further education, penetrates into a vast field. It is an area all the more complex in that it stands at the interface between education and work, education and training, and education and future occupational status. The pressures building up in this sector of the education system generally and in the school in particular, are not, however, limited to sheer numbers, though that is the most obvious symptom. They extend into school organisation, educational management, infiltrate into the burgeoning ‘science’ of educational decision-making (*sic*), press upon the curriculum and call for such a massive reappraisal that historic systems of management and administration are often left powerless – where not aghast – at the task before them. To some, the solution is seen in terms of redefining the administrative structure of education so that it conforms to the fad of ‘corporate management’. Others, principally the devotees of Ivan Illich, await the day when present methods create their own burial place. At which point, education, wafted into the bosom of the community by computers and knowledge networks, will – like Lazarus – rise, take up its bed and walk. Both these solutions are interesting. They represent the two extremes, the one technocratic, the other chiliastic if not millennial. King and his associates, walking delicately like King Agag, steer a steady course between the twin orthodoxies that hitherto held sway.

To view an old or persistent problem in a new light not only demands a new vocabulary – that lesson most historians or political theorists are well aware of. It also demands empirical confirmation of how far the new vocabulary of discourse *does* explain – or bring together – patterns and practices that were previously dispersed amongst different sectors of the field called education. Most enquiries undertaking a redefinition of the framework of discourse often omit this. Or the converse is true; namely, that empirical investigations are usually conducted within the bounds of contemporary orthodoxy. If the former seeks to clarify new maps of knowledge and to explore new ‘conceptual sets’, the latter is aimed rather at clarifying the extent to which current developments conform to current concepts. The seminal aspect of these two works, the first containing the empirical data, the second marrying both concept development with policy recommendations, is that they unite both. In that lies their originality. And their boldness.

The enquiry was carried out in five countries: France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Sweden and England. Relying on questionnaires and interviews, it was based on 5,419 students, 631 teachers and 54 schools. To the nitpicking, the schools investigated seemed, at least in the English sample, to be over-represented by sixth form colleges and atypical in the comprehensive sector. All three 'bilateral' schools were creamed (p.157) and in addition, shared a catchment area with two technical colleges. If creaming affects the flow up to the sixth form, as studies by Benn and Simon have shown, then it is no less likely that the combined effect of both grammar and technical colleges in the same area will reduce the sixth form of the 'bilaterals' to the mere shadow of a rump. Not even the rump itself! It is a pity that the sampling did not control, at least in the English secondary sector, for policy of access. Access to the sixth form is an important structural variable. Whether it is an 'open' sixth form or a 'closed' one not only affects the type of student found there. It also affects curricular provision and hence subject preferences amongst young people. Not to have included at least one non-creamed comprehensive school with an 'Open' sixth form is surely, a grave sin of omission? More so since the educational debate when the investigation began in 1970 was turning in that direction.

The authors will doubtless reply that their intention was to get behind the particular structures to see what changes were taking place in the *perception* of participants in that area of the education system. In which case, the sampling frame is less important. True. But their own evidence would appear to suggest that where the functional equivalent of an 'open sixth form' exists -- for instance in Sweden where the upper secondary school currently caters for 85% of the age group up to 19 -- there are marked differences in precisely that aspect the study sought to investigate, i.e. perceptions and values.

Perhaps the most important single finding is that the 16 to 19 age range is well aware of the shifts in occupational and professional status. A very significant finding, especially when placed against other studies undertaken earlier as well as contemporaneously into the vocational aspirations of sixth formers in England, for example, the Government Social Survey's report in 1970 on sixth form pupils and their teachers and Gordon and Williams' investigation in 1975. It suggests that the high degree of vocationalism, especially amongst late developers and the so-called 'new' sixth formers, could well be capable of rapid response to national need when national need is defined and publicised enough. Policies such as these are particularly important at that moment of transition between the breakdown of the 'traditional' structure in education for the 16 to 19 year olds -- selective, academic in curriculum, limited to schools and aiming at higher education -- and the emergence of the 'open structure', non-selective, diverse in the ability range of its students and hence diverse both in curriculum and in the career goals of those passing through it. We are then, at a point in educational development when the hitherto accepted three unities of post-school education are slowly vanishing. These unities are the unity of ability, the unity of curriculum and -- in the long run most significant of all -- the unity founded upon the concept of linear, sequential study. The gradual demise -- some would argue the inadaptability -- of the latter, leads to the notion of 'recurrent' education.

Yet it is equally obvious from this Report that whilst, from the standpoint of structural innovation, the 16 to 19 age range is opening up to groups hitherto excluded

on grounds of ability and in consequence of policies of formal selection lower down the school, there are just as powerful forces present and seen as desirable by young people which can fulfill precisely the same function. Over half the British students and around seven European students out of ten thought that much more counselling and guidance was needed. There is, to be sure, a qualitative difference between exclusion from certain 'types' of education that lead on to certain well-defined areas of the occupational hierarchy, and matching an individual's strengths and wishes to a job in which he will best be able to realise them. Nevertheless, it suggests that in the future young adults become even more reliant on the education system, if not for qualifications, then certainly for information about the state of labour market. This, however, is precisely the area where our education systems, not to mention European systems, are at their weakest, despite moves by such countries as France to set up a National Office for Information on Education and Careers (ONISEP).

Quite correctly, King and his associates devote considerable space to the task of outlining a model of relationships between the component parts of the education system which, hopefully, will permit the successful transition from the 'sequential' pattern of studies to the 'non-sequential'. "All highly urbanised countries and regions are experiencing the tension between those deep cultural traditions which have invested the citizens' minds like language or religion and those contradictory challenges which arise from an altered life-style developing in a plurality of new possibilities" (vol.1, pp.382-3). The 1970's, they suggest, represent a third stage in the post-war development of education, a stage characterised by 'polyvalent' adaptability, initiative in continuous enterprise and learning, with feedback and interchange in a 'communications society' (vol.1, p.386). Unlike Illich, this is not so much a knowledge network, as an administrative or even institutional network. More efficacious than our present organisation, to be sure. In theory, it should allow adjustments by institutions to the changes in needs and perceived needs on individuals within them or their periphery. It should also permit greater adaptability by other institutions, following the initiative in one. To many, such an information and adaptability nexus lies at the heart of the Swedish strategy of a rolling reform in education. To the administratively perceptive, such a network implies the decentralisation of decision-making in education systems hitherto centrally governed. It also implies a degree of re-centralisation in systems based, as in England, upon a municipally run education system.

This cybernetic interpretation of educational development is not new. Most organisations from governments downwards pay particular attention to 'feedback' in times of stress and social change. Those that do not, fail, unless they are tyrannies, to last long. What is new is the widespread recognition of the importance of a mechanism previously taken for granted. Yet the concept of institutionalised feedback is no guarantee that an organisation which has declined as a hierarchy will emerge permanently as a plurality. Certainly, the reinforcement of such a mechanism of mutual control is a necessary condition for change. But it is not sufficient. This, for the simple reason that, like any mechanism, it is only a means, a tool. As such it may be more sensitive to detecting the changes in attitude amongst young people, their career aspirations, their values and their hopes. But it does not of itself answer the highly important question of control in education or to what degree such changes will be acknowledged as a legitimate foundation for policy implementation. Simply to argue that feedback func-

tions in education are more important today than ever before, does not mean by simply recognising this fact that a pluralistic society will inevitably emerge as a permanent fixture. Indeed, given the power of certain key groups in education, be they teachers, parents, or administrators, those whose values were defined, consolidated and nurtured in times previous to the general consensus about the necessity for an 'information flow model', it is a proposition. Certainty it is not.

That administrative hierarchies are apt to intensify the cybernetic function in times of stress (witness the role of the Central Office of Information and the wartime surveys on the state of public opinion in Britain) can, of course, add to the belief that plural societies are a more just form of social organisation. Or that they embody a more equitable form of human relationships with local authority and central government. The egalitarian argument in favour of educational advance these 15 years past has generally been couched in such terms. But that does not mean to say that precisely the same 'feedback' mechanism cannot be used to make a hierarchy more efficient once the stress of transition is past.

The work of King and his associates at the Comparative Education Research Unit in London University goes far beyond the boundaries of education. Both as regards its methodology and the wealth of findings, it will remain a key work for many years to come.

Guy Neave
Institute of Education
European Cultural Foundation
Paris

Jack E. Rossmann, Helen S. Astin, Alexander W. Astin and Elaine H. El-Khawas (1975). *Open Admissions at City University of New York: An Analysis of the First Year*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 265 pp.

This book reports the findings of a large-scale survey of the operation of "open admissions" at the City University of New York (CUNY) during the first year of its implementation in 1970. The study was contracted by the Board of Higher Education (BHE) in 1969, after its decision to start an extensive open-enrollment program in the following year, and was designed to provide a reliable basis for a thorough evaluation of its policy. Rossmann and his collaborators also hoped that their institutional analysis would serve a "cooling-out" function so that the level of controversy surrounding "open admissions" would be lowered.

The primary focus of the book is on college outcomes and their various predictors. In addition, it contains descriptions of the institutional and curricular responses to the new admissions policy by the individual college campuses (e.g. remediation programs, counseling services, grading policies, etc.). While the authors provide a wealth of information on the CUNY-system culled from available statistical sources, cognitive tests and interviews, the study, if viewed first of all simply as a piece of survey research, suffers from an almost total lack of theoretical conceptualization. The overwhelmingly descriptive concern of the authors produced an overwhelming mass of descriptive material awaiting structure, interpretation and focus. The researchers' extensive hunt for predictors of college success by means of a multiple regression analysis is equally

non-focused and theoretically blind so that the reader is not informed why these and not other variables were selected, what made them dependent rather than independent and vice versa, and what they were supposed to measure. Furthermore, the form of interconnectedness of the various variables as well as their explanatory power are not theoretically postulated but rather *post festum* derived from the statistical results. The statistical procedures in turn are not discussed in terms of their theoretical adequacy, while the causal model implied is more often than not interpreted in terms of a temporal sequence. Empiricist procedure par excellence!

The “random” nature of the variables made statistical results at times even puzzling for the authors: “Students were more likely to fail courses at those four-year colleges that had open green space on the campus or that allocated relatively large sums for day-session salaries” (p. 74)! There are many more examples of such “surprising” predictors of college success, for which the authors usually provide some sort of ad-hoc interpretations. The precision of the statistical results does not compensate for the lack of theoretical reflection, it highlights it.

One could certainly raise other critical points with regard to the methodology of this study (e. g. sampling procedures, questions of validity and reliability), but there is another more interesting aspect of this research which will become apparent if the book is viewed in the context of CUNY’s “open-admissions” system itself.

“Open admissions” is not new. Many mid-Western universities have been run on this principle. Yet, when the BHE announced that CUNY would move from restricted to “open” admissions, the then ongoing heated controversy over the direction of higher education and the questions of educational opportunity and academic merit received new fuel, and there were quite a few who regarded the Board members’ decision as a revolutionary act. Of course it was nothing of the kind: “Open admissions” at CUNY was, first of all, the political response by the central administration to the perceived threats of a “quota democracy” demanded by black and Puerto Rican student protestors at the City College of New York (CCNY). “Open admissions” at CUNY had also been a long-projected goal for 1975, calling for a stratified system of “open” community colleges and semi-elitist four-year institutions with transfer possibilities for the academically talented and successful. To be sure, this long-range plan for an “open admissions” policy did not so much spring from humanistic impulses or a grand educational vision; it was rather the result of both, the continuing tradition of CUNY’s chartered mission to expand educational facilities in order to accommodate all of the city’s deserving poor, and its adaptation to New York’s changing manpower needs which in the sixties demanded more white collar workers with some postsecondary education. Since the early sixties, when “open admissions” had first been programmatically conceived of, the BHE and CUNY had made little use of their lead-time for study purposes and self-initiated planning efforts. When confronted with a fundamental critique and all-out rejection of the meritocratic selection criteria and ideological bias of many of the existing curricula by black and other minority students at CCNY, college, university and BHE acted surprised and in the end fell back on the old “open admissions” plan, moving it up by five years.

The newly established enrollment procedures together with CUNY’s no-tuition policy, the racial and ethnic heterogeneity of its students and the differing institutional and curricular responses to “open admissions” by its individual campuses were certain to attract the attention of everybody concerned over the future of public urban multi-

versities and provided a quasi experimental set-up for social scientists interested in the results and economic returns of higher education and their underlying causes.

At the same time, “open admissions”, as the very term suggests, contains a claim and promise which well transcend the partial democratization of college access obtained at CUNY. In fact, given its current institutional form, the BHE has accepted a risk inherent in all partially democratic structures: that the participating individuals will eventually learn to demand – and get – full democracy and equity. To the extent that “open admissions” projects this possibility, it has begun to subvert the meritocratic principles of the dominant educational philosophy and policy. Viewed from this perspective, the system of “open admissions” challenges and invites social scientists not only to study college outcomes under changed conditions but also to explore new conceptions of academic success and alternative directions and uses of higher education.

Rossmann and his collaborators have answered this challenge in an unbalanced and confused way. While devoting $6\frac{1}{2}$ pages to a critical reflection on the ideological function and bias of meritocratic selection procedures, standardized tests and the conventional notion of academic standards, they reserved more than 200 pages for an analysis of the success of the first year of “open admissions” at CUNY focussing primarily on academic achievement and college performance as conventionally defined (e.g. in terms of grade-point-averages, reading test scores, etc.). In their first chapter, the authors argue convincingly that “open admissions” emphasizes the value added to the intellectual and educational growth of students by college experience, whatever their previous baseline, rather than the sorting-out of the already most talented. Why then didn’t they make this criterion the focus of their subsequent empirical study? The answer seems to lie in the entirely descriptive purpose of the whole book, which makes even the first few pages more a kind of fact-finding survey of the (critical) issues raised by “open admissions” rather than a critique of the dominant educational principles.

However, despite and against their purely descriptive intentions, the authors in their opening chapter have ventured ideas which cast doubts on the prevalent paradigms of educational research. And the empirical findings of their immanent institutional analysis can also be seen as partly subverting the usual legitimation process which renders prior test scores and school success the all-important factors in regulating college access. For Rossmann and his colleagues found that open-enrollment and regular students progressed at about the same rate and that retention rates at CUNY were comparable to those of similar institutions, while academic standards had not been lowered. This “success” of “open admissions” (if one were to accept the empirical findings as valid) in terms of the conventional criteria can be read as an attack on the highly selective admissions procedures employed by many colleges. On the other hand, the study’s findings also give support to the continued validity of meritocratic principles, because the authors conclude: “High school grades and achievement test scores did not disappear as predictors of success among CUNY students. Indeed, both these variables continued to have important relationships to outcomes related to academic progress such as grades and credits earned” (p. 167). However, they hasten to add, students’ motivation must also be taken into account as an important predictor and it is only through “open admissions”, they point out, that this motivational potential can be utilized. All in all, the final results of this study present a peculiar mixture of evidence subverting and evidence supporting the traditional meritocratic admissions criteria, a mixture reflective of the BHE’s policy

decision in favor of a cautiously calculated democratization of college access, suspending meritocratic principles for some programs while continuing them for others.

Marlis Krueger
University of Bremen

Alexander W. Astin (1975). *Preventing Students from Dropping Out*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. xvii + 204 pp.

Astin's work is commendable in an area, student dropouts, where the volume of research is enormous but concrete recommendations few. Astin presents the results of a long-term, U.S.-wide study of students entering universities and colleges in 1968, and followed up in 1972. This book draws together much of Astin's previously published work in the area.

The audience to whom Astin directs his book is clearly stated — institutional planners and policy-makers at state and national level, and students and guidance counsellors.

Astin defines his population in terms of dropouts, stopouts, and persisters, and analyses the reasons given for dropping out. The book then describes the prediction of which students will drop out (with worksheets appended for the use of individual students interested in computing their own chances, or for administrative and planning use). The impact of specific campus or student characteristics on the likelihood of dropping out is then examined in meticulous and merciless detail. Included are effects of various forms of financial aid, employment, residence, academic achievement, participation in extracurricular activities, and type of institution. Astin concludes by summarising the implications of his findings for each category of his intended audience, in a succinct and extremely useful chapter.

Some of Astin's definitions and descriptions of procedures tend to be confusing, and the less diligent reader must take what he has done at face value or surrender to the morass of technical detail. Astin criticises published research on dropouts because of lack of longitudinal data and use of only one or a limited number of institutions. This book, however, makes clear the necessity of global, longitudinal research such as his being supplemented by in-depth studies of student motivations and individual differences among students from superficially similar backgrounds. Some aspects of the book will have no relevance to educational institutions outside of the U.S.A.. For example, some schemes providing financial aid for students are unique to the U.S.A., although others (parental support, scholarships and grants) are universal. Some of the terms used by Astin (e.g. work-study programs, honors programs, and two-year colleges) require a fair degree of knowledge of the U.S. educational system on the part of the reader.

The book is well indexed, although by no means providing a bibliography of recent research in the area. Virtually all of the references are American.

One very important interest group has not been catered for at all by this book — those who are concerned with the other side of the dropout interface, the teachers. There is little information about the types of courses from which students are most or least likely to dropout, and nothing on such issues as teaching methods, size of class, and student interest. The audience to which the book is directed, and anyone doing research

in the field, will find it extremely useful, down-to-earth, and comprehensive. If only some of the recommendations would be acted upon by them.

Susan Hayes
University of Sydney

J. Dronkers (1976). *Studenten en hun onderwijs. Een onderzoek naar de wisselwerking tussen universitair onderwijs en studenten* (Students and their education. An investigation into the interdependence of university education and students; with English summary). Groningen: H.D. Tjeenk Willink. ix + 170 pp., (paper). f 22.50. ISBN 90 01 30118 5.

The author of this book is a sociologist, until recently working in the field of educational research and development at the Free University of Amsterdam. The book enabled the author to obtain his Ph. D. degree at that university. Since then he has moved to the SISWO Foundation, an independent sociological research organization, to head their group on university education.

Referring to the well-known Dubin and Taveggia study, the author states that the question of what constitutes good university education has in the past been approached in the wrong way. This is, he says, mainly due to the fact that most of the studies concerning this question were done by psychologists and similar people. What we need is an entirely new approach, one which a sociologist is in an eminent position to provide. What then is this new approach? The notion that educational outcome is not only dependent on student characteristics, but also on the characteristics of the educational environment, the author says, apparently completely ignorant of Kurt Lewin's adagium, stated more than 30 years ago, that behavior is a function of personality and environment. In his actual study in measurement characteristics of the environment the author almost exclusively relies on students' perceptions of it. The whole study then boils down to one in which students' reactions to questionnaires are related to their examination performance.

Two groups of students, in the faculty of social sciences (sociology, anthropology and political science) and in the school of dentistry, were questioned at different times during their first year at university. The samples in the study were small: no more than 128 social science students and no more than 58 dentistry students were involved in the study. They were presented with a Dutch translation of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values; with what the author obscurely calls a test for 'cultural patterns', i.e. they were asked what their reasons for coming to the university were, what the faculty should offer them and what they expected would be offered by the faculty; and with a questionnaire for assessing their perception of this study environment. Moreover they were asked which friends they had among their fellow students, and a number of miscellaneous questions. All these data were correlated with performance.

The only persistent result seems to be that students with more friends among their peers do better. The relation is not very strong—in the order of .2 or .3 — but significant, and holds for social science as well as dentistry students. Of course, here and there a few more statistically significant correlations show up, but it is difficult to detect a pattern and they are all invariably very weak.

The methodology of the study is weak. Regularly the author alludes to differences

between averages without reporting tests of statistical significances (pp. 73 ff.). Discussing the reliability of the questionnaire for perception of the study environment and its subscales the author refers to the reliabilities reported by Geensen. Geensen's questionnaire, however, contained 135 items measuring 10 subscales. The author abridged the instrument to 26 items measuring 9 subscales. Surely this must have had an effect on its reliability (see pp. 44 ff.). At another point the author states that the fact that there is a difference between the mean scores of two groups of students on a particular instrument is an indication of its reliability (p. 43). Such a finding might constitute part of an argument for its validity; in an argument about reliability it seems out of place. These are only a few examples.

The study reported in this book is, in my opinion, a bad example of its kind. The kind is very familiar, and, at this point in time, no longer very promising. That is a rather sad conclusion, considering the amount of time the author must have spent on it. What makes the book highly irritating is the childish controversy the author creates between sociologists on the one side and other social scientists on the other side, and the petty pretensions he wishes to associate with this distinction: we sociologists can do a much better job than those others. That in itself may be true, but the author certainly went a long way to prove the opposite.

Hans F. Crombag
University of Leyden

P.J. Hills (1976). *The Self-Teaching Process in Higher Education*. London: Croom Helm. 144 pp. £ 5.50.

A superb quotation from Bertrand Russell, about the use by psychologists of laboratory animals, shines on page 37 of this book: "animals studied by Americans rush about frantically with an incredible display of hustle and pep, and at last achieve the desired result by chance. Animals observed by Germans sit still and think, and at last evolve the situation out of their inner consciousness". Is it not so that teacher enthusiasm for a new method or new audio-visual gadgets is equally communicative to their students? No significant differences are found between an innovatory method and the lecture method; yet "self-teaching" procedures are gaining ground. This well-documented, clearly written book, with scattered misprints is much too expensive for a typeset text of this length. It may serve as a practical introduction to the field.

Self-teaching displays the usual attributes of a stereotype: the arbitrary coupling of dissonant terms; the hammering-in by the various media; an underlying dualistic philosophy: student-teacher, success-failure, reward-punishment, lecture-tutorials; the grasp for totality, expressed here in the systems approach, where all relevant known factors should be identified prior to defining one's objectives.

The new emphasis on the "self", and on self-directing individuals (chapter 11) is an imported product. This American ethos has roots in history, that of immigration into vast new lands, with the ever-recurring temptation towards isolationism; another factor is the Puritan mentality which recently, has crossed with the psychoanalytic movement: a recent popular bestseller in this vein is entitled *How to Be Your Own Best Friend* (New York: Random House, 1971).

Self-reliance becomes a marketable commodity when massification has set in, and

when insecure individuals are seeking help. To state in other terms this paradox, a self-teaching system (in terms of the student) is teacher-designed. Often, self-teaching devices are merely cost analysis – i.e. savings – in disguise. Their modular construction and the attendant fragmentation of scholarship, of the acquisition of knowledge, point to a central processing unit, acting as the seat of control.

In his book, Dr. Hills unhesitatingly refuses to identify the teacher with this authoritarian function. He keeps referring to the administrator. His own extensive recourse to quotations, which makes the book under review appear more as a source book or commented bibliography than as an original essay, his explicit references to the library (p. 122) as the model for the resources center, are congruent with the description of a teacher as some kind of a library outpost into the wilderness.

This reviewer takes issue with such an impoverished philosophy of teaching and learning. Need the principles be modelled on machines, simply because our institutions are cost-restricted to the cheapest technologies? Among other missing dimensions is that of the future. Self-teaching is an effective tool *because* it is a utopia. The focussing on the resplendent individual; the notion that no two minds function in an identical manner, that there exist many different ways of arriving at an answer or at formulating a question; the detailed analysis of how one relates, not only with the subject material, but also with others in a group; all of these are part and parcel of self-teaching, as many of us have practised it, and will continue to practise it. In other words, self-teaching is not a recipe or a technique, it is an action-directed attitude.

Pierre Laszlo
Université de Liège

Earl F. Cheit (1975). *The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition*. Last in a Series of Fifteen Profiles by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill. xxx + 166 pp. \$10.00.

Earl Cheit has written a book that will generate considerable, heated debate, for he observes not only that it is professional education rather than liberal education that now serves primarily as the paradigm of higher education but that, in addition, it is probably just as well. In the first of these conclusions Cheit appears clearly to be correct, and one wonders how this observation could have escaped attention. With the second conclusion, however, one suspects that many will take exception and therefore find fault with many of the elements of his argument.

The stage for the debate is set with two introductory chapters in which the author begins by presenting the historical higher education conflict between the “useful arts” and the liberal arts, drawing here upon the works of Aristotle, Cardinal Newman, Dewey, and Veblen, and contemporary writers such as Van Doren and McGrath. He continues with a discussion of the “new vocationalism” being experienced on campuses world-wide, and with a general, historical discussion of the progressive development and status of professional education on higher education campuses. In so doing he notes the stages of “early resistance,” “separate but unequal,” and the present day “new enlightened status.”

In Chapters 3 to 6 Cheit presents as the object of his focus, in turn, the historical development of professional education for agriculture, engineering, business administration, and forestry. These chapters alone justify the considerable effort of the author and

of the Carnegie Commission, for here are vividly presented concise, though complete histories of these four professions which seldom have received scholarly scrutiny. Members of these professions will be keenly interested in their own particular story, and students of comparative professional education will find interesting and useful treatises.

In the final chapter Cheit argues the major premise of his book: “that the experience of the new professional schools is relevant to the resolution of this (the curriculum paradigm) issue beyond the obvious fact of the enrollment pressure they are exerting.” In preparation for arguing his case, Cheit acknowledges the diversity of these four professions, the limitation of his institutional “sample,” and therefore the difficulty in generalization. In this the reader is well advised, because the evidence cited in support of the major premise is necessarily incomplete and occasionally the messages from these professions are inconsistent. In the end, one is left with the feeling that Cheit may indeed be correct in his major premise, but that values have played an important role in constructing the case—albeit necessarily so.

For example, some will take issue with the assumptions underlying a cited study implicitly praising interdisciplinarity in, and the introduction of behavior sciences into, professional curricula. This is an example of precisely the argument that has characterized professional education throughout history: of specialization versus a broader professional curriculum. Is there time and space for both in the curriculum? And, if so, how much of each should there be?

A second issue regards the proper role of market forces in shaping curricular designs. Cheit contends logically that regardless of one’s preferences, in fact, student vocational demands are forcing many institutions to modify or even abandon traditional liberal arts offerings. The author appears to endorse this trend or at least is not particularly uncomfortable with it. Values will vary on this point too. Some will agree with the “market strategy” of curriculum design while others will assert that only institutional goals can serve as the proper base.

A third issue involves the optimal timing of individuals’ career selections. Cheit acknowledges the validity of the view that such decisions are best deferred until late in the student’s educational experience, but he asserts that a modern professional curriculum model can assist in this decision making, in part through breadth and non-specificity in professional training. What is optimal on these two dimensions of breadth and non-specificity is, in turn, the point on which disagreement will be noted. Is any narrowing of career selection to be avoided until as late as possible in the student’s educational career? Cheit’s proposal would seem to require greater professional focus than does a classical liberal education.

It is at this juncture that the reader needs additional assistance. Precisely how does the “modern professional curriculum model, “as conceived by the author, differ from the liberal arts model? Clearly, Cheit is *not* arguing for a curriculum that is devoid of the elements of a traditional liberal arts education. On the contrary. What he appears to call for is a synthesized professional-liberal curriculum. However, further detail would be helpful in defining and differentiating between the two. For example, it is not entirely clear how the author reconciles his finding that some professional schools are becoming more like the traditional disciplines with his recommendation that in many cases the professional model rather than the traditional model should be followed. (The author cites the disappearance of the difference between engineering and applied sciences and

even theoretical sciences in many engineering schools and the heavy mathematics orientation in many business schools.) If the professional schools are mimicking the traditional disciplines, how do the two models differ? Cheit provides the reader with the “feel” for the essential difference, but additional assistance would be helpful.

This modest suggestion should not detract from the excellence of this book and its revelations, nor especially from the thought-provoking nature of its recommendations. Cheit has made an important contribution to the field and has done so in a scholarly manner. Those interested in the curricula of higher education will find the reading of this book an enlightening experience.

Larry L. Leslie
University of Arizona

The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1976). *Progress and Problems in Medical and Dental Education: Federal Support Versus Federal Control*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 178 pp.

Once more medical and dental school educators have received a series of warnings and recommendations from an august body – the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies and Higher Education. Being in the tradition of the Flexner Report of 1910 and the 1970 report *Higher Education and the Nation's Health*, the report must be taken seriously as a headlight to the future.

The first warning is that “we are in a serious danger of developing too many new medical schools, and decisive steps need to be taken by both federal and state governments to stop this trend” (p.3). Such a warning may appear ludicrous to those living in urban ghettos and rural areas where health care delivery continues to be inadequate. If this is true, the problem then becomes simply one of maldistribution of the existing physicians and a problem of overspecialization rather than entry into primary care.

To see the problem in such a simple way leads to a second warning of the council – “there is a critical danger that concern over geographical maldistribution of health manpower and overspecialization in medicine will lead to excessive and unwieldy federal controls rather than to policies emphasizing incentives to effect the required changes” (p.6). Federal controls in higher education would go against the coherent scheme that Carnegie commissions have historically envisioned for American higher education. In the Carnegie view there ought to be evolutionary change not revolutionary change emanating from government. Change in medical education would take numerous forms – federal grants to train more primary care physicians rather than specialists; the development of area health education centers in which students would be trained to educate patients to be more active in their own treatment; there would be training of new allied health practitioners such as nurse practitioners, physician assistants and dental auxiliaries; and the increase in each medical school of National Health Service Corps Scholarships with a commitment to serve in underserved areas. In essence the Carnegie Commission wants medical and dental schools to accept a greater sense of social conscience without compulsion. No doubt, as such a conscience develops, the capitation payments will increase in their flow to medical schools and dental schools. In an earlier era the Carnegie Commission would have lead the forces of change with its own funds but today such a

role can only be undertaken by a federal government in co-operation with state governments.

The third warning has international implications that may be welcomed throughout the world. With stridency and forcefulness the Commission declares that “the time has come to cease relying on foreign medical graduates to meet the need for physicians in the United States. The number of U.S. medical graduates is now increasing so rapidly that we can expect ample future increases in supply from existing medical schools” (p.8).

Upon reading the report one cannot blame the United States medical educator if he is perplexed. In 1970, in a report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education entitled *Higher Education and the Nation's Health: Policies in Medical and Dental Education*, he was admonished with these words . . . “the Commission recommends that all universities with health sciences centres develop plans for accelerating premedical and medical education (p.49) . . . we particularly favor a program calling for three years (instead of four) after the B.A. to obtain the M.D. . . . a three year residency instead of the typical four years for internship and residency (p.49) . . . that existing two year medical schools that do not lead to M.D. candidate education within the same university system be converted to provide M.D. candidate education as soon as possible” (p.53). Consequently, while working to achieve goals declared six years ago, newer and more limited steps become advisable in the 1976 report under review. Can reasonable educational goals be achieved in alternating eras of expansion and contraction suggested by Carnegie Foundation?

An even more serious issue needs to be confronted. In this report the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies has enunciated all the right things – controlled growth, greater efficiency in training health manpower, patient education, social conscience, primary care programs, and better manpower distribution. However, one factor is missing – leadership. Today medical and dental education needs another Abraham Flexner, not just federal support or federal control, and such a leader would design the path for change through a Carnegie-inspired evolution or revolution.

Mel Freedman
McMaster University

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1976). *The States and Higher Education: A Proud Past and a Vital Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. xviii + 94. pp.

Labelled “A Commentary” in the Carnegie Council series, this slender, well-produced volume includes more than the Carnegie Foundation’s opinions about the role of the states in supporting higher education. The book also has 29 quantitative displays (figures), chiefly illustrating financial support, and good succinct expositions of the quantitative data. For six additional dollars, the Council offers a supplement containing more statistical detail, but the present volume should suffice for most of us who want to know how well our states, collectively and comparatively, support higher education.

Useful as is the quantitative presentation, readers are likely to find the commentary associated with that presentation even more interesting. For example, while suggesting that some states may now have developed excessive Ph.D. offerings, the Foundation is cautious about recommending large cutbacks, especially at institutions with long-established and high-quality doctoral programs (p. 44). On a broader and more

controversial subject, the volume reflects the Carnegie Foundation's persistent concern with governmental support for both private and public institutions. Explicitly, the Foundation advocates state as well as federal funding for the private sector at the same time that it recommends that the states continue to provide for their own universities and colleges. Urging a more generous state support for private institutions than many of us at public institutions would consider justified, the Foundation still wants that support to stop short of the point at which a private institution becomes *de facto* so much like a public institution that it will be subject to the governmental controls characteristic of state colleges and universities. A "peril point," the Foundation suggests, "is reached when an average of one-half as much state subsidy, on a per student basis, is given directly or indirectly to support of institutional costs to a private as to a comparable public college" (p. 10). Does this mean that private institutions should receive enough tax money to survive, even at a possibly expensive per-student level, but not so much as to persuade the elected representatives of the taxpayers to impose something like the per-student cost formulae used for public institutions? One may wonder how realistic such a proposal is in the American political system.

Leon D. Epstein

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Burton R. Clark and Ted I. K. Youn (1976). *Academic Power in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education. (ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 3). 53 pp. US \$3.

This excellent brief essay is part of a series of research monographs sponsored by the ERIC Clearing House for Higher Education each year. There are ten annual reports, each of which attempts to summarize a particular topic of relevance to American higher education. Recent topics have included higher education and the economy, the implications of Federal education policy, collective bargaining, student financial aid, and similar issues. The essays vary in quality from excellent to fairly inadequate, but most provide a useful overview and all include excellent bibliographies. Most of these monographs are written by established experts in the particular aspect of higher education under consideration. The cost for an annual subscription is \$25 for ten reports.

Sociologist Burton Clark and doctoral candidate Ted Youn have written an excellent essay focusing on the concept of academic power and the ways in which it is exercised. While focusing mainly on the United States, examples from European countries are included, and this makes the essay especially useful for those interested in comparative higher education. Power, according to the authors, is rooted in formal organizational structures, and they analyze the differing types of academic organization and the implications of these patterns for the authority of the professoriate and in general for the nature of the higher education enterprise. The historical roots of the American university—in the medieval university, in the German university, and in the British university—are traced and the meaning of these roots on current American academic organization is discussed. They then discuss how the American academic "semi-system" developed as a result of these and other influences, and finally posit a number of hypotheses concerning forms of authority and the ways that these forms affect higher education. The essay is in part speculative, and it provides considerable food for thought

concerning the intersection of academic forms, organizational structures, and the current nature of academic power. As the authors state at the beginning of their monograph, there is relevance in considering comparative and historical materials when analyzing particular national systems of higher education.

Philip G. Altbach
State University of New York at Buffalo

Pierre L. van den Berghe (1973). *Power and Privilege at an African University*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 278pp. £2.50.

During a year as a visiting professor at the University of Ibadan in Nigeria, Pierre van den Berghe turned his research talents inwards and studied the institution of which he was a member. The result is a fascinating anthropological case study of perhaps the most outstanding university in Africa. For van den Berghe, the most interesting question posed by Ibadan is how a social system which is so apparently anachronistic is able to retain its coherence and stability in the midst of social turmoil including a civil war. In attempting to explain this stability he concentrates his analysis upon the two social forces which might be expected to disrupt it most, i.e., ethnicity and social stratification. The three major social groups within the university community—academic staff, students and junior staff—are characterized as “estates” and the bulk of the book is a detailed and often entertaining description of the political characteristics of each and their relations with each other. His conclusion is that despite the rich and subtle diversity of the three groups, their hierarchical relationships and their frequent envy and even hostility, they are all bound together in a mutually reinforcing self-interest to preserve the institution which guarantees their different livelihoods and status.

The strength of the book lies in its analysis of the subtle interplay of universalistic and ascriptive criteria in the operation of the university. Thus the author shows that neither race nor ethnicity are in themselves the overwhelmingly powerful determinants of individual behaviour that the outside observer might expect. Rather they work within a broader web of factors which provides the constant background to decision-making in the institution:

This is not to say that universalistic rules are inoperative. At the very least one has to go through the motions of following them even when one fully intends to pervert their spirit. Second, one has to know the rules in order to be able to challenge one's opponents on legalistic grounds. Third, the formal rules define at least the minimum level of competence, typically a minimum schooling requirement, required for the job, and thereby impose limits on the play of particularism. But within these limits particularistic considerations are often paramount.

For anyone familiar with other African universities such conclusions along with descriptions of the origins and colonial legacy of Ibadan, the daily round of university politics, and the cleavages between British and American trained members of staff and so forth all combine to produce a sense of *déjà vu*. But there are important differences between Ibadan and elsewhere, and for those interested in drawing instructive comparisons from the study the Ibadan experience provides both warning and encouragement. The warning is the picture of the speed with which the vicious spiral of ethnic

suspicion can feed upon itself to create an atmosphere of pervasive mistrust which threatens the very essence of the university. The encouragement is contained in the conclusion that, despite the ethnic strains to which Ibadan was subject, its integrity as a home for independent thought survived. This survival is attributed to two particular factors. The first is the fact that the “internal control of university affairs remained solidly in the hands of academics as opposed to administrators”. The second is the absence among academic staff of a colonial mentality inducing either guilt-ridden neo-paternalism on the one hand or racial assertiveness stemming from insecurity on the other, both of which can be equally destructive of the atmosphere of intellectual integrity upon which in the last resort a university depends. Overarching these factors in determining the character of the university is the commitment of the academic staff to the institution:

To them (academic staff) the University is thus not simply a place of work, as it is primarily to the Junior staff. It is the basis of their ‘class’ position, the source of their institutionalized power, and in the most fundamental sense, their *raison d’être*. They largely regard the University as theirs in a quasi-proprietary sense.

The author views this concern for the institution as little more than enlightened self-interest. However, those familiar with universities where the administrators do subjugate the academics and where, perhaps in reaction, the loyalty of the faculty members is less to the institution than to economic interests outside it—where the university does become little more than a place of work—cannot dismiss such ‘union’ activities as entirely self-serving or without broader benefit. The failure to examine the question of what in addition to positions and status are being preserved by this concern and whether it is worth preserving is perhaps the greatest deficiency of the book. It is a deficiency because the author has an intrusive opinion on this question. In order to make his own biases explicit van den Berghe summarizes his view of what a university ought to be in his introduction. Increasingly as one reads the ensuing pages one senses that Ibadan does not measure up to his conception and that the social structure which he documents so admirably supports or at least contains a type of education which he regards as reprehensible. The full force of his contempt for this colonial and conservative education breaks out in the final paragraph of the book:

UI as a late colonial creation fulfilled its intended role in producing the successor elite to the British colonial bureaucracy. Steeped in the Western tradition, the neo-colonial mandarin is, not surprisingly a creditable intellectual replica of its mentors. In the political and economic context of Nigeria, however, the University became an island of privilege and a hotbed of ethnic and other political conflicts wrapped in the deceptively serene-looking shell of a palm-shaded Oxbridge.

The tone of this concluding indictment of education at Ibadan strikes with the force of shock because it is rarely the direct subject of the preceding pages. The purpose of the institution—training a neo-colonial mandarin—is taken for granted and is not treated as relevant to an explanation of the functioning of the Ibadan social system. The antiquated character of the education provided—the prominence of classics and religious studies and so forth—are attributed no doubt correctly to the Oxbridge legacy, but this

pattern is treated as an inevitable by-product of an undefined process of neo-colonial determinism which is sustained by the pattern of social relations worked out between the three “estates” inside the university but with very little influence on it. Yet this is surely a rather simplified view of the relationship between education and society. Other universities—e.g., the University of Dar es Salaam—starting from a similar heritage have managed to organize a different type of education and patterns of social relationships.

More important, the type of education which prevails and the social structure which sustains it cannot be explained solely by reference to factors internal to the university. They survive and evolve in the form they do at least partly because they are functional to the wider society. The continuance of a ‘classical’ pattern at Ibadan is particularly interesting in face of the fact that the Nigerian military regime would not at first glance seem to be the most natural and hospitable supporter of the Oxbridge tradition. There is a chapter on the university and society which outlines some of the points of contact between the university and outside world, but there is very limited analysis of the effects of the interaction, and this probably reflects the author’s circumscribed and university-centred view of Nigeria. Thus the concentration on the internal dynamics of social interaction within the university in the end limits the broader explanatory value of the study. This is ironic in view of the explicit warning in the text against falling prey to facile single factor explanations of complex phenomena, and the provision of a vivid demonstration of this thesis in the section referred to earlier which analyses the complex ways in which ethnic considerations interrelate with others in determining social behaviour.

The danger of participant observation as a mode of study is that it tends to cast the researcher in the role of *voyeur* and such is the tone of much of this book. This is partly because of the uses of fictional names for the university and its members and the ready resort to illustrative anecdotes of university politics. The labyrinthine nature of university politics lends itself more easily to treatment by the novel than by the more systemic pretensions of social science, and certainly this study evokes the Cambridge of C.P. Snow or V.C. Ike’s *Toads for Supper* as much as Newcombe’s classic study of Bennington College. In sum, as a description of the politics and social structure of an interesting university this book is stimulating and instructive. As an analysis of the relationship between the university and the national politics and nascent stratification of the larger society—which it also claims to be—it is illuminating but incomplete. At a time when universities in Africa are increasingly being castigated for their residual colonial character and “irrelevance” it becomes more than ever important to identify the pattern of factors which sustain the type of institution which is decried. The University of Ibadan, like any other, is more than the product of the self-protective lobbying of its constituent communities.

David Court
University of Nairobi

William John Hanna (ed.), (1975). *University Students and African Politics*. New York and London: Africana Publishing Co. 296 pp.

This book was conceived at a time when Western campuses were beset by student unrest, sometimes resulting in general campus upheaval. At first glance there seemed to be

comparable unrest almost all over the world. Certainly Japan experienced more than its fair share of campus warfare. France in 1968 hovered over the brink of revolution partly ignited by student rebellion. The Olympic Games in Mexico in 1968 took place in the shadow of a massacre of students. But even more immediate from the point of view of the authors and editor of this book were the campus difficulties which seemed to traverse the North American continent from Berkeley to Columbia, from Sir Simon Fraser to Atlanta universities. American scholars were turning their eyes towards African campuses partly because American campuses were ablaze. That after all is what the sociology of knowledge is all about.

To some extent the book suffers from some of the preconceptions of the authors with regard to student behaviour. What most of the authors chose to scrutinize was partly influenced by expectations drawn from student behaviour in North America at the time. One sometimes detects a sense of disappointment that students in, say, Uganda or Ghana have not modelled themselves sufficiently on the assertive, individualistic and sometimes rebellious patterns set by students in the Western World.

But even after making allowances for these ethnocentric biases of the authors, and for the fact that many of the essays have been overtaken by events as a result of delays in publication, this collection of essays is an important addition to the general literature concerning youth in politics in the Third World as a whole. Virtually half the book is written by William John Hanna either on his own or with co-authors. His wife, Judith Hanna, participates as co-author in three of the chapters. And Vivian Zeitz Sauer is involved as co-author in Chapter 4. The first four chapters are general and macro-comparative, analysing sub-themes drawn from experience at different African universities and sometimes comparing experience in Africa with experience elsewhere.

Aristide Zolberg concerns himself with conflict between political generations, partly in relation to biological generations. His case study is the Ivory Coast.

J. Leo Cefkin examines university students in Rhodesia. Here again the problem of anachronism is at its most painful, since the national situation has been changing so rapidly, and student behaviour has been to some extent responsive to those changes. Cefkin is fortunate that his study is not about school children in South Africa, for then the changes after Soweto would have emerged as even more striking.

Kenneth Prewitt looks at university students in Uganda where he taught for a while. When he was in Uganda he was to some extent concerned about the intellectual paradox of high intelligence among the students but low intellectual engagement. What he meant by this was that the competitive nature of requirements for university admission in a country with only one university, and the entire elitist structure of education as inherited from the British, produced on the one hand, a selection system which resulted in high concentration of intelligent young people on a campus like Makerere, but on the other hand produced also the kind of mental orientation and careerism which reduced the excitement of intellectual pursuits for their own sake. It is this paradox of high intelligence and low intellectual engagement which Prewitt discussed when he was at Makerere and thereby provoked considerable debate and controversy on the issues involved.

In his chapter in this book he is concerned with another paradox – that of students being highly involved in politics but minimally inclined towards political protest. Influenced by some of the earlier work by William and Judith Hanna, Prewitt points out

that Makerere students could be deeply involved “in” politics but not “against” political authority. Citing the formulation by the Hannas, Prewitt observes that the Makerereans (in comparison to Nigerian students) “display more partisan behaviour, are more involved in territorial and local institutions, but demonstrate and protest less.”

From these observations Prewitt then goes on to examine how student behaviour can be analysed as part of a more general enquiry, examining not only the institutional setting of the university (as does Seymour Martin Lipset) but also in relation to the broader social forces which condition recruitment into educational institutions and shape the opportunities which await university graduates.

Both Prewitt’s essay and the comparative essays by Joel D. Barkan have also been adversely affected by events in Uganda since the military took over power in 1971. Periodically the Makerere students under Amin have shown greater courage and far less quiescence than Prewitt and Barkan might once have anticipated on the basis of evidence of student behaviour under civilian rule. At considerable risk to themselves, and sometimes paying heavily at the hands of the soldiers in Uganda, Makerere students have periodically risen to demonstrate against either governmental lapses or governmental excesses. What is not clear is whether the military invasion of the Makerere campus in the first week of August 1976 has more decisively damaged the students’ will to protest. While the invasion was far less brutal than the international press portrayed it to be (I am now satisfied that no *massacre* of students took place on campus), the soldiers that invaded the campus nevertheless inflicted severe injuries, wounds, and brutal humiliations on large numbers of students. They also terrified many of them by dragging them away on military vehicles towards prisons from which many others before had never emerged alive. But in fact the students were returned to campus relatively intact, but with bruises from ruthless intimidation. It is to be hoped that these experiences, however frightening at the time, have not yet destroyed the spirit of protest and dissent among students in Uganda. (A detailed account of student demonstrations in Uganda is given in a paper by Bryan Langlands, the former professor of Geography at Makerere who was deported from Uganda in 1976. His paper on students and politics in Uganda, which I have seen in draft form, is scheduled for publication in *African Affairs* in the course of 1977).

Roberta E. McKown addresses herself in this book to the experiences of university students in Kenya. For at least ten years now the administration of the University of Nairobi has experienced periodic confrontations with students, either in relation to university issues or in connection with wider national questions. Professor McKown even in her postscript takes the story only up to 1969 when there was a confrontation between university students and the government over the question of whether the leader of the opposition party, Oginga Odinga, should be allowed to speak on campus. Of course since then there have been a number of other confrontations. The last major strain was in 1976 in connection with the commemoration of the death of J.M. Kariuki, who was murdered the previous year seemingly in circumstances which implicated some members of the government and some members of the law enforcement agencies. At the very minimum there was evidence that the government of Kenya might have been guilty of trying to cover up some of the facts surrounding Kariuki’s murder. Both the Kenyan parliament and the students of the University of Nairobi were active in protesting the murder of this popular political dissenter, and both groups were highly critical of the government’s handling of the entire affair. McKown refers to the relative openness of the Kenyan

political system, and how this relates to students' political behaviour. That openness was perhaps at its greatest in 1975 following the eruption of demonstrations and criticisms against the murder of Kariuki.

In spite of these defects arising from delayed publication, these essays are still valuable as glimpses of the dynamics of student behaviour on Third World campuses and within Third World polities. The issues range from the role of universities in class formation to problems of racial tensions in Southern Africa as manifested in student behaviour.

Perhaps the most important omission from this collection is an essay on students in Ethiopia. Even in the late 1960's it was already clear that Ethiopian students were becoming the most radicalized in the whole continent. It is not clear how important a factor the students were in the collapse of the Imperial System of Haile Selassie, but the students were certainly a significant variable behind the erosion of the legitimacy of the old monarchy. The students seem also to have been very relevant as a causal factor behind the radicalization of the military regime which succeeded the Emperor. For a while the soldiers seemed to lack a sense of ideological direction. The students helped to push that junta more firmly leftward. This book, appearing as it does, after the end of the imperial system in Ethiopia and against the background of the role of students in that revolution, suffers from its omission of Ethiopian students in its list of case studies. It is just hard luck for the collection. One cannot expect an editor to anticipate every move that history makes to redefine what is politically significant from year to year.

Ali A. Mazrui
University of Michigan

David L. Westby (1976). *The Clouded Vision: The Student Movement in the United States in the 1960s*. Lewisburg, Pennsylvania: Bucknell University Press. 291 pp. \$12.00.

This volume is another analysis of the wave of student activism in America in the 1960s. It is essentially a synthesis of a wide variety of sociological studies of students and an effort to provide a new theoretical framework from which to view student activism. Chapters deal with such matters as the social class origins of student activists, the role of the university in student activism, the interface between the society and the student movement. The book does not deal much with the student organizations of the period nor with the various struggles in which these organizations and movements engaged. Perhaps the most interesting section of the volume is the critique of the various theories of student activism (such as generational conflict) and Westby's effort to create a more suitable framework for analysis. Unfortunately, this theoretical formulation, which Westby calls core-periphery analysis, does not provide a wholly convincing argument. The book is a useful summary of available studies, but does not go much beyond other available books.

Alexander W. Astin, Helen S. Astin, Alan E. Bayer and Ann S. Bisconti (1975). *The Power of Protest*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 208 pp.

In 1968–69, when the American Council on Education was concerned with increasing receptivity in hundreds of mercurial colleges and universities to the collection

of data for the national study of student unrest reported in this book, they came under fairly heavy fire from the normally suspicious left. Like so much that passed for intellectual commentary at the time, most of the questions raised were foolish and most of the explanations as to the motivation and intent of the researchers were bizarre. There was clearly no need to worry. As Paul Lauter, one of the left's most passionate critics, accurately noted in his angry broadside in *The New York Review of Books* "the best defense against such studies is the simple-mindedness of the researchers." On this point, Lauter was right.

The purpose of the study was to learn how the spate of student unrest of the 1960's affected campus life. That there had been significant changes was an unquestioned assumption: 'It is obvious that this phenomenon is importantly affecting university structure and function.' Given this starting point, it is not surprising that it could be concluded that "to summarize, the analyses indicated that protests tended to 'work.'" And given this circularity, one might wonder why Astin and his colleagues had to spend so much time and money gathering questionnaires from almost 200,000 students on 246 campuses, interviewing 35 students, faculty, and administrators (supplemented by documents and other materials) from each of 22 institutions that had experienced some unrest during the 1968–69 academic year, and completing a content analysis of reports on unrest in college newspapers from over 200 campuses; evidently, they could not help but find what they were taking for granted. Yet their results are far from convincing.

In the first place, one-quarter of the book is given over to an in-depth analysis of "three sample protests." Since these narratives end when order is returned to the campuses, we have no idea what long range changes, if any, the students effected.

More importantly, however, there is no indication that anything of substance in institutions of higher learning – activities related to enriching the human spirit through the pursuit of ideas – was touched deeply by the events of the 1960's. "Curricular revisions," the introduction of "ethnic studies," "formation of new committees," "greater student representation on existing committees," "special admission policies," "liberalization of parietal rules," "reforms in the judicial process," "alterations in the grading system," and "hiring more black faculty" are not terribly profound changes, nor do they have very much to do with the cultivation of the mind. We can only talk about significant change if we find that students spend more or less time reading, that they read a greater or lesser amount of materials that are enlightening, that they read with more or less comprehension, that the typical baccalaureate knows more or less about the scientific approach or about developments in biology than his counterpart of 10 or 15 years ago. It seems that what was most affected were political issues, e.g., the distribution of power, and these, alas, have not been shown to have much to do with educational issues. All of this reflects an erroneous belief that some of the means that could alter the direction of institutions of higher learning are ends in themselves. Moreover, there is little evidence that the decision-making process in colleges and universities is any more open, democratic, or rational in 1976 than it was one or two decades ago.

The difficulty, of course, is that by focusing on problems that from a scientific point of view are uninteresting and trite, e.g., what sort of student is most likely to engage in protest activities and "the more immediate situational causes of... campus unrest", rather than on something important, e.g., delineating the systemic conditions that are the preconditions and precipitating factors in dissent, the findings of Astin and

his colleagues must be banal. Thus, we learn from a painstaking analysis which attempts to specify the distinct antecedents and consequences of three types of protests – racial, academic, and anti-war – that: “Apparently, one of the best ways of determining whether entering freshmen would take part in a protest during their first college year was simply to ask about the likelihood”; “black students were likely to participate in protests against racial discrimination and against administrative policy but not against the Vietnam War”; “living in a college dormitory during the freshman year...[and] associating primarily with students in either the humanities or social sciences... appeared to contribute to the likelihood that students would protest”. That such findings are reiterated sometimes more than once does not make them any more meaningful.

Thus, when the authors find something the implications of which might be important, it goes right past them. For example, when they report in the same paragraph that “a substantial proportion of all institutions implemented significant changes in the two academic years under consideration” and that “few changes were made with respect to war-related issues, such as termination of ROTC [Reserve Officers Training Corps], discontinuation of war-related research, and abolishment of recruiting on campus,” the possibility that this might be a pretty good indication of where academic pharaonic leaders are willing to compromise and what they believe the true functions of institutions of higher learning to be is never raised or pursued. They instead would have us ponder their revelations that “students were less likely to fail to complete a homework assignment on time in college than they had been in high school, more likely to type their homework assignments, and more likely to study with other students.” They are even able to interpret this sort of finding: “students became much less likely to miss school because of illness, a change that could be attributable not only to a greater feeling of responsibility in college but also to the likelihood that the student was no longer living at home with parents who might be inclined to keep a child from going to school if he or she was ill. The finding that students were more inclined to smoke cigarettes and drink beer and less inclined to take vitamins may also reflect this new freedom from parental supervision.” And so it goes.

Quite simply, there is nothing much new here. There is a derivative, brief, and sketchy history of student activism in the 20th Century. We are again told, as if it has special meaning, that what are referred to as protest-prone students are exceptionally able social sciences and humanities majors who come from Jewish backgrounds but have no current religious preference. Nobody will be surprised that they were also found to be politically liberal, verbally aggressive, and confident about their intellectual abilities. The emphasis, then, is mostly on students whose activism is brought about by *stress* and *frustration*. Institutions (other than colleges and universities) and society in general hardly seem to matter.

In sum, this is not as the authors would have us believe a report on the relationship between campus unrest and changes in American higher education. It is instead a moderately liberal tract which celebrates the gradual putative transformation of educational institutions without violence and with a minimum of disruption, a theme both the left and right would surely reject, and a conclusion the middle can hardly accept as one sees too little of the data on which it is presumably based.

Lionel S. Lewis
State University of New York at Buffalo

William R. Keylor (1975). *Academy and Community: The Foundation of the French Historical Profession*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, x + 286 pp. \$14.95.

Georg G. Iggers (1975). *New Directions in European Historiography*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, ix + 229 pp. \$16.00.

In February 1975 René Haby, France's Minister of Education, announced in his *Propositions pour une modernization du système éducatif* major changes in France's primary and secondary education. The legislation enacted in July of that year to accomplish this modernization equals in importance that of François Guizot in 1833, and Jules Ferry from 1879 to 1886. Guizot's reforms were designed to give France a population sufficiently literate to make the July Monarchy work. Ferry's innovations were expected to give the Third Republic a primary and secondary education capable of sustaining the Republic's stalemated society. Building on the law of 1975, Haby issued in the spring of 1976 detailed curriculum changes. Philosophy, history, and geography have lost much ground and the teaching of the social sciences acquired pre-eminence in the education of France's children and adolescents. The Minister of Education has put in place the system that will determine, in his words, "the visage of France in the year 2000."

Haby's identification of the social sciences with modernization represents an official action that is part of a long drama in France's educational history. This drama developed its archetypal plot and form during the period from 1870 to 1914 when the disciplines of the social sciences and history established their professional claims to be "scientific." Terry Nichols Clark's *Prophets and Patrons: the French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences*, (Harvard UP, 1973) recounted the growth of the social sciences through an analysis of the problems innovators faced within the organizational complexities of higher education in France. A sociologist, Clark excelled in describing the points of contact and disconnection between the followers of Comte and Le Play and their professional successors who carried the banners celebrating the victories of Durkheim and his associates. He also cast a brief glance at the period after 1914 when the flags drooped and the line wavered in the absence of the great leader. Keylor's *Academy and Community* plows and cultivates the same terrain as did Clark in an effort to uncover the roots of modern historical practice and professionalization. The result is an insightful and very informative account of the historical profession's quest for its academic identity and appropriate prestige in the world of learning. The historians at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, like their colleagues and sometime rivals in sociology, earned their victories by successfully marking out, conquering, and defending their territory within the institutional and academic establishment.

Sociologists and historians manoeuvred and skirmished in the corridors of the Sorbonne and the antechambers of the Ministry of Public Instruction in order to guarantee their discipline's role in training the teachers of the secondary schools. The *lycées* provided jobs for their students and the brightest of their staffs the recruits for the advanced study of sociology and history. After 1914 historians and other social scientists ceased to be outsiders in the official world of learning and were able to give renewed attention to theoretical and methodological problems. It is the great merit of Georg Iggers' *New Directions* to judiciously and subtly analyze this legacy which he identifies in a brilliant first chapter "The Crisis of the Conventional Conception of

Scientific History.” The character and consequences of this crisis in the years since 1945 is traced through the participation of the historians of the *Annales* conviction, the problems preoccupying West German historians, and the input of Marxism and modern social history. (A colleague of Iggers, Norman Baker, adds to this discussion a section on British social history.)

These books offer the student of the history of thought and education conceptual and paradigmatic models of great significance. Clark’s particular achievement was the identification of the variables he judged to have determined the establishment of the social sciences in France. Keylor’s gift is that of an intellectual historian who is aware of the importance of the sociological dimensions in the study of thought and institutions, but who remains faithful to the traditional tasks of the historian of consciousness and society. He insists that the study of an elite sector of society does not necessarily involve an encounter with personalities of magisterial originality and scope. But he deftly explains how the historical community convinced France of the academic importance of history to the unity of the nation and hence to higher and secondary education. To this end historians and social scientists overcame their differences and formed a *union sacré* in face of their public and academic foes.

Georg Iggers is alert to the continuing institutional and professional issues that have shaped modern historical scholarship since 1945. He gives priority, however, to the intellectual problems central to contemporary historical belief and behaviour. Acting as neither judge, nor plaintiff, nor defendant, he scrupulously directs attention to the work that promises the perfection of the historian’s craft. Iggers welcomes the rigor and sophistication of modern historiography, but is unswervingly convinced of the presence of the unexpected and irrationality in all historical experience. Thus he cautions the champions of every historical tendency to beware of exaggerating their cognitive certitude. In France the Haby laws have in Draconian fashion arbitrated the quarrels between history, philosophy, and literature in favor of the social and economic sciences. The significance of this educational decision will be determined in the future. This visage of the year 2000 is to be approached and understood through these three indispensable books.

Edward T. Gargan
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Virginia P. White, (1975). *Grants: How to Find Out About Them and What To Do Next*. New York and London: Plenum Press, 354 pages. \$19.50.

Grants for basic and applied research in the United States are big business. Well over \$10 billion is expended by all sources each year for various grants, the largest amount coming, directly and indirectly from the federal government. Private foundations, those peculiarly American institutions, are also active, and many business firms also provide funds to researchers on matters related to their interests. Ms White has written a basic guide to grants. She describes the various kinds of grants, and then proceeds to provide some general guidelines for applying for them. There is a lengthy series of appendices giving addresses of various agencies in the grant-business. While this book only skims the surface of possible sources of funds, it does provide a good introduction to the field. Its direct applicability is limited to an American audience. Those with \$19.50 in their pockets and an insatiable desire for more money will rush out and buy this volume.

Philip G. Altbach
State University of New York at Buffalo