DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 359 HE 000 297

By-Clark, Burton R.

The Culture of the College. Its Implications for the Organization of Learning Resources.

California Univ., Berkeley.
Pub Date 20 Jun 65
Note-24p., Paper prepared for Conference on the Library and the College Climate of Learning, Syracuse University, New York, June 20-23, 1965
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.30
Descriptors-*Cocurricular Activities, College Environment, *Decentralization, *Educational Resources, Higher Education, *Integrated Activities, Interaction, *Student Interests

The need to identify the mode of integration of learning resources on contemporary US campuses grows as institutional expansion becomes a primary organizational concern. The implications drawn in this paper from the culture of the campus to the organization of learning resources is that many of these resources must be drastically decentralized around clusters of students and their interests rather than around the scholarly requirements of faculty and the dictates of administrative order. The internal diversity of US colleges varies from extremely monolithic in many small colleges, to extremely pluralistic in large universities and colleges, both in formal structure and student life outside the classroom. Many small colleges have fought to reduce the autonomy of extracurricular activities and to make them serve the intellectual pursuits of the institution. But large, impersonal universities are still faced with the problem of clustering students with similar interests in order to encourage the intellectual stumulation and self-identity that contribute to a meaningful educational experience. Large campuses should cluster the classroom, cafeteria, library, and lounge into communities that are conveniently available to, reflect the interests of, and provide room for intellectual interaction between students. What really matters is the tone and autonomy of cocurricular student life and how it affects what is done in the classroom. (WM)

Ref.

THE CULTURE OF THE COLLEGE: ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF LEARNING RESOURCES

Burton R. Clark
Research Sociologist
and Professor of Education
University of California
Berkeley

Paper Prepared for Conference on The Library and the College Climate of Learning, Syracuse University, June 20-23, 1965.

THE CULTURE OF THE COLLEGE: ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF LEARNING RESOURCES

It has recently become a common view among those engaged in research on college students that a good share if not most of what happens to change a student in the college years takes place outside the classroom. Psychologists and sociologists and educators speak increasingly of how students relate to one another, of the "student peer group" and the "student subculture." The focus on student relations is part of a move toward thinking past the classroom to the campus as a system of learning.

The emphasis on the college outside the classroom is not new to American thought, however; it touches a central theme in the reflections of men concerned with the higher learning. Woodrow Wilson, when he was President of Princeton (before stepping down to the Presidency of the United States) fought vigorously against the "sideshows" of the campus, the social and athletic extracurricular activities that, it seemed to him, were dominating and sabotaging the intellectual efforts of the faculty. Wilson's battle against these activities, and specifically against students and alumni wedded to them, developed his sense of the campus as a setting for learning. He observed over a half a century ago:[1]

> "The real intellectual life of a body of undergraduates, if there be any, manifests itself, not in the classroom, but in what they do and talk of and set before themselves as their favorite objects between classes and lectures. You will see the true life of a college .... where youths get together and let themselves go upon their favorite themes--in the effect their studies have upon them when no compulsion of any kind is on them, and they are not thinking to be called to a reckoning of what they know."

"Where youths get together and let themselves go upon their favorite themes" is today, in common parlance, the bull session and, in research, the peer group. This is where we must look, agree this old-time president, many students past and present, and modern researchers, if we wish to see much of the true life of a college, including the effect of studies.

But President Wilson, true academician, also felt that the student groups could not themselves sustain the intellectual life of a college:[2]

> "The comradeships of undergraduates will never breed the spirit of learning. The circle must be widened. It must include the older men, the teachers .... So long as instruction and life do not merge in our colleges, so long as what the undergraduates do and what they are taught occupy two separate airtight compartments in their consciousness, so long will the college be ineffectual."

Woodrow Wilson attempted to tell us, then, that if we are interested in college learning we must look first to what the students are doing outside the classroom and second to how and how well that life merges with "instruction" -- by which he probably meant the classroom but which we can broaden to mean classroom and library. He identified major segments of a system of learning and maintained that these parts must be integrated.

Wilson's categories of thought are still important guidelines today. The need to identify the major segments of the campus that enter significantly into the process of learning grows ever deeper as large size becomes the primary fact of organizational life. The need to identify the degree and mode of integration of the segments is particularly intensified in modern times, as the campus becomes so varied that it recapitulates much of the heterogeneity of the city. So let us begin with the segmentation and integration of the campus. Is the campus one culture in any significant sense or must we speak of it as many subcultures? Are the major segments of activity closely integrated or widely separated, even "airtight compartments"? Let us think about the campus as a society or a possible culture by first discussing homogeneity and diversity and then the integration of the campus as a system of learning.

HOMOGENEITY AND DIVERSITY IN THE COLLEGE

American colleges vary greatly on a number of important characteristics, much more than is suggested by aptitude and achievement scores,

and they vary in internal diversity from extremely monolithic to extremely pluralistic, in both their formal structure and the life outside the classroom. Some small colleges consist of several administrators, several dozen faculty members, several hundred students, and a curriculum organized in a few divisions with a passing pretense at departmental specialization. The other extreme, in case its magnitude has escaped your attention, is the university now appropriately described as the multiversity, where students are in excess of twenty thousand; faculty in excess of fifteen hundred; administrators are piled tier upon tier and stretch laterally from the campus to Washington; and the formal learning resources are organized in a dozen or more Schools and Colleges, fifty or more departments, a similar plethora of institutes and centers, a massive central library, and satellite libraries specialized in domains of knowledge and level of instruction. Many subunits in the multiversity, e.g., the Department of English with 75 faculty members, are larger than an entire liberal arts college of 600-800 students.

The perspectives of students are also exceedingly varied, among colleges and within the large campuses. We can type and subtype student orientations in a variety of ways to map this terrain. One elementary typology points to collegiate, academic, vocational, and non-conformist orientations.[3] The collegiate is the Joe College way of life that dominated American colleges from the 1880s to the last decade, the life of fun and sports that drew the hostility of Woodrow Wilson and the disdain of academic men generally. This style of passage through college

has been located in and supported by sororities and fraternities and secondarily by traditional and well-organized dormitories. The academic subculture is the orientation to do as the faculty does, to accept their values, to take their behavior as model, to be a little Don getting ready for graduate school. The students who strongly embody this perspective pursue ideas in and out of the classroom and are favored by the faculty. A weak version of this orientation produces the grade-grubber, a style adopted by many reasonably intelligent girls in order to keep seriousness in its place, out of the way of sex. The vocational orientation is to pursue job skill and job certificate with no nonsense about fun on campus or leisurely contemplation of ideas. This orientation is strong among men from lower social origins, especially if they are also married and supporting a family, are working on the outside, and commute. Their student role is narrowed to the classroom and the assigned books, and they may not have much of a sense of where the library is. Their orientation is often not a "subculture" because they do not cling together enough to support one another but rather pass as strangers. They are so atomized that they are usually an effective force in student politics and government and are outvoted by those in the fraternities and dormitories even when in the vast majority. The nonconformist orientation usually includes a serious commitment to ideas or to artistic performance but a weak identification with the regular machinery of the campus since it is seen as part of the organized society or Establishment against which the young person is reacting. The nonconformists usually symbolize their detachment and

criticism in some very noticeable way, lately in dress, and hence have great visibility. They link themselves closely, have a vigorous and viable subculture, and with their visibility and integration "have influence all out of proportion to their numbers," as we say in college administration.

With both formal structure and student subcultures in mind, what is the balance of homogeneity and diversity that best promotes learning, that will make the college a place of impact on the minds and actions of students? The problem of balance takes radically different forms in small and large colleges. In many small colleges, the educational problem is that the campus is too monolithic. Let us condider a hypothetical Midwestern liberal arts college - Jude - with a faculty of fifty that is grouped in tiny departments of two to five members and committed to teach twelve to fifteen hours a week. Because there is not much chance to specialize or to engage in the labors of scholarship, and the name of the college is obscure, recruitment of the faculty is only nominally nation-wide and is in fact largely from several nearby state universities. The faculty contains, in short, only one or two cosmopolitans from Chicago or Columbia, the kind of men who could possibly fit in at Cornell or Stanford. Jude is also church-connected, and about a half of the faculty are members of that church. Recruitment, backstopped by the self-selection of probation and turnover, produces a fairly homogeneous faculty. Men must fit fairly closely in style of thought and personality, partly because they see so much of one another. The campus

is community recaptured, and the problem of contact with fellow faculty members is how to avoid some of them. With this cast, the student is not likely to encounter ideas at great variance from those of the home nor Young Turks with tongues that loudly criticize the campus. The students at Jude, numbering six hundred, come largely from a constituency bounded by homestate, church, and middle white-collar occupations. They have essentially one style of life on campus, a combination of mild religion, personal exploration and development through social activities, and a secondary investment in what the faculty wants of them. "Race relations" is very far away, or appears on campus as a speaker.

Here, at Jude, the problem of the campus as a setting for learning, is thus one of the cultivation of diversity. To become an effective educational setting, the campus apparently must grow somewhat larger. It certainly must recruit faculty and students more widely with an eye for in-gathering of a number of different kinds of orientations. It must develop cultural homes on campus for these different orientations, so that those who come from different social strata or with various political persuasion or with significantly different degrees of religiosity can find a place. If there are several major subcultures on campus, finally, then there is some chance of major confrontation of values.

In many large colleges and universities, on the other hand, the educational problem is just the opposite: the campus is chaotic scatteration, too diverse internally to be educationally effective. Our case

of pluralism run wild is Munster, a hypothetical state university in the Far West with a faculty of 1300 and 25,000 students. At Munster, only 5 per cent of the teaching of the freshman and sophomore classes is done by senior faculty. This task is split between junior faculty and 1100 teaching assistants. The classes are even larger than outsiders believe on the basis of stories about the freshman lecture of one thousand, since the enrollment expansion of the last several years has lifted many upper division courses to one hundred and fifty and many graduate courses to forty or larger. Munster has all-embracing goals: "preserving truth," which covers all the heritage of man; "creating new knowledge," in fields stretching from Egyptology to Real Estate; "serving the needs of man through truth and knowledge," which covers anything from home economics for mating to research for space exploration. It takes a complicated organization, full of overlap, gap, and contradiction, to serve well such purposes. The campus takes on some likeness to a confederation of tribes that just happened to wander into the same camp grounds.

The tribe, at Munster, is the department and the professional school. These are the basic units for organizing the work because they serve well the scholarly interests of the faculty and the manpower interests of the more advanced white-collar occupations. They are the embodiment and the carrier of expertness. The chemist, the educationist, the historian, the authority on marketing, each has a place of work where he associates with others of his kind, producing

fifty or a hundred distinctive clusters of experts. The men of the cluster identify first with their own discipline or profession and secondly with the academic profession over-all or the campus as a whole. In gathering diverse experts in one place, Munster is thus fractured by professionalism. The basic units have a strong centrifugal force. The collective control of the faculty over its constituent parts becomes each year a more precarious venture. The campus is not a community of scholars in any meaningful sense. The professor usually knows less than a tenth of his colleagues and interacts frequently with but a tiny fraction. Paths do not cross as the buildings spread out ever further, in one direction across the river and into the trees. The single faculty lounge of old that was even open to librarians is replaced by coffee pots in hundreds of locations, reducing the odds to near nothing that the Professor of Engineering and the Professor of English will find a common humanity in laughing at a joke or that the librarian and the mathematician will discover with considerable delight their common interest in the harpsichord and music of the 17th century.

For students, Munster has varied styles of life. Outside the classroom, the student can step into the play world of Joe College, or into the serious coteries of Little Dons, or go with the hedonism of the vocational majors, or even join one of the cells of nonconformity in art and literature, jazz and espresso, mountain-climbing and surfing. In the classroom, there is a high level of specialized training and a spread of courses and professors that pulls students from the smaller

colleges. Students opt for Munster, much as adults, while pining for community lost, opt for the Metropolis. They and the faculty are not about to return to the pastoral college any more than the city dweller will retreat to the isolated small town.

With all this, however, Munster is in serious educational trouble. There are many indications that thousands upon thousands of its students do not get hooked in, that the institution does not engage their motivation. The formal campus relates to the various subcultures quite differently. It still connects reasonably well to the collegiate style. The students who most fully embody this perspective now have to study harder than ever before, and Joe College has therefore become somewhat more academic. But there is still room for sports and fun, within the benign supervision of the Dean of Students Office, the campus police who know how to handle unofficially the problems of sex and beer, the general student association, and the inter-fraternity council. The principle hardship of students of this subculture comes from a sense that their way of life, formerly dominant, is now on the defensive, subject to scorn by increasing proportion of the students.

The formalities of Munster connect to the vocationally-minded students in one way but not at all in another. The curriculum is well fashioned to service their interest in technical training, and the students have little reason to be unhappy with what is offered in the classroom and by the teacher. Out of the classroom, however, they are lacking in presence. They often have little time as they have to bolt for the parking lot or the streetcar to arrive at their off-campus job on time.

When they have an hour or two on campus, it is not uncommon to find them sitting in their car, or in a vacant classroom, or on the steps between the second and third floor. Some, of course, find the coffee-shop or library. A few may find a corner in the student union that they attempt to turn into an informal study, but it can be rather noisy there and the paid personnel frown their feeling that a student union should not be turned into a library. These students, in short, get their job training, they are not otherwise much engaged by the campus, the general flow of ideas and issues does not reach them, and in their deeper perspectives they are little affected by the college years. Observers are prone to conclude that the campus as a setting for learning is not here effectively organized, that the student and the campus to a significant degree pass one another like strangers in the night.

The formalities of Munster fit least well the inclinations of the young academics and the nonconformists, the two orientations of the four named that contain a serious interest in ideas. The young academics ache to sit at the knee of a scholar but they have some difficulty getting closer than a hundred feet and this no more often than once or twice a week. The Helicopter Don shuttles to the airport to sit with government and to commit a conference. When he is in town, the press of students is so great that he must hide away to find time for thinking and writing. The students who sit on the floor in the hallway as they line up for the office hour sense they cannot be individuals to the professor: when they go for a recommendation, the professor must look them up in the grade-book, and, if conscientious, consult with the reader or teaching assistant.

The student academic has a special problem of books at Munster, much worse than his professors realize. The course enrollments have gone up faster than the number of copies of books that are on the reading list and placed on reserve in the library. The pressure to steal and mutilate books goes up geometrically; getting to a book is a roulette of reservations and return trips. The more insightful professors at Munster have come to realize that the library, two million volumes strong, is great for the scholar but bad for assigned readings in classes; and, since they would rather switch than fight, they have gone entirely to purchased paperbacks or to alternative readings that distribute more widely the crush on the library.

The students who come with the nonconformist orientation, or develop it on campus, find Munster to be proof of their feelings. For them, the formal campus is little more than a warm place by day, between high school and whatever it is that lies ahead. It is the immediate voice of the Establishment and the very embodiment of cold, unthinking bureaucracy. As they clutch the IBM cards in the registration line, they know they are right in rejecting it all. Hence Munster for them is nearly all off-campus, in educational space made available by businessmen and landlords. Woodrow Wilson's "true life of a college" is here carried out in the apartment house and in the cafes and clubs that cater to the nonconformists. What the huge size of Munster permits is this concentration of nonconformists wherein loners become joiners and an impersonal machinery wherein the nonconformist can hide from and evade

the supervision of conforming adults.

Jude and Munster are extremes of unified and diverse culture. They are depicted here to highlight features of campuses that we generally experience in less extreme form. Each, we can say, is not a satisfactory arrangement for education in a pluralistic society. One is a tight little island, prone to contain imagination rather than to develop it, inclined to low rather than to high horizons. Given a fast changing, complex society, it offers cultural deprivation, a narrow exposure to the possibilities of life. The other is the Educational City, prone to occupational training, inclined to a radical separation of "instruction and life", little concerned about the thousands who are not even minimally engaged by the campus and live a life of poverty and powerlessness. In the affluent society, we have been unaware until recently of the one-fifth or one-fourth that fall below the poverty line. So it is at the affluent university: we do not see the many students who are in cultural poverty and lack the means of contact and influence. Munster is callous, generating discontent and restlessness.

As we conceive of the weaknesses of Jude and then the weaknesses of Munster as systems of learning we can make a first approximation to balance: a campus must be pluralistic in its formal provisions and its student subcultures, but pluralistic without chaotic scatteration. There must be alternative tracks of performance and alternative social supports for alternative personal interests and life styles. But the alternatives must not become a supermarket of segmented and business-like

relations. The array of formal concerns of the university must not, in particular, be such that the undergraduate program, which once sat alone at the table of educational provision, is pushed down past the salt. The undergraduate program in many places has become the overworked peasantry whose labors help make possible the high culture and power of the knights of the estate -- graduate training, research, outside consulting.

INTEGRATION OF THE CAMPUS

Even in the more monolithic colleges, we usually find some strain between those who control the curriculum and those who control the extracurricular life. Students have always had a life outside the classroom, of course; what matters is the tone and autonomy of that life and how it affects what is done in the classroom. Beginning in the 1880s, there developed a realm of student activities that was increasingly autonomous and antithetical to faculty desires. Academic reform at college after college after the turn of the century had to grapple with the autonomy and spirit of the extracurricular. The solution of this problem is much more important than revision of courses and programs of study in raising a college to first rank. The colleges at the top in academic standards are places where the extracurricular to a significant extent has been brought under the control of the faculty and administration This usually entails a long period of battle with the football alumni, dogged recruitment to find serious students, and a persistent effort to erode the campus practices that symbolize and sustain the life of fun. Colleges that are now first-rank are generally places that fought through such

issues in the 1910s, 1920s, and 1930s. Many such battles are going on now in other colleges. The high level of demand for entry to college has lifted the heavy hand of student shortage for many colleges of average caliber. The temper of the times favors academic severity The battles to change the tone of the extracurricular, to reduce its autonomy, and have it serve the intellectual pursuits of the college are changing many small colleges as systems of learning.

In the large colleges and universities, the problem of integration of segments of the campus takes the form in part of control of the extracurricular; but increasingly it is a matter of how to put the student back into contact with the faculty, and with other students in ways that support the intellectual life. This is the problem of how to effectively substructure the large place so that it is large and small at the same time. The overall size of any university is not finally decisive in determining its character as an environment and setting for learning. It is the substructure of the campus that builds the walls of impersonality and arbitrary authority or promotes the conditions of caring and informal power. The large becomes small psychologically and the person has a chance of being heard when students and professors and administrators (and librarians?) interact daily in decentralized clusters. To offer several dicta: no large campus in this country is effectively organized unless a student can have a daily personal encounter with a professor; no educational structure is effective that does not put the administrator in lounges, cafeterias, and hallways where his path will intersect those of the professor and student; no campus has an appropriate

distribution of influence unless students feel that when they speak someone is listening.

The substructure of the university is currently at most places made up of departments and student rooming facilities. Student are not meaningful participants in departments and faculty in turn are not meaningful participants in the places where the students are. Thus reform efforts on the large campuses today usually attempt to replace or abridge the department and dormitory with units such as the residential sub-college whose first commitment is to liberal education for the undergraduate. The main thing is to get students of somewhat similar interests together so that they can stimulate and support one another's often precarious commitments and to provide direct and personal encouragement and rewards for such commitments by similarly committed faculty members. This requires serious effort by the administration and at least a part of the faculty to minimize the "people processing" aspects of the large campus.

The clusters that would effectively re-integrate the large campus cannot be called into being by proclamation: they have to have structural definition and support, formal membership, physical place for meeting and working, and some insulation against distracting and competitive interests and appeals. They cannot, in short, be a paper assignment, as when a student is made part of a College of Letters and Science along with eleven thousand others. The clusters must be small enough to allow members to know one another personally and as wholes; they must be stable enough to

allow patterns of sentiment, identification, interaction, and intellectual support; they must be reasonably homogeneous with respect to the values and interests represented so that members can center their relationships around these shared and developing interests, rather than around the interests which comprise the lowest common denominator of student life. In short, these have to be genuine intellectual communities, rooted in residence halls, or groups of departments, or in some other combination of structured interactions and shared intellectual interests. But the problems are many. In universities where the academic values are by no means predominant, but compete with vigorous collegiate and vocational orientations, the division of a student body in the residence halls may simply reproduce the heterogeneous and partially atomized mass of students in smaller units: the structural definition of community is present but not the essential commonality of interest and value. But even such random assignment would be some gain over the present and worsening situation, since a residential college of five hundred can purposefully shape its own internal organization in ways that an aggregation of twenty-five thousand students and a thousand faculty cannot, especially in regard to the educational process outside the classroom.

In brief, the problem of integration of the large campus is now no longer simply one of bringing together the curricular and extracurricular but one of sub-grouping the student body so as to give students intellectual presence. The large campus is short on intellectual anchoring points

for students, foci of collective and self identity that make college academically something more than 120 units of registered classroom lecture.

THE MIXED-UP CAMPUS

It follows from the preceding discussion that there should be a sub-clustering of many of the learning resources of the campus, including the library. The community-cluster basis of organization is the opposite of functional specialization. It means putting back together that which has grown apart: the classroom, the cafeteria, the library, the lounge. The problem is somewhat parallel to that of urban redevelopment, where much thought is being given to the possibilities of bringing work and home closer together, of putting the store in the housing development -- in short, of mixing up the use of space so that those who now run on separate tracks will intersect and spontaneously interact and so that one's ordinary activities will not be in watertight compartments. Some tremendous concentrations are needed, e g., a financial district, but much that is now separated along lines of main function could be reintegrated at little or no economic loss and at considerable social gain. So it is on the large campus: some large concentrations are needed, e.g., that part of the library which is the resource of the advanced scholar, but much could be reintegrated at little or no economic loss and at considerable educational and social gain.

Those who seek to fashion the mixed-up campus could tackle the problem, in part, as one of taking resources to where the studenta are,

instead of saying as we often do: well, here are the great facilities that we have provided for you, so come and use them if you wish. We will even provide an orientation guide, Monday, September 26, 2-4 p.m.

The rapid growth in knowledge and modern advances in technology are pushing us further down the road of central concentration of resources, the mammouth library to which very large numbers of students must come. The library can become awesome in a negative way, out of scale for the sensibilities of the student and certainly a watertight compartment in the life of a large share of the student body.

The main library on many campuses has already been substructured somewhat in knowledge clusters, e.g., the social science library, the education library. On a few campuses where residential Houses are well developed, the individual Houses have libraries of some value to the student. But much more could be done by way of clustering that would relate the resources of the library more effectively to the life of the student and that would make the library something of a bridge between the academic and the social. An obvious extension of the House library is the library that serves the dormitory or a bevy of dormitories. A more speculative extension of this idea is the Bookmobile manned by Ye Friendly Librarian, that receives requests and delivers requested books for several hours each evening in the graduate-student housing that is always a mile to five miles away from the center of campus The married and otherwise harassed graduate student badly needs an integration of the living and learning resources of the campus.

This line of thought suggests that the mammoth, specialized Student Union and the centralized, specialized eating complex carry the campus in the wrong direction, fixing the resources of the campus as separate compartments. We have learned to put snack bars in the Student Union, apparently because light eating is sufficiently "social" that it can be grouped with the bowling alley and the offices of student politicians. We also sometimes allow the bookstore to be in the Union, a convenient location for service to students. It is not a large step to put a sub-library in the Union, although this violates the philosophy of many students and of many adults who operate "student buildings." In turn, some of the facilities normally segregated in the Student Union, kept away from classroom buildings and the library, could be scattered to mix-up the use of space. Coffee shops and lounges do appear in classroom buildings but we seemed to have been terribly effective in keeping them out of libraries. Hence another dictum: no campus library is a good library if it does not have a good coffee shop. Ideally, a library should have a large number of rooms where books would come together with coffee and conversation. The sign on the wall, if any were needed, would read, "TALK!" The coffee would need to be priced a little high, perhaps, to replace books smudged to death by greasy fingers.

Such speculations only scratch the surface of the possibilities of decentralizing the formal resources of the campus around the plurality of locations for the "life" of the student. Most difficult is how to attach learning to the hectic, no-nonsense pursuit of job training and

certificate that is the lot of hundreds of thousands of relatively poor students. The commuter at the junior college, state college, state university, and private urban university is not touched by the clusters that group the library with the units of on-campus living. There has been growing recognition that the commuter needs lounges or some space in which to meet others. We should extend this perspective to include the commuter library and the commuter library lounge. It is no mystery where such facilities should go: the paths traveled by the commuter as he heads for the streetcar or parking lot, sometimes right across the grass and through the ivy, are well known. "His" library-lounge could be something of a campus House, but one adapted to the mandates of his life, e.g., having five-minute warning on the departure of the bus that gets him to his job on time.

Thus, finally, the implications drawn here from the culture and social constitution of the campus to the organization of learning resources is that many of the resources must be heavily decentralized or redivided around clusters of students and the interests of students, rather than being centralized or grouped around the scholarly requirements of faculty and the dictates of administrative order. We shall have to have it both ways, with centralized resources for certain services and scattered resources for other purposes. There would be many gains in the scatteration for those responsible for the learning resources. The librarian who was associated regularly with four hundred students in a sub-center, instead of serving thousands of strangers in the main repository,

would find new pleasures in his work. The librarian would be closer to the life of the student and would more fully enter into the teaching role. Where the resources of the library are integrated with other services of the campus in residential and commuter facilities, then the librarian is also more fully integrated. The role of librarian house master could serve well the sensibilities of the librarian as well as the requirements of education on the modern campus.

Footnotes

[1] Woodrow Wilson, "The Spirit of Learning" (1909), in Selected Literary and Political Papers and Addresses of Woodrow Wilson, Vol. I, New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1925, p. 252.

[2] Ibid., p. 258.

[3] Burton R. Clark and Martin Trow, "Determinants of College Student Subcultures," in T. M. Newcomb and E. K. Wilson (eds.), The Study of College Peer Groups, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, forthcoming.