DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 625 AC 004 563

By-Daigneault, George H., Ed.

The Changing University; A Report on the Seventh Annual Leadership Conference.

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Brookline, Mass.
Pub Date May 5?
Note-66p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.40
Descriptors-Administrative Personnel, Administrative Policy, *Adult Education, College Faculty, *Educational Change, Educational Objectives, Enrollment Trends, *Environmental Influences, Evening Colleges, Junior Colleges, Leadership, *Universities, *University Extension

This publication presents the papers which were given at the Seventh Annual Leadership Conference for Association of University Evening College officers and committee chairmen and National University Extension Association officers. A summary of the discussion which followed is also provided. Each speaker emphasized the marginal nature of adult education activities of the university and suggested that the university image includes evening college and extension activities, if at all, as a public or community relations adjunct or as a method of securing additional financing. The papers also, however, suggest ways in which adult education can be made an increasingly central concern and responsibility of the university. (se)

The hanging University

A Report on the Seventh Annual Leadership Conference

Edited by

GEORGE H. DAIGNEAULT

A REPORT

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
4819 GREENWOOD AVE. • CHICAGO 15 ILLINOIS

An organization established as the result of a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with the universities providing liberal education for adults.

THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS was established as the result of a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with the universities providing liberal education for adults. The official purpose of the Center is to "provide aid and leadership to the forces that can develop the evening college and extension movement into a more effective instrument for the liberal education of adults." Communications may be addressed to the Director, 4819 Greenwood Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois.

Publications of the Center are listed on the back covers, with information as to how they may be obtained.

THE CHANGING UNIVERSITY

A Report on the Seventh Annual Leadership Conference

Edited by

George H. Daigneault

Research Associate

CSLEA

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

May 1959

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Early in March, 1959, the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, in co-operation with the Association of University Evening Colleges and the National University Extension Association, ran the Seventh Leadership Conference. Started in 1953 for AUEC officers and Committee chairmen, this conference was officially expanded in 1955 to include the officers of the NUEA.

After seven years, the Leadership Conference has been accepted as a secure part of the higher adult education scene. Its aim is twofold: first, to provide officers of the two associations with an opportunity to discuss separately and jointly the affairs of their associations, and second, to make available an occasion for broad consideration of major problems, concerns, and activities in the field of higher adult education.

Because of the importance of the papers presented at this conference, and because of the need for careful examination and review of their implications for the field of higher adult education, the Center is making them available in this form for distribution and use by extension and evening college staff meetings at specific institutions and for use as working papers at AUEC and NUEA regional meetings.

The following format is used, to make these papers of greatest use for discussion purposes: 1) each of the papers is reproduced as presented at the meeting; 2) a summary of the discussion which followed the presentation is included; and 3) issues for discussion, which highlight points raised by the speakers and relate them to adult education, are then presented in the form of implications and questions.

A review of the papers appears, at first sight, to buttress the points made by Burton Clark in his paper, "The Marginality of Adult Education."[1] Each speaker, directly or indirectly, emphasizes the marginal nature of the adult education activities of the university. In different

---

1. Burton Clark, "The Marginality of Adult Education," NOTES AND ESSAYS #20, The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, June, 1958.

ways they report that universities do not look upon the adult activities as a basic part of the university. They suggest that the university image includes evening college and extension activities, if at all, primarily as a public or community relations adjunct or as a method of securing additional financing—either for the university itself or for faculty members involved in extra teaching assignments. Demerath describes the tensions and stresses within the university and asks whether the adult activities will be looked upon as "real education or as a hoi polloi activity." He further raises the question of whether evening college and extension activity will be squeezed out as a result of the internal pressures in universities. Coombs, discussing the external pressures on universities, raises questions about the impact of increasing numbers of students on the demands for space and faculty, about the extent to which universities can provide the entire educational job, and about the impact of increasing demands for research in universities by the government and industry on other fringe university programs.

McConnell asks whether, in the light of increasing demands for education and limitations on day college facilities, the evening colleges may not on the one hand become the dumping ground for the less fit or, on the other, whether their task may not be increasingly assumed by the junior and community colleges. Blakely, although generally approving the stock-taking posture of the conference, raises the question of passivity and suggests that possibly we should be asking questions about "Where do we want to go—what do we want to do—what do we want to make happen" rather than "Where are we being taken, or what is shaping us?" Although a first reading of these papers may heighten the apprehension of some evening college and extension deans and directors about the future of their programs, a second reading suggests certain positive forces which are at work and some ways in which those interested in higher adult education may utilize them to expand and add meaning to the university education of adults. Demerath, for example, suggests that the very existence of the internal stresses and strains in the universities may provide a climate for clarifying the adult responsibilities of the university and proposes increasing emphasis on the enormous and challenging task of "getting adults to become scholars"—certainly an appropriate function of a university.

Coombs, on his part, suggests that universities have a responsibility

for preparing students for the "cumulative process of self-development" and that increasing demands for learning in areas such as foreign affairs, urban renewal and the like provide new opportunities for and impose new responsibilities on universities. He also raises the question of the extent to which universities have a responsibility for working more closely with the rapidly increasing and widely proliferating special and voluntary groups in industry, labor, and the community who are eager for advice and assistance in developing their own educational programs.

McConnell calls for a new approach to adult education offerings and emphasizes the challenge for adult educators to provide integrated, inter-disciplinary offerings aimed especially at adults.

One month's perspective and a number of hours of review of these papers more than ever emphasizes Blakely's call for attention to "where do we want to go and what do we want to do." These papers are certainly thought-provoking. They re-emphasize some of the marginal aspects of university adult education. They raise questions about the future of adult activities in the universities. They suggest that very, very few college presidents or boards of trustees now look upon the adult activities as a basic and priority aspect of the University. But they also suggest ways in which the adult activities can be made an increasingly central concern and responsibility of the university.

Whether universities will accept their responsibilities for life-long and continuing education depends to a great degree on what we in the evening college and extension field ourselves do in the next few years. Can we clarify and set forth our objectives in clear-cut and resounding terms? How can we improve understanding of the evening college and extension activities on the part of the top administration and policy makers of the colleges and universities? How can we more effectively communicate with the centers of power and the makers of policy both within the university and in the community? Can we carry on our present activities and our present programs, maintain levels of excellence, increasingly develop a posture of experimentation and innovation and also provide the services that are needed? How can we improve our research and evaluation so that we can prove the excellence of our educational activities and the importance of our offerings?

These are but a few of the basic questions which inevitably grow

out of this conference. If higher adult education is to continue as an integral and important part of higher education, it is essential that we devote our attention and bend our efforts increasingly to secure answers to these questions.

A. A. Liveright, Director
The Center for the Study of Liberal
Education for Adults

THE CHANGING CHARACTER OF THE UNIVERSITY

by

Nicholas J. Demerath*

Just what you expect of me this morning I am not quite sure. I believe you want a general perspective on the modern university in the United States as a kind of bench mark for your particular observations and discussions. That you should ask a sociologist is not surprising inasmuch as sociologists are beginning to study the institutions of higher education, and we tend to make a specialty of the broad view. Also, even the psychiatrists nowadays have their sociologist advisors, so why not the deans? In both instances, and especially this morning, one may ask just who is stretching or shrinking whose heads!

Our subject this morning is perplexing. Though the university is supposedly the seat and center of the life of reason, it has been examined less rationally than any institution in our society. With apologies to you administrators, it is my impression that it is also managed less rationally. So much is written and said about higher education and universities in particular, and yet we know so little surely and systematically. This is more than a pity academically; more than a neglected area for new scholarship. The fact is the university today is at a critical stage in a critical period of Western history. I will not dwell on the historical context for several reasons; not least of which is that Professor McConnell, who appears on your program this evening, is an international authority on the historical development of universities. It is enough for our purposes to note that the U. S. university, as we know it today, is a quite new and unstable institution confronted with such increases in scale and changes in function that its very survival, as we know it now, is problematic. A main question, therefore, is: just how far can we afford to modify the forms and functions of our universities to meet present demands for mass education, mass professionalization,

*Director, Social Science Institute and Professor of Sociology, Washington University, St. Louis.

even mass entertainment? The most important conditions of the university are not mere conditions of work, play, physical plant, and fiscal position. The conditions of the mind, conditions for the mental life, these are the main thing. How do they fare? How are they affected by current trends to be noted following?

The University Seen Whole

To cope with the critical period of this critically important institution, we must see the university as a complex whole. As Paul Appleby, one of the deans of American public administration, has said, "We need men who can make a mesh of things." For the guidance of no institution is this need more acute today than for the American university. My approach this morning—and the one that I would urge upon you as educational leaders—is to view the university as though it were a living plant or animal; always adapting and relating to various environments, including other institutions and groups; always adjusting its parts internally; and always moving, reaching out as long as it is alive. No mechanical automaton is this, but a vital and purposive organization of students and teachers, researchers and administrators, resources and clienteles, activities and objectives. The university is an organization of wonderful complexity, so interdependent that a change in any one part will touch off changes and adjustments in many other parts, commonly unexpected, often unpredictable. Christie and Merton, in a recent account of the procedures which they have employed for the sociological study of the value settings of medical schools, put it well.

> We assume, first, that changes in part of a social system will tend to bring about changes in other parts of that system. . . . For example, the criteria and procedures a school adopts to select its students help to shape the environment the school provides for each of its students. As the criteria of admission vary, obviously so will the character of the student body vary. If the admissions committee in one school assigns prime importance to high college grades, the composition of students in that school will of course be skewed toward the upper reaches of this kind of achievement. As a result, students of any particular degree of capacity will find themselves in a distinctly different kind of environment of peers than would those same students in a school having a differing set of criteria for admission. If the criteria are changed, the web of student life will be changed. Student competitiveness will be greater or less; student anxieties will be variously deepened

> or curbed; the prevailing atmosphere of greater or less interest in research will presumably change.[1]

One of the more exciting products of the growing exchange between biological and social scientists has been the idea of "organization" or "system." And in that idea, there are no more important elements than the concepts of "prerequisite" and "stress." Hans Selve has written a book, as many of you know, called The Stress of Life. Let us consider this morning some of the stresses of universities seen as wholes, as complex systems. You deans and directors, I expect, will be quick to agree that there are few organizations more stress-packed or stress-ridden than the modern university. No wonder that the layman who only knows the academic world as a one-time student or football fan cannot imagine why we too get ulcers!

Just as stresses in the organism-environment relation are the essence of life there, so are the stresses of a university the essence and sine qua non of its growth, movement, and change. Contained within certain limits, the university's stresses are not "pathological," but instead are the "normal" characteristics of any human organization. Inasmuch as stress is a vital quality, a university is dead that is stress-free. On the other hand, as we will note subsequently, the university that cannot handle its stresses so as to meet the necessary conditions or prerequisites of its existence will cease to be a university in any recognizable sense looking from the past, or it will be destroyed entirely.

I. Multiple Goals and Diverse Activities within the University

Education in the U. S. A., higher education included, has not been a one-track. one goal affair; not even in the earliest colonial period. We have had many different educational objectives or aspirations; about all in fact that an educational system could imaginably have: (1) religious indoctrination; (2) broad humanistic training; (3) the creation of an aristocratic elite after the gentleman image; (4) the production of technologists—"useful" scientific workers, scholars, engineers, and, increas-

---

1. Richard Christie and Robert K. Merton, Procedures for the Sociological Study of the Values Climate of Medical Schools (Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Reprint No. 277, 1958), pp. 125-126.

ingly, administrators; and (5) the preservation of the past in a static society. As Malcom MacLean and Robin Williams have noted, the old style scholar has never been at home in American education. Neither the frontier nor our business civilization have valued contemplation and detached intellectual activity above utilitarian work. In our cultural scheme of things, the scholar tends to be an "impractical" misfit. Though to the advocates of change our universities often seem hopelessly conservative, the fact is that our universities with their scientific and technological emphases are far more dynamic than those of most other societies.[2] At the same time the transmission of our cultural heritage, and the training of the "raw generation" has been an elemental concern of our colleges within the universities. This diversity and plurality of goals has, of course, involved stress and conflict among the keepers of the various flames, the doers and diers! This is true within as well as between institutions. Who was it who said the whole thing can be handled if we would but "humanize the scientist, and scientize the humanist"?

Since World War II, another kind of stress has arisen as between those who would make whatever we do in our universities aloof and removed from matters of value—a sheer impossibility, of course—and those, on the other hand, who, concerned by the challenge of totalitarian advance, loss of integration in the U. S. culture, excessive "materialism," or merely in tune with the "back to the church" trend, would promulgate particular values. Not since 1920, perhaps, have such words as "character," "morals," "Christian tradition," "ethical judgment," "religious study," "the soul of man" been used as freely in educational circles as they are today.

The newer goals of the university often attract the opposition and hostility, more or less openly expressed, of arts and science faculties. Conflicts develop accordingly as between the innovators and the traditionalists, administration, faculty, alumni, and others. The emphasis on usefulness, "pleasantness" and conformity, the relative devaluation of scholarly and leisurely interests, the leveling and lowering of standards, the increase of vocationalism and technicism, big-time professional athletics, big money for applied programs of education and research, along with the older complaints about too many clubs, too many courtships,

---

2. Robin M. Williams, Jr., American Society (Knopf, 1951), p. 301.

and too much ROTC—to all of these the "hard core" of the university's faculty still object. And if we are <u>really</u> serious about our education contest with the Soviets, this faculty voice will become more influential. The demand for such "hoi-poloi" activities and attractions by the young and the lesser-educated will not abate quickly, however. As a result of this and the population increase, there will be new schools, junior colleges, and universities. Also, we may expect a sharper line of difference between first-class and lesser universities.

II. <u>Membership</u>

For any organization the recruitment and maintenance of membership is of course a necessity of life. Recently, in the modern university, the attraction of students has been a problem only in a few private universities who have up-graded or priced themselves out of their markets. By and large, our universities have had large and growing enrollments and easy admissions. On the side of quality and adequacy of resources of plant and staff, however, disturbing and stressful problems have mounted.

If student recruitment is no great problem, recruitment of faculty is. The present supply of Ph.D.'s and the annual increments thereto are far short of the total demand, though the picture is quite uneven comparing one specialty with another. For deans and chairmen who must hire, the future looks bleak and bleaker. For most faculty, however, the prospects are bright and even brighter. As salaries go up in a professor's market, so will the professors' influence and prestige in the university and in the society be raised. More of the talented from our middle-classes will also be recruited to the academic profession, and this also may enhance the profession and the university, assuming enough of the crucial pre-conditions of intellectual work and educational achievement are met.

This upsurge in university size around the country has, of course, been a reflection and response to the new demands of a growing population and changing society. The accretions to knowledge, the new specialisms, the new professions and the would-be professions, the new managers of expanding industries and markets, have all had their impact on the American university. As noted by the great German sociologist, Max

Weber, forty years ago, the American university is the creator as well as the creature of much of our bureaucratization. I'm still not sure just who is "The Organization Man," but whoever he is, our universities have had a hand in his creation and nurture.

The trend from small to large and larger in our universities has been accomplished usually by increases in complexity. Schools and departments, centers and institutes, projects and programs, bureaus and divisions, vice-presidents and deans, have multiplied like our Esster totems. And the imperialist interests, power blocs and politicians have given our boards and presidents many a sleepless night. Where faculties still deal with policy matters, even their meetings have been less sleepy and hum-drum.

I scarcely need remind you that the effect of all this has been strain on organizational policies and structures; supervisory, fiscal, personnel, communications, review and planning, pedagogical methods, plant facilities—in all of these adjustment to stress is continuous. What worked last year, and perhaps for many years, creaks and breaks down today. Small wonder the management consultants turn to the university for new business. (Yet I can't help but be surprised at the ways academic administrators have been fooled by some of these consultants.) If there are many campuses "where the cement never dries," so are there many universities whose organizations are never stabilized.

III. Favorable Exchange

To claim from the society the needed resources of material, money and members, the university, like any other organization, must provide certain goods or services. On the one hand, the American university is expected to indoctrinate variously an increasing portion of each new generation. On the other hand, the university is looked to for new knowledge, especially in critical periods such as the present. Inherently, these objectives are stressful, and less than optimal in the exchange sense. The university as indoctrinator and purveyor of established knowledge and philosophies, is very carefully watched by the power elites of our society. It becomes the target of public pressures when cherished beliefs are threatened and when politicians look for whipping boys and scapegoats. If someone could only figure out how basic research can be car-

ried on, how discoveries can be made, how scientists and scholars can go about their business without talking and writing. Then we could more surely aid our society without violating the properties and the past. Unfortunately, as my friend James D. Thompson notes, the university, no matter whether its corporate legal form be public or "private," becomes a public institution, a focal point for a society's fears and aspirations. Our kind of society cannot do without the university, and how well it will let us do with it is one of the most exciting questions of our age.

Another stress in connection with the favorable exchange between the university and the society is that so many of the university's goals are elusive; too bad we don't make shoes or grow corn! Basic research, the pursuit of original scholarship, even educational achievement are matters extremely difficult or impossible to assess, much less to count and measure—project by project, year by year. I say this despite the fact that we make so many surveys: "g-r-a-d-e by g-r-a-d-e," as a certain political satirist sings it. Similarly, though one may compare one graduating class with another, no one knows whether a given student group could have been better educated. When it comes to evaluating an institution, the difficulties are even greater, of course.

While we can count the number of college graduates who go on to become Ph.D.'s or "V.I.P.'s," or who receive various awards and honors and Who's Who entries, no one knows whether this reflects more on the institution, the individual, or his ancestors and neighbors. We have a tendency to focus attention on substitute measures of achievement, such as number of papers published, grade point averages, number of honors won, number of committees and offices, consultancies and the like. Only a few of the arts, sciences, or professions within the university turn out products that are in any sense "hard"—the artists who paint or make music, the technicians who are in engineering or development work, the architects who design things, the surgeon who creates a tool or technique. These are about all. All of us, nonetheless, are pressed to measure or be measured, and to be "cost accountable." And if it weren't for the fact that we can lie with statistics, I suspect the scientific managers who have invaded the universities in recent years, and necessarily so, would have more of us on the rack than are.

Whatever the university produces is seen and evaluated in a context

of public attitudes which has been outlined by Williams as follows.[3]

> 1. There is overwhelming generalized approval of college or university education, especially for boys. It is felt that the colleges generally do their work well.
>
> 2. College education is valued chiefly as a means to occupational success. Higher education is generally thought of as a weapon or tool in individual competition.
>
> 3. Correspondingly, relatively low (but increasing) value is attached to training in the arts, citizenship, "character development," and other indoctrinating, liberal, general, or humanistic studies. A liberal arts, or "cultural" education is more often approved for women than men.
>
> 4. Substantial minorities of the population have several important criticisms and fears, viz.:
>
> > a. A conception of higher education as impratical or as detached, isolated, or alienated from the viable values and concerns of the society;
> >
> > b. A fear of academic freedom; a hesitancy to endorse the full discussion of man and his problems—of religion, or communism, for instance;
> >
> > c. Ambivalence towards, or outright rejection of, the specialist and the scholar (frequently an attitude of half reluctant respect mingled with apprehension and hostility —shown, for instance, in the projective stereotype of the "diabolical scientist").

These attitudes and values have set the criteria and limitations according to which collegiate services are requested and evaluated by the public. That such attitudes have a bearing upon the other, more peculiarly university functions goes without saying. Surely these attitudes will change; partly as a consequence of educational leadership and direction, but largely as a corollary of the vaster and fundamental changes in our society and our world.

IV. The Government of Universities

Let us now consider the arrangements of power and authority, the arrangements by which universities are planned, regulated and governed. The paragraphs preceding have stated something of the "external relations" with which university government must deal, most obviously and typically. This is a responsibility of the president, his staff and the board. This latter facet, by the way, has received good empirical study of late.

---

3. Ibid., pp. 295-296.

In his doctoral dissertation, Richard Stephens (now at the George Washington University) delineated the numerous and often conflicting roles of the university president.[4] He noted, especially, conflicts between the president's external activities, representations, responsibilities, and his inside work. The inability to handle both complex sets of roles has spelled the end of many a president. The Carnegie-supported "Study of the University Presidency," now in progress, by Harold Dodds, Felix Robb, and R. R. Taylor, will probably yield a rare combination of first-hand wisdom and systematically gathered experience from a number of institutions.

Like our public schools, the universities tend to be controlled by a combination of business groups, political officials, and professional administrators. The governing boards of the larger private universities are weighted heavily with businessmen and their corporation lawyers. The dependence of the private university on endowments no doubt has an influence on its policies. Similarly, the state university's dependence on political power makes that type of institution sensitive to state political forces. One who moves, as I have, between private and state universities cannot help but be aware of the differences in source and type of extra-mural powers.

A university worthy of the name must cope deliberately and well with such forces—thrusting, parrying, pocketing—and at the same time utilizing them for academically viable purposes as far as possible. After all, conservative bankers and politicians have frequently been the best friends and defenders of academic values. In this continuous encounter, the university representative has more than "our faculty's rights" to lead from. After all, the university is the main source and spring of the sciences we value so highly, a custodian and legitimator of professionalism (almost everyone wants to be "a professional"), and last but not least, the source of honorary degrees—and who doesn't want one of them even as "Man of War," I am told!

What about associations of universities as representational devices in common causes? So far, like the universities themselves, the associ-

---

4. Richard W. Stephens, The Academic Administrator: The Role of the University President (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1956).

ations have usually been loose and ineffective. Sometimes, as in the Southern Regional Compact, for example, an association has been highly effective and inventive. But institutional competition is greater than co-operation and it is unlikely that the competitiveness of universities will be reduced. Even though there will probably be more than enough students to go around, the likelihood of sufficient funds and prestige for all is dim, indeed. Our recent experience with Uncle Sam's National Defense Education Act of 1958 only lends support to my surmise: better that the Congress authorize nothing if it could not allocate funds for more than 160 fellowships to be spread about 48 states! However, it is that much less temptation for many to violate their beliefs in regard to the oath prescribed by the unfortunate addendum to the Act.

Within the university, its government must cope with another kind of external group—external, at least, to many faculty and administrators. I refer to the students. The very considerable distance in outlook, values, behavior between students and their elders has been a matter of common observation and occasional study. Sociologists and anthropologists like to refer to "the college culture," the youth culture, student society, etc.; and who among us has not said, "A university would be a grand place if it weren't for the students and the classes." The fact is that our universities with undergraduate colleges are custodial as well as educational. Many college administrators spend much time dealing with or preventing violations of our control norms. You educators of adults may spend more time in the opposite direction; getting your adults to become scholars, to think and act as students. In any case, the supervision of masses of students in our universities, who think themselves ready for adulthood though adults are unwilling to grant it, is a task of very considerable difficulty. As every sociologist knows, the effective norms of conduct are generated and learned in the intense group life of the campus, in the fraternities, the sororities, the cliques, and other segmented units of student society. More, also, many of the orientations toward adult life are transmitted. Much of what we say about undergraduate life is also true for graduate students, I suspect. And in our haste to turn out young scientists and scholars, we would do well to consider the student culture and what Henry Seidel Canby, years ago, called "education common"—for <u>both</u> undergraduate and graduate students.

As for the internal government of the university, here again we find variety to be the most conspicuous characteristic; variety, that is, between institutions as well as within them. Though centralization and standardization of business procedures have increased greatly, there are many differences in the government and management of technical schools and liberal arts colleges; medicine, law, and other professional schools; private and public institutions; science and non-science departments; teaching and research oriented units. Nevertheless, a general pattern and line of change is discernible. It consists of this: from collegial and informal structures to bureaucratic and formal; from diffused and shared decisions and policy making to specific and unitary decisions; from faculty dominance to administrator dominance; from department autonomy to divisional and school power; from great to lesser distance, and from hard to easy access, as between the university and "outside" groups and institutions. In other words, we have seen a bureaucratization of the American university whereby the managers come to mediate between (1) faculty and the rest of the university, (2) between the university and the board of trustees, and (3) through the trustees to the power centers of the larger society. This administrative bureaucracy is acutely aware of the public relations interests and of the criticism or feared criticisms of influential groups in the outside community. As Williams says,[5]

> It is concerned with placating ruffled parents, raising funds, attracting students, increasing the renown of the organization. Because of the nature of its responsibilities, the pressures to which it is subject, and possibly because of some selectivity in its personnel, the administrative group differs in its interests, goals, and standards from the scientists, scholars, and teachers who make up the faculty. Tensions and misunderstandings are therefore common, and, in some instances, both severe and chronic.

As a consequence, what has happened to the "free professor" of high calling and socially vested obligations and privileges? He is not yet extinct, but his ranks appear badly depleted. Does this affect the creativeness, the contribution, of the American university? Lazarsfeld and Thielen, in their recently published book,[6] find that at least in the social sciences, professiorial productivity (measured in terms of consultanships, publica-

---

5. Williams, op. cit., p. 297.

6. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., The Academic Mind (The Free Press, 1958).

tions, prominence in national learned societies) is directly associated with the professor's insistence on "faculty rights" as opposed to public relations or institutional interests in conflict situations over academic freedom and the like. And in so far as the American university professor sees himself as an employee on a fixed salary, subject to a chain of command, and dependent for his advancement or security on the favorable evaluations of his administrative superiors, it seems we are breeding a greater proportion of academic "locals" in contrast with "cosmopolitans." That is, we are getting more academicians whose orientation is to their immediate university organization and local clienteles in contrast with their peers across the country or around the world. If this be the case, what happens to the universality, and to the liberating influence of the liberal arts?

That the academic and administrative hierarchies do not yet coincide is a fact which makes academic administration perhaps the most difficult of administrative jobs. In a good university, the administrator is a man caught in the middle of several conflicts: (1) the expectations of the trustees of "the public" and those of the faculty or students; (2) accounting on the basis of costs versus accounting in terms of academic intangibles; (3) the managerial necessities of more or less clearly delegated responsibilities and lines of authority versus the collegial attitude that the university is a community of equals and there can be no set decisions acceptable if they offend the professor. It is inevitable that the administrator will strive for the closure and coincidence of the academic and administrative hierarchies. How successfully the academician can resist, and what will be the products of this tension is another exciting and basic question of higher education in the U. S. A.

V. Motivation and Morale

The contest between collegial and administrative structures,[7] which characterizes the American university, makes the situation of the ambitious professor unclear at best. Compounding this of course is the multiplicity of goals and practices from one college or school to another with-

7. In its dual structures of authority, the university resembles the hospital which is governed both by the medical staff and by the hospital administrator.

in the university, and even between departments within the same college —practices which vary with the personal influence and view of senior faculty members, relations with the dean, the personnel committee, and the like. Policies change, seemingly, from one year to the next, and what is rewarded today is apt not to be tomorrow. The man in the professional school is probably less subject to the vagaries produced by intangible and multiple goals, and by shifting and unclear administrative practices.

If Caplow and his colleagues have overemphasized, as some critics think, the sorriest side of the academic market, they have etched nevertheless the main components of the supply-demand, reward and mobility situation for arts and science faculty people in our major universities.[8] A main finding is the general inability of the academic man to learn just what is expected of him in the various stages of his career, is it good teaching of undergraduates or graduates, or both? Is it community service? Is it consultancies? Is it applied research? Is it publication? And if so, when, where, and how? Is it committee service within the university? Is it one's TV "Hooper Rating"? Or is it a certain manner and style of personal and domestic life? The acceptability of one's wife? That these are sources of anxiety everyone knows. To what extent do they also motivate productivity, or excellence (not necessarily synonymous terms, you see)?

Many teachers and scholars have climbed on to administrative ladders because they could not get the salaries they desired otherwise. This has happened in spite of the fact that almost no academician will admit to any administrative desires; one must be "forced," one never seeks. Indeed, this trend may well be a factor in the very growth of administration that the professors lament. Higher salaries unquestionably are needed to keep present teachers and scholars as well as to recruit others, and these should compare better than they do now with administrators' salaries and perquisites.

At the same time, we must take care lest too easy and too great reliance be placed on higher salaries alone. Certainly one of our national weaknesses is to imagine that the socio-psychological deficiencies in any work situation can be corrected by paying more money. This we attempt

---

8. Theodore Caplow, The Academic Market (Basic Books, 1958).

to do in private industry and in the defense establishment. Every time I read that an Air Force plane has crashed because of mechanical defect, what I know about the Air Force suggests that the failure is probably attributable to a work group who didn't do their job because skill, pride, co-operation, or leadership were lacking. These are things that cannot be bought by pay raises and promotions alone—either in industry or the university.

As long as an administrator only tells the academician that he is an important fellow, while making his main play for enrollments, buildings, public acclaim, and professional athletics, the academician will be at least a cynic. And he may get the administrator fired. I once knew a business manager who became a president. He slipped and said he could buy professors for "a dime a dozen." His term of office lasted about a year thereafter. However complex and many-sided are the roots and dimensions of university morale (and the faculty is only a part of the membership), let us recognize that morale seems extremely important and that it can be measured. As Taylor has shown in a recent study of organization and the reputations of arts and science departments, of several variables investigated, morale alone bore a statistically significant relationship to departmental reputation.[9]

VI. Conclusion

Now, in conclusion, let me say as to the future of the U. S. university, I hope I have asked some of the right questions. I am reasonably certain of only five things which might warrant the name "conclusion." First, our changing universities may lose the very qualities and conditions indispensable to creative scholarship and to liberal education—for adults and youth alike. Second, if this is not to happen, more responsible and more effective faculty participation in university governments, at least, must be achieved. (One good place to begin usually is by overhauling outmoded or inadequate committee and consultative structures, and by reawakening in faculty and administration alike a sense of their common mission.) Third, we need continuously to alert our boards, our pub-

---

9. Richard Robb Taylor, Jr., The American University as a Behavioral System (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1958; available from University Microfilm, Ann Arbor, Michigan), p. 138.

lics, government, business, and many foundations to the indispensable conditions of university excellence. Fourth, a great deal more research is needed into the changing forms and processes of higher education; particular needs and methods, what works and how. With our present ignorance, we can scarcely expect more effective, more efficient educational planning and management. And fifth, in these and other matters of higher education, we must avoid that inflexibility or worship of the past which makes institutions incapable of adaptation, and therefore brings their demise. I thank you.

Summary of Discussion

The discussion revolved around the following topics: the disappearance of the scholarly professor; the abyss between administration and faculty of all parts of the university, and especially evening college and extension departments; the involvement of faculty in adult education programs; the stability and function of the university.

Mr. Demerath indicated that his reference to the disappearance of the scholarly professor stemmed from his suspicion that faculty tend to see themselves not as the "free" professor in the European sense—a linguist, a scientist—but rather as salaried employees.

Relative to the abyss between administration and faculty, Mr. Demerath suggested that it is necessary to get the faculty leadership committed to adult education. However, since evening college administration is so removed from day-to-day contact with them, it may find it difficult to identify the real as distinguished from the designated faculty leadership. Demerath suggested that the evening college administration must be careful not to give the impression that it is running a "service station," especially since the evening college is in many instances a second cousin of the rest of the university. Unfortunately, many faculty associate themselves with it largely for assistance at conferences, extra salary income, and potential income for the day department or school. It would be unfortunate if the university power elite came to look upon the evening college solely as a refuge of efficiency and a source of public relations experts.

The question was raised concerning the way in which to get prestige faculty committed to adult teaching. Demerath suggested that the prestige faculty member usually has little available time, may not need additional income, and would prefer to spend the bulk of his time with bright graduate students. One way to reach him may be through a commitment which he already possesses—the importance and dignity of good teaching. He would soon discover that the rewards of teaching adults are as great as if not greater than those which accrue to teaching adolescents.

Mr. Demerath felt that although the adult education program should be integral to the university, the other goals of the changing university should be estimated before too much expansion occurred in adult education.

Issues for Discussion

1. Demerath suggests that the university, as a complex system of stress, should be viewed as a living animal—adapting and relating to various environments. One of the major conflicts is the tension between the educator as a traditional scholar and contemplator versus the dynamic educator and innovator. The stress created by these conflicting roles is a matter of concern for the adult education dean. The way in which the academician resolves this stress (if, indeed, he does so at all) may affect significantly his interest in and willingness to participate in the adult education work of the institution.

> What can the adult education dean and his staff do to resolve this conflict in favor of the adult education division? To what extent does that imply that teaching in the adult division needs to be made not only more attractive financially, but more rewarding professionally (i.e., more interesting and challenging students and courses)? What patterns of recognition need to be instituted in order to secure a contribution from the resident faculty member? Are there administrative or organizational devices which might be of value (deputy department chairmen supervising the adult education program of the department, a vice-president for adult or continuing education, etc.), in affecting the faculty member's resolution of his conflict?

2. A pattern of stress exists between the "keepers of the various flames" in the context of a plurality of university goals. The adult education division is a relatively recent addition to the multiplicity of objectives of the American university, and therefore contributes its own share to the stressful environment within which the university must operate.

> Are there changes in the pattern of legitimacy which should occur in order that the adult education division can pursue its function with greater effectiveness (more power to the adult dean, more status to the staff and teachers, more administrative and financial support, etc.)? What <u>is</u> the relationship of the adult education division to the other parts of the university in the competition for resources? Is this the relationship which should obtain? Why?

3. Stress exists between the real educational function of university which is expressed largely by the faculty voice and the multitude of which Demerath calls "hoi-polloi" activities. To the extent that the faculty's voice becomes more influential, these activities will consume a less significant part of the faculty's and students' time and energy. Adult education deans and directors need to ask themselves where their own programs stand in relationship to sound university education as defined by a more influential faculty.

> To what extent would the faculty regard activities of the adult division as "hoi-polloi" activities? Which ones would they regard as such? Are these activities legitimate? What test does the adult division use to determine legitimacy of audience and/or program?

4. The trend toward growth in the academic bureaucracy has placed a strain on organizational policies and structures, thereby causing them to be basically unstable. This may mean that the role of the adult education division will be in flux for an indefinite period and that it will have to compete in an unclear environment with other administrative units for the easing of its administrative and organizational burdens.

> Are there advantages to be derived from the unstable character of the university's administrative organization (i.e., freedom to experiment in staffing, programming, etc.)? Should the adult education division share more equitably in the growth of the institutional bureaucracy? How can this be accomplished?

5. The university as a quasi-public or public institution is a focal point for society's fears, hopes, and aspirations. The adult education division should play a particularly significant role as the interpreter of the university to the community and vice versa.

> How should this role be defined? What implications does such a role have for the purposes and the organizational structure of the adult education divisions?

6. The problem of the adult education division of the university may be the reverse of the problem of the day divisions: getting adults to become scholars. This suggests the application of considerable imagination to the task of educating adults and may imply the abandonment of many ex-

citing modes of learning.

To what extent is existing knowledge about the adult as a learner being systematically applied to instruction and curriculum? What further research and investigation should be made by the staff of the adult education division in co-operation with appropriate sections of the university (registrar, sociology, and psychology departments, etc.) in order to expand our understanding and capacity to deal with the adult as a scholar?

7. Another conflict facing the faculty members is learning just that is expected of him from authority figures at various stages in his career.

Is there a role that the adult education dean can play in striving for the clarification of the career implications of teaching in the adult division? Is this not necessary both fo. the protection of the faculty member who devotes part of his energy to adult teaching as well as for the protection of the adult division itself?

G. H. D.

THE UNIVERSITY AND ITS EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT

by

Philip H. Coombs
Secretary, Fund for the Advancement of Education
New York

Even an amateur clairvoyant can plainly see that the next ten years will witness the most dynamic phase yet in the very dynamic career of American higher education.

Our colleges and universities have lately entered a new era of enormous change, provoked by explosive changes in their environment. The explosion of knowledge and of population, the explosion of political forces touched off by a worldwide revolution of human expectations, have confronted higher education with an unprecedented challenge and with unprecedented problems.

The challenge, simply stated, is to boost quantity and quality together—rapidly and by a large margin—and to achieve all this with a set of resources which, though large, will be limited. Meeting this challenge will require drastic, indeed revolutionary changes of method and program in the most conservative of all human institutions—the university. It will require also the wisdom and courage to respond affirmatively to some environmental pressures while stoutly resisting others.

Our obligation here, fortunately, is not to draw a blueprint of solutions but simply to identify some of the external forces which will help shape the future of American higher education in the years ahead.

It may be useful to distinguish between those forces that impinge on the demand side and those that affect the supply side of the higher education equation. Most notable on the demand side, of course, is the prospective increase in customers. Twice as many young people as now are expected to be seeking a college education within ten to twelve years. More important even than this quantitative dimension of demand is the qualitative dimension. Tomorrow's college students will live their adult lives in a world vastly more complex than their parents and grandparents, and

accordingly they will need a considerably better education. The youngsters in grade school today will spend part of their lives in the 21st Century, assuming that the generation which bore them has the wit to let them make it. Considering the great rush of unpredictable new developments and complexities in the last forty years and the accelerating pace of change, how can we possibly predict what life will be like for them in the year 2000? What kind of education will it take to prepare them to live such a life effectively? Obviously no one can know in detail, but we can be sure that it will require a better education than even the best models of the past provide.

This being the situation, it is evident that no university can aspire to give its students a "complete education" for their future—if indeed, it ever could. The prime obligation of the schools and colleges is to equip their students for a life of learning—to fit them with the skills, the appetite, the discrimination and the values which will enable them to pursue indefinitely a cumulative process of self development and self realization. To do less or to claim more would be a fraud. Without such preparation for future and continuous learning, an individual's schooling will soon become as stale as yesterday's newspaper.

This point, if valid, has profound implications for much of the activity now carried on in our schools and colleges under the banner of education. The Dean of a leading medical school noted recently that 90 per cent of the prescriptions written by doctors today could not have been written ten years ago. Recognition of this fact led his medical school to drop the old required course in pharmacology in favor of a more general course in how to upset or restore the chemical equilibrium of the human body. The medical students would have to keep abreast of the evolving details of pharmacology after they entered practice; there was no point wasting their precious time in medical school learning facts that soon would be obsolete. It is obvious to anyone who has inspected the curriculum lately that our schools and colleges and universities are still heavily laden with the equivalent of old-fashioned pharmaceutical courses which have a high rate of obsolescence. The need is for a more basic, more durable early education, coupled with abundant opportunities for continued learning.

Even the most enthusiastic proponents of adult education have probably grossly underestimated the need and the latent demand for system-

atic, rigorous educational programs outside and beyond the pale of what we think of as the formal educational system. There is evidence of this enormous demand in certain recent developments. For example, it has been estimated by Professor Harold Clark of Columbia University that American corporations are spending more each year on the education of their employees than the annual budgets of all colleges and universities combined. (Parenthetically, while the colleges and universities search frantically for sources of funds to expand and to pay adequate faculty salaries and while the debate over Federal support to education rages on unresolved, these rapidly-expanding educational activities of industry are 52 per cent financed at Federal expense through the corporate tax structure.)

Another striking evidence of the great demand for serious learning which is not being met by conventional university programs is the fact that 300,000 people are pulling themselves out of bed before 6:30 every morning to learn atomic physics from Professor Harvey White over Continental Classroom.

On the demand side of the equation there are numerous other pressures upon the colleges and universities. Some of the most important result from the new international position, risks and obligations of the United States. It has become urgent, for example, to liberate the undergraduate curriculum from its narrow preoccupation with Western Civilization if we are to have less parochial and more competent citizens and leaders in the future. Similarly there is need to train experts of all sorts for service in all kinds of lands, ones who as quickly as possible will make the Ugly American obsolete.

In recent years American universities, ready or not, have become deeply enmeshed in foreign programs. At present they have contracts totalling about $19 million, financed by the Federal Government, involving the use of American university personnel abroad and the training of foreign nationale here, in addition to substantial privately financed arrangements. Last year 382 formal international exchange programs were being conducted by 184 different American colleges and universities, and 43,000 foreign students were studying in the United States, 70 per cent of them from underdeveloped countries. This number will undoubtedly continue to grow.

The sharp increase in American international activities has imposed new obligations on almost every university department, but not least of all on those responsible for teaching foreign languages, one of our own underdeveloped areas. We have in this country at the moment only as many foreign language teachers as we have high schools and colleges, and since these teachers are unevenly distributed there are many schools that offer no opportunity whatsoever for learning a foreign language. Many of these teachers are poorly qualified, our foreign language instruction methods are seriously obsolete, and major languages spoken by large portions of the world's population—Chinese, Hindu, Arabic, Russian, and Japanese, for example—are taught in very few places to very few students. As a nation we are miserably equipped to converse with other peoples.

Another enormously expanded demand upon the universities is for research. The real needs are great in every field, though the actual demand is most persistent and best financed in the physical and biological sciences and in engineering. Humanistic research and creative activity subsists marginally on a very thin diet. Social science research is putting on a little weight.

Since 1940 government expenditures for research and development in the colleges and universities—95 per cent of it in the natural sciences—has multiplied 30 fold, from $15 million to $440 million. A ten minute discussion with the president of any major university makes it clear that this fabulous increase in sponsored research is hardly an unmixed blessing, but the demand is there and it cannot be denied.

From a long range point of view, one of the highest priority demands upon the universities—even if it is not always treated as such—is the obligation to strengthen and improve the entire educational structure of the nation—by expanding the supply of good school and college teachers, by helping to improve the techniques and effectiveness of education at all levels, and by providing aggressive leadership toward educational advancement. It is paradoxical—and potentially disastrous—that the colleges of education and the graduate schools of education which are most directly responsible for giving direction and strength to our total educational effort are often the least respected, the most financially neglected, and the least progressive members of the university family.

There are many other pressing environmental demands upon the universities, both serious and frivolous, including the demands for special services to special groups in the community, the pressures of professional societies to expand and upgrade offerings, and the pressures of non-professional occupational groups to lift themselves to professional status and respectability by establishing a special school and a special degree at the university. There are other important pressures, less evident to the public but acutely felt by the university, to maintain or achieve a respectable rank in the academic pecking-order, through expanding curriculum offerings, developing new graduate programs, building strong departments, attracting and turning out good students, and by elaborating certain academic forms and rituals best understood by anthropologists.

These, then, are some of the heavy demands which are being thrust upon the universities, the schools, and colleges, by powerful external forces beyond their control, demands which vary greatly in size and importance. They need not all be met, at least not in equal degree, but few can be entirely ignored. But as things now stand, our higher educational institutions are simply not ready to meet even the most urgent of these demands in the coming decade. They are handicapped both by too little strength and too great rigidity within and by insufficient support from without.

The principal bottlenecks to rendering greater and better educational services in the future, apart from internal rigidities, are money, facilities, and manpower, and the greatest of these is manpower. Here education encounters another set of powerful external forces. Our colleges and universities are both producers and consumers of talented manpower. As producers they are pressed by the great external demands already discussed. But as consumers they are at a serious competitive disadvantage in the very active market for the high quality manpower required for good teaching and good research. To an increasing degree they are obliged to bid not only against other institutions, which is rough enough, but against industry, government, and other users of top quality manpower whose demands are swelling and whose purse-strings are longer. If education's needs for good manpower are not met, they, our colleges and universities as developers of human talents will fall far short of meeting their demands and obligations, to the detriment of all.

Higher faculty salaries are an indispensible part of the solution, but more money and higher salaries alone will not solve the problem because there is a physical limit on the supply of trained manpower that will be available to meet all the competing needs. It will be necessary for the colleges and universities, and the schools as well, to find ways to enable their best teachers to be more productive. In short, we must manage to serve more students and to improve the quality of education at every point with relatively fewer teachers—but much better paid and better utilized teachers—than we now think we need. Far-reaching innovations and changes will be required—such as television, as a means of extending the reach of great teachers, more emphasis upon independent study, and greater use of assistants to remove from well-trained teachers the housekeeping and clerical burdens which now waste their valuable time and talents.

Even with considerable improvements in internal efficiency, our colleges and universities will require far greater financial support to do their job well, on the order of three times as much ten or twelve years hence as now. As a nation we can well afford this increased investment in the education of the next generation of adults; it can be financed with a small fraction of the increase in national output during the same period. The one thing we cannot afford is to invest too little in education.

The financial problem is not whether we can afford good education but whether we can find effective means for channeling enough of the national income into the support of education. In this matter our educational institutions are heavily dependent upon external help; they cannot solve their financial problems alone. Here again they are up against stiff external competition from other claimants for funds—highways, hospitals, missiles, and the like, and up against the well known reluctance of people to part with their money.

We cannot expect today's pattern of educational finance to meet the expanded future needs. More funds will certainly have to come from all the present sources—private donors, state and local governments, and the students themselves, though the present proportions may have to change. In view of the increasing financial difficulties and other growing demands on state and local governments, in view of the short-comings of their fiscal structures and the ability of the Federal government to

Greek and Roman society and the other ancient civilizations whose creative works we still revere.

The question for us is where we go from here, from this comparatively high level of material well-being which embraces not a tiny fraction but a considerable majority of our whole population. Will the brute forces of sheer hedonism and conformity which are certainly running strong convert us into a glob of well-fed idle spectators? Will we become a bunch of standardized human vegetables sitting on our fat sofas before T.V. sets watching the good guy shoot the bad guy, or the Yankees beat the Senators? Or, are we on the verge of a great explosion of human creativity which will carry man to higher levels of performance and excellence than was ever dreamed of? In short, will we as a civilization, well-housed and well-fed, now be propelled by the highest value of our inherited culture, or by the lowest appetites?

Much of the answer lies within our universities, for they are the principal custodians of these great values and of the means for projecting them far into the future. Here is one task, one obligation, for which more money is clearly not the solution. The solution, if there is to be one, must come from deep sources of conviction in the faculties, the administrations, and the trustees of our universities. It must come from the wisdom, courage, and skill they exercise in steering a course for higher learning amidst these powerful external pressures, without being consumed or utterly corrupted in the process. In the long run our educational institutions have more to do than anyone else with shaping the external forces which in turn will shape them.

Summary of Discussion

Mr. Lorenz Adolfson, Mr. Coombs' interrogator, observed that there appears to be a changing climate of opinion about education generally and about higher education specifically. For example, the Wisconsin legislature seems to have a growing feeling that since adults are employed, they should be able to pay for their own education. Their education should not be subsidized by the state. Is there a similar attitude among university administrations toward adult education?

Mr. Coombs responded that university administrations generally don't seem to worry much about adult education—things run smoothly in adult education divisions. However, the general conception of adult education fails to take into account "invisible" educational systems—industry is extending itself in education (one participant observed that there are presently 3,000 educational directors in industry beyond the trade level). The military service have 23 extension centers serving over one million servicemen. Even the yacht clubs are in the education business. Mr. Coombs inquired as to what might be done to co-ordinate these various educational enterprises. He noted that there appears to be a "groundswell of increasing public concern" with education from the PTA to the federal government. Unfortunately, this is accompanied by a general lack of agreement and articulation among spokesmen for the field when they come to Washington. Coombs felt that before long this groundswell of interest and concern will spread from elementary and secondary to higher education.

Issues for Discussion

1. With the parallel explosion of both knowledge and population, universities are going to be faced with enormous change. It can be assumed that this explosion will have its effect on the adult education division of the university both in terms of the share of the total resources of the university which become available to the adult education division and the response which the adult education division makes to demands on its own resources.

   What implications does the explosion of knowledge and population have for the curriculum and clientele of the adult education division? Will the adult division's objectives be modified? In what way? How can the adult education division anticipate the nature of the changes that will occur?

2. If, as a result of the expansion of knowledge and population, it is true that the university cannot aspire to provide a "complete education" but needs to prepare the student for a "cumulative process of self-development,"

> what should be the role of the adult education division in the continuing education of the student?

3. The increased flexibility in educational programming and the pruning of obsolete and useless courses from the curriculum which Coombs sees as necessary for the effective use of the university's limited resources can find significant expression in the adult education division.

> Is it possible that new and experimental offerings can be tested in the adult education division before finding their way into the regular curriculum of the institution? How could this be worked out?

4. There is a tremendous demand for serious learning abroad in addition to the formal educational offerings of colleges and universities. In some instances, the tremendous quantities of time, energy, and money that are being invested by other agencies—corporations, public agencies, etc.—might better be channelled through the adult education facilities of the university. This suggests that some attempt be made to inventory these activities and programs and then, in relation to the over-all goals and purposes of the program and the resources available, to determine which of the activities would be appropriate for the division to attempt.

> In other words, is there a hierarchy of activities or programs in which the adult education division should engage? If there is, what criteria should be used to rank the activities in terms of their importance or validity? Who makes up these criteria? Who should make up the criteria?

5. The tremendous demand for knowledge about foreign affairs, the need for development in the teaching of foreign languages both western and eastern, and active involvement of universities in foreign educational programs suggest that the whole field of foreign affairs as an important one for adult education divisions to concern themselves about. A number of adult divisions are sponsoring trips abroad for groups of adults, teaching foreign languages in new and exciting ways, etc. Some coherent ap-

proaches need to be developed for confronting educational opportunities in these areas.

What is the responsibility of the adult education division to educate its clientele in aspects of international affairs? How is such a responsibility best fulfilled?

6. One of the most significant and far reaching impacts on the higher educational institutions in the last decade has been the expansion of corporate and government research. Although this has been most dramatic in the physical and biological sciences, there is increasing evidence that effects are being felt in the social sciences as well.

To what extent is the appropriate agency for the interpretation of this research to the layman the adult education division of the university? Should there be a more systematic canvassing of the university efforts in research to uncover those aspects of it which the public <u>should</u> know? Does the impact of this massive research effort provide another competing source for the facilities and resources of the university, one which will usually get higher priority than adult teaching? What should be the posture of the adult division under such circumstances?

7. Other pressures relate to the demands for special services from special groups in the community and from professional societies who want the professional schools to expand and to upgrade offerings. In addition there are both internal and external pressures on the university to maintain a respectable rank in the academic pecking order.

To what extent will (or does) the adult division become the recipient of such miscellaneous demands funnelled to it by disinterested administrators and faculty members? What positive role should the adult division assume in assisting such groups to fulfil their educational objectives? What negative position should the adult division take in attempting to resist the imposition of new obligations on its limited resources?

G. H. D.

A LOOK AT THE TOTAL EDUCATIONAL SCENE

by

Thomas R. McConnell

I

As one looks toward the future, he finds little reason to believe that American higher education as a whole will become more selective. The reasons are set forth succinctly in the report of the Educational Policies Commission on Higher Education in a Decade of Decision:

"In the first place, the number of college-age youth will increase substantially; college enrollment will grow even if only the present proportion of that age group continues to enrol. In the second place, the pressures to enrol and to remain in college longer are increasing. It is probable that a larger proportion of qualified youth will seek college and will complete programs for which they matriculate. And, in the third place, colleges and universities themselves are under pressure to develop new programs in both general and technical education to meet economic and social needs as well as students and parental demands. New and improved college programs will attract more youth."

There are those who would stubbornly resist this trend by curtailing educational opportunity for all but a select group of students. In their view, it would be salutary rather than disastrous if, when the deluge hits, we simply did not have enough places to go around, and so had to turn away the unfit and the incompetent, i.e., unfit according to their standards or their conception of education.

Writing in The Key Reporter, a former instructor in English in two state universities declared:

"If what I have seen and heard is at all representative of what is going on elsewhere outside the sheltering walls of the Ivy-League . . . then the simple fact remains that our state colleges and universities are being overcrowded today by students who are absolutely unfit to be there, and whose presence constitutes an absurd and intolerable situation, frus-

trating and futile to them and their teachers alike, and one which bids well to make our higher education a laughing stock in the eyes of foreign nations. . . . The path of duty and expediency for all of these schools is unmistakable: putting aside the cant of 'democracy in education,' to stem this frightening tide of mediocrity by finding means of tightening their admission requirements without delay."

And I am sure you remember the blunt condemnation of Professor Douglas Bush, the distinguished Harvard literary scholar, who said:

"Educational history of the past fifty years seems to furnish a pretty good forecast of the bad effects of the deluge that will come along in the next fifteen. When we survey the results, in school, college, and university of the huge increases in the student body during the last half-century, we may conclude that the principle of education for all leads ultimately to education for none. Mass education is inevitably pulled down to the level of the mass mind it helps to create, and we have a crowd of people —"The Lonely Crowd"—who think and feel only as other people think and feel. . . . The rising flood of students is very much like the barbarian invasions of the early Middle Ages, and then the process of education took a thousand years. . . . As things are, we have an army of misfits, who lower educational standards and increase expense, and no branch of a university staff has grown more rapidly of late years than the psychiatric squad."

In sharp contrast, the late Lotus D. Coffman, perhaps the greatest of the state university presidents, stated the purpose of a state university in bold and uncompromising, in startling and, to some, shocking terms, in terms, however, that have survived as the best expression, not only of the spirit of the state university, but of all American education. He said:

"Growing out of and flourishing in the very soil of democracy, supported and maintained by all the people, committed unequivocally to a more highly trained intelligence of the masses, believing that the road to intellectual opportunity should never be closed, maintaining a wide-open door for all those . . . willing to make the trial, the state universities, nevertheless, have held in common with the private universities a high sense of obligation with regard to the necessity of advancing human knowledge, of promoting research, and of training those of superior gifts

for special leadership . . .

"The state universities hold that there is no intellectual service too undignified for them to perform. They maintain that every time they lift the intellectual level of any class or group, they enhance the intellectual opportunities of every class or group.

"They maintain that every time they teach any group or class the importance of relying on tested information as the basis for action, they advance the cause of science. They maintain that every time they teach any class or group in society to live better, to read more and to read more discriminatively, to do any of the things which stimulate intellectual or aesthetic interest or effort, they thereby enlarge the group's outlook on life, make its members more cosmopolitan in their points of view and improve their standard of living.

"Such services as these the state universities would not shrink from performing—indeed would seek to perform."

We justify the generous extension of educational opportunity in this country on two grounds: first, that in a democratic society, every person should have the opportunity to develop whatever excellence is in him; and, second, that the public welfare requires the fullest realization and utilization of human talent. The benefit to society of educating students with a wide range of ability is often weighed in economic terms. Thus President John Gardner of the Carnegie Corporation has pointed out that in a complex industrial order, many echelons of ability, training, and skill are essential. "In the spotlight," he said recently, "are the great designers, inventors, and innovators, but back of them stands an immensely able corps of technically brilliant men to put their discoveries in operation. And back of these men stretch rank after rank of highly trained technicians and mechanics. Only in recent years have we learned that much of the strength and vitality of American technology is this 'training in depth.' Several of the leading countries of the world can match us for brilliant men at the top. But we outstrip most of them in competent, excellently trained second, third, fourth, and fifth level workers."

But in a democracy "training in depth" is important for more than economic reasons. It is equally essential if ordinary citizens are to consolidate in civic affairs and in life generally the leadership of men of high intelligence, unusual sensibility, and outstanding idealism. This, presum-

ably, was what Sir Richard Livingstone had in mind when he described the great contribution of Oxford and Cambridge before they abandoned, for the most part, the Pass degree, and limited their students mainly to those competent to read for the specialized and intellectually demanding honors degree.

"No one will understand the British universities," said Sir Richard, "who does not realize that they aim less at the training of experts or even the advancement of knowledge than at educating the ordinary student, who will never be a pure scholar, but who as a statesman or civil servant, in a profession or in private life, will hereafter be among the leaders of the community, directing the policy or moulding the spirit of the nation. This is true of both Oxford and Cambridge. Their influence on national life has been less through the eminent scholars whom they have produced —the English are suspicious of professors—than through the innumerable men whom they have sent out to do the ordinary work of life, with some knowledge of some branch of literature, or learning, a sense of great ideals and achievements, a touch at least of the wisdom, disinterestedness and inspiration which belong to the world of the mind and the spirit."

Before looking too far into what some people believe to be the appalling future of higher education, we may ask how far into the pool of human ability our colleges and universities now reach. Among the projects of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley are several investigations of the diversity of student characteristics within and among institutions of various types, at undergraduate and more advanced levels. We have attempted, first of all, to map the "intellectual surface" of American higher education at the point of intake. For this purpose we drew a fairly adequate representative sample of the more than 1800 post-high school institutions in the country. We secured the scores of the entering classes of 1952 on whatever tests of academic aptitude had been administered and equated them to scores on the 1952 form of the Psychological Examination of the American Council on Education.

We were interested, first of all, in comparing the ability of the student population of higher education in the United States with the degree of selection proposed in the reports of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education and the Commission on Financing Higher Education. You will remember that President Truman's Commission took the posi-

tion that half of the age group were worthy of two years of education beyond the high school, and a third were capable of completing a four-year undergraduate curriculum. The Commission on Financing Higher Education was more conservative. It suggested that college attendance should be limited to the upper quarter of the population.

Actually, as I am sure you know, we have gone beyond the limits set up by either of these bodies so far as admitting students to college is concerned. Our sample of 200 institutions accounted for more than 60,000 entrants. Our best estimate is that 32 per cent, or nearly one-third, came from the lower half of high school graduates in ability. High school graduates, of course, score higher than the age group as a whole. Our estimate is that between 82 and 88 per cent of college entrants in the United States in 1952 were from the upper half of the general population in ability.

We have more detailed information about college-going in the state of Minnesota, including separate data for men and women. Thirty-two per cent of the male freshmen of 1952 in Minnesota institutions were drawn from the bottom half of the distribution of ability of high school seniors; 40 per cent were drawn from the top quarter, and the remaining 28 per cent from the next-to-top quarter. The women were somewhat more highly selected.

The variation among institutions in the ability of their entrants is as striking as the spread of ability in the student body of higher education as a whole. Excluding Negro colleges, the mean ability among institutions in our national sample varied from 72 at the bottom to 142 at the top. The mean score of all freshmen in the sample was 104. For the statistically minded, I might indicate that the range of mean scores corresponded to 2-1/2 standard deviations of individual scores in the total sample.

It is interesting to note the variation among supposedly similar institutions. The range of average freshman scores among a group of Protestant and private liberal arts colleges in the North Central area was from 90 to 123. The means of a group of southern Protestant liberal arts colleges varied from 72 to 123. In one of the states we are studying, the average freshman score in the most selective institution was a full standard deviation above that in the least selective institution. That is, approximately 84 per cent of the individual scores in the first institution were

above the average score in the second.

So great is the range of average student ability from one liberal arts college to another that although they may be similar, not only in structure, but also in professed purposes and in curricular organization, the resemblance is superficial indeed. In the intellectual demands they can make on their student bodies, they are most dissimilar.

While we may become reconciled to this wide range of academic ability in higher education, and to a wide range of academic excellence among higher institutions, we should be seriously concerned about matching students and institutions, or at least matching students with appropriate educational opportunities and demands. In this process, we should give particular attention to exceptionally able students.

We have all but attained in this country the ideal of universal secondary education. But almost any observer of American high schools would have had to conclude, even before the Conant report, that we have been much more successful in extending educational opportunity than in individualizing it. Now, before we have managed to individualize secondary education, the same problem of reaching the individual in the mass confronts us insistently in higher education. The problem of the high school has become the problem of the college. Let no one gainsay the danger that in educating the many we may fail to make full use of exceptional talent, and thus suffer an irreparable loss.

Too often in this country we have coupled the extension of educational opportunity to the masses with a false egalitarianism. It is almost as if we wanted to erase any marks of exceptional talent, to impose a spurious uniformity and a deadening mediocrity, to hide the superior behind a false facade of equality. Surely we can learn to recognize exceptional ability without disdaining or deprecating lesser capacity and accomplishment. Any charge that this is special pleading for an intellectual elite, Dael Wolfle has said, misses the point. "The democratic ideal," he wrote, "is one of equal opportunity; within that ideal it is both individually advantageous and socially desirable for each person to make the best possible use of his talents. But equal opportunity does not mean equal accomplishment or identical use. . . . Along with moral and legal and political equality goes respect for the proper use of excellence."

Failure of any significant group of citizens to measure up to their potentialities is a serious loss in a democratic society. But the failure to capitalize the talents of the relatively few who are capable of the highest levels of accomplishment in scholarship, in research, in university teaching, in industrial management, and in civic, cultural, religious, and intellectual leadership is a failure which a free society cannot long sustain.

But must exceptional academic accomplishment be sacrificed to mass educational standards? I do not think so. I agree with Dr. John Gardner when he said:

"The demand to educate everyone up to the level of his ability and the demand for excellence in higher education are not incompatible. We must honor both goals. We must seek excellence in a context of concern for all. If we are really serious about equality of opportunity, then we should be infinitely serious about individual differences; because what constitutes opportunity for one man is a stone wall for the next man. Individuals differ vastly from one another, and they differ in innumerable ways. If we are to do justice to the individual, we must seek the kind of education which will open his eyes, stimulate his mind, and unlock his potentialities. There is no one formula for this."

To accomplish this goal, we will have to provide numerous kinds and levels of education and different kinds and levels of institutions. We will have to differentiate the educational process, both among and within institutions, much more effectively than we have yet managed to do. As one looks at this problem, he finds numerous impediments to the sensible pairing of students with institutions and curricula. He also finds that many factors militate against the development of differences among institutions.

II

In the Center for the Study of Higher Education, we have been exploring some of the demographic aspects of the functioning of higher education, including the relationship of certain factors to the proportion of college-age youth in college, state by state. One of our hypotheses was that there should be a positive relationship between the range or diversity of offerings within all public higher institutions in a state, and the proportion of the age group actually in college. The data, however, did not support the hypothesis.

The two factors of those we studied that were significantly related to college-going were (1) the number of institutions per 1000 youth of college age, and (2) gross expenditures for higher education from all sources, public and private, in relation to per capita income. The sheer availability of higher education in thus more significant than diversity of educational opportunities in attracting students. The lack of relationship between college-going and educational diversity suggests that, in general, young people do not go to college for particular types of educational opportunity. They go, in a large number of cases, at least, because it is the thing to do.

Dean J. G. Darley has interpreted the situation somewhat differently, as follows:

"Parents and students will buy, so far as they can afford it, the education that approximates their quality perceptions and concepts of what education can do for them. Since we carefully—almost religiously—refrain from publishing a consumer's guide for education, parents and students are left to form their own standards of value. Our institutional halos, our over-all imputation of quality, or our mere proximity bring us our students, rather than what we say we are doing in our institutions. Our diversity, as we define it, may be more apparent to us than to our customers and clientele, and less accessible to them than we believe."

Social prestige and acceptability are also powerful determinents of educational choices. This is reflected, for example, in the disproportionate distribution of junior college students between transfer and terminal curricula.

Presumably one of the unique purposes of the junior college is to prepare students for technical occupations or the semi-professions, and to offer a general education adapted to the abilities and needs of students who will not transfer to four-year institutions. In the course of his study of 70 junior colleges in 15 states, conducted under the auspices of the Center, Dr. Leland Medsker has discovered, however, that in many of these institutions, terminal curricula do not exist, and if available, often attract relatively few students. He found that in the fall of 1956 only a third of the students in the 70 junior colleges had enrolled in formal terminal programs or had chosen a sequence of courses with an immediate vocational objective in mind. He also found that although two-thirds of

the students were enrolled in transfer curricula, only one-third of the students who had enrolled in the fall of 1952 had actually transferred to four-year institutions. These data are for all institutions together; there were wide variations from junior college to junior college.

Many junior college administrators reported that students aren't interested in terminal programs. Said one administrator in a state widely known for its extensive junior college system but in which only a very small percentage of day students are enrolled in vocational curricula, "It just doesn't seem to be a part of our culture for students to enrol for a vocational program in college. To them and their parents, 'college is college.'" And, I think we may say, "college means a four-year college."

Educational prestige lies with the four-year institutions. Students, parents, chambers of commerce, and, I suspect, a large proportion of junior college teachers find their greatest satisfaction in an institution that mirrors the first two years of the four-year college, or better, the lower division of the state university. Considering the relatively small number of students who complete terminal programs, and the relatively high mortality in transfer curricula, one might ask whether the junior colleges are in fact performing very differently from four-year institutions which, for the most part, put all students through a relatively common preparatory curriculum, using it as a means of sifting out the small number capable of attaining a baccalaureate degree.

There seems to be a kind of "pecking order" of public prestige (and faculty valuation) among higher institutions. I suspect that at this moment, with the prospect of soaring enrollments, a good many junior colleges harbor the desire to become four-year institutions. State colleges are changing their names to universities in epidemic proportions. (And in many instances, the change seems appropriate.) In these new universities, faculties are almost certainly striving to approximate the educational values they associate with some stereotype, some standard of excellence or reputation. If the faculty of the preferred institution engages in research (or purports to do so) then the aspiring faculty will press for time, facilities, and rewards for research. If the model multiplies courses and specializations, the ambitious institution does the same, often at the cost of general educational enfeeblement. If the prototype has professional schools, the advancing institution tends to establish

many of the same professional divisions whether the state needs them or not.

If one looks carefully at our presumably diverse institutions, he will discover that many observers have confused diversity with geographic dispersion. He will find that many of these institutions are striving to be alike rather than different. As a result, as Dean Darley observed in the course of our explorations of the problem of diversity, we tend to have replication, if only by a pale reflection of the model, rather than diversification.

California has attempted to maintain a tri-partite system of higher education composed of the University of California with its eight campuses, state colleges, and more than 60 junior colleges. On the recommendation of two state surveys, the three groups of institutions have accepted both common and differential functions. But in spite of continuing studies of purposes and programs, and of voluntary efforts at co-ordination, it has proved to be difficult to maintain differential functions between the state colleges and the University. One of the reasons is, of course, that the state colleges feel that to be different in effect means to be inferior.

A diversified educational program not only requires differentiation among institutions; it also requires differentiation within particular institutions. In states where differentiation among institutions is minimal, and this includes a growing number of states, internal differentiation should be maximal. Yet in most complex institutions something like an educational caste system exists in which various disciplines or divisions are arranged in a scale of social or intellectual acceptability. The poles may differ from one institution to another, but these will be familiar to most of you: humanistic-scientific (or is the order changing now?); liberal-vocational; pure-applied; specialized-general; learned professions-humble occupations. There is another scale in which the steps are either levels or types of student ability. Thus, at the University of Minnesota there is still a stigma attached to being a student or faculty member in the two-year General College, which will accept students whose academic ability is too low for admission to some of the University's other schools and colleges. In many universities and liberal arts colleges, musical and artistic talent and performance are considered in-

ferior to verbal aptitude and expression. The latter are thought to be associated with the higher mental processes, and the former with something lower.

All this is unfortunate in American education and American society. Dr. John Gardner has declared that we cannot hope to create or have an adequately diversified system of higher education unless we "recognize that each of the different kinds of institutions has its significant part to play in creating the total pattern, and that each should be allowed to play its role with honor and recognition." And he added, "We must develop a point of view that permits each kind of institution to achieve excellence in terms of its own objectives."

In order to accomplish this goal we will have to change public prejudices. And remembering the hierarchies of esteem within educational institutions themselves, we might well try to change faculty attitudes. Both tasks may prove to be beyond known techniques of social engineering.

III

Because the vanguard is on their doorsteps, it is natural for colleges and universities to be preoccupied with the immediate task of providing enough places for the throng of students to come. Administrators are worried about securing sufficient funds for buildings and operations, and now and then they become concerned about finding enough qualified faculty members. These are the immediate problems the educational crisis presents.

But beneath and beyond these pressing matters, there is the more fundamental and persistent problem of defining the central purposes of education, and of distinguishing between means and ends in the educational process. This is the problem for which all of us are responsible but which most of us shun.

Surely as a result of learning, our intellectual processes should become increasingly disciplined, our sensibilities should become more refined, our values should become governed by both sensibilities and intellect, and our understandings and ideals should more directly guide and stimulate our behavior.

I shall be content with but two observations on the means to these

ends. The first is that no one subject or discipline or field of knowledge is sufficient to produce the intellectually sophisticated or the cultivated man. To see life steadily and to see it whole is much more difficult today than it has ever been before. It requires access to many more avenues of experience and truth than in other times, and it places greater demands on synthesis and imagination than the past has called for. Yet scholars in various fields often have not been hesitant to assert that their disciplines alone were capable of providing a way of life. Humanists have not been unduly modest in this regard; in fact, they often seem to have arrogated to themselves the essence of a liberal education. Now some scientists seem willing to displace the humanists in carrying almost the entire burden of civilizing the young.

My second observation is that how one learns is as important as what he studies. Mere exposure to a discipline gives no assurance that its potential values will be acquired.

The human mind is versatile and powerful. But it is also peculiarly fallible. It has a disconcerting proclivity to particularize its learning, to escape prejudice in one domain and surrender to it in another, to think rigorously now and loosely then. By the nature of his specialization, the scientist is schooled in precision. He is trained to observe carefully; gather sufficient evidence, suspending judgment the meanwhile; and generalize cautiously. The competent scientist does all these things <u>in science</u>. But unfortunately this is no assurance that he will honor the same canons when he steps outside his own discipline. Now and then mental training is pervasive, but it is likely to be much more limited. Sir Richard Livingstone has observed, a little sadly, that "in his own field the scientist is no doubt rigidly objective; he collects the facts relevant to a problem and makes no conclusions that the facts do not justify. But, outside his subject and where his emotions are involved, he is no more objective or less liable to prejudice than the rest of us." Yet, proud of his virtues, the scientist may be unaware of his limitations. Under the title of "Scientists with Half-Closed Minds," a writer in <u>Harper's</u> for November observed that "A scientist is—perhaps fortunately—only capable of scientific thought for a small portion of his time. At other times he usually allows his wishes, fears, and habits to shape his convictions."

Stung, perhaps, by the common notion that scientists are narrow

specialists who are uninterested in artistic things, one of the scientists I have already quoted has pointed out that "the most abstract of them—the theoretical physicists—are, as a rule, highly musical." But there is no assurance that musical ability or the experience of natural beauty will invoke the finer sensibilities. One looks on in dismay while a scientist with musical talent joins with other scientists and laymen in forcing a distinguished and devoted physicist from government service.

The moral of this discussion is, I think, inescapable. It is that the potential values of a subject may elude both the general students and the specialist, though, no doubt, in different degree. The high school or college students may gain from his required courses in science neither an understanding of what science is and how it develops, nor the ghost of a scientific attitude. And, as we have been told, the specialist may be a scientist only part of the time, with only part of his mind, and may act as a true scientist only during a part of his career.

If science does not automatically make men scientific in spirit, neither do the humanities inevitably make them humane. Humanists are not infrequently arrogant. They are often disdainful of lesser men and highly conscious of their superiority. This kind of heightened self-regard or intellectual self-consciousness is almost certain to dispose an individual to arrogate to himself more wisdom than he could possibly possess. In this man, too, the finer sensibilities lie fallow.

Yet, despite this penchant for intellectual snobbishness, humanists have kept man—individual, personal man—at the center of their concern. Sometimes, however, this emphasis on the individual has seemed to take him out of society, or at any rate to rest on the assumption that society is merely the sum of its individual parts. This fallacy—for I think the evidence shows clearly that it is a fallacy—led Irving Babbitt and his disciples to make a sharp distinction between humanism and humanitarianism. They profoundly distrusted social reform as a means of improving man's lot and declared that individual salvation was the only means of social amelioration.

Surely, this distinction between humanism and humanitarianism, between man's fate and the social conditions under which he lives, draws the line too sharply. Who today would say that the problem of juvenile delinquency can be solved by working on the individual without changing

the social factors that have bred misconduct? Human behavior is a resultant of the interaction of an individual with his environment. Man and his culture are inseparable.

And so the resolution of individuality and sociality becomes the province, in turn, of the social sciences. These disciplines deal primarily with collective man—man in his social relations in the manifold groups large and small which he helps to mold or in which he is caught up. The social sciences are concerned with social structure and organization, and with the processes of association. The pathology of the social sciences is an obsession with the primacy of organization, with the subjection, of individual choice and will to group control. This subjection is often the goal, or at any rate, the result, of what the dynamicists call the group process.

Scientists, conscious of the short time man may have to control the instruments of destruction he has perfected, tend to be impatient with the relatively slow methods of education. In a spirit of urgency, it is easy to turn to organization—even to imposed organization—to close the gap between education and catastrophy. This seems to be the attitude which led one scientist recently to say:

"Man as a biological species is in danger of going down the drain of natural history as an unsuccessful experiment—despite all the saints and philosophers, poets, artists, humanitarians, and scientists he has produced. In the face of this danger, I can see no answer in the development of more perfect individuals. . . . Being a scientist, I cannot see the fate of mankind in our time as depending on spiritual heights reached by a few individuals. The crisis mankind is facing now will not be resolved by increased capacity of individuals for intellectual achievement or artistic creation, but only by the advancement of human society from its traditional semi-barbaric state to one adequate for survival in the scientific age."

In spite of the possibility that man may go down the drain of natural history, we have little chance, impatient scientists to the contrary, of imposing a more perfect form of international organization on an unwilling or apathetic people. A more effective international organization does not have to wait, of course, on complete consensus. But it will have to wait, unless we surrender our most cherished democratic hopes, on

wider intelligence, nobler sentiments, a deeper sense of personal responsibility, and a more impelling will to act.

But there is no reason to believe that the study of the social sciences will automatically produce these outcomes. We have gone through a period in which in an effort to become objective, social scientists have abjured values, and they have especially declined to take responsibility for leading students to civic action. The result, according to Justice Arthur T. Vanderbilt, in his report on pre-legal education, is that "the most serious complaint against the way the social sciences and government in particular are taught is that the men from the colleges do not come to law school with any abiding convictions as to their personal responsibilities as citizens. What William James has termed 'that lonely kind of courage, civil courage' seem to be particularly lonely in college graduates." You will remember too, that studies of the civic behavior of college graduates have revealed that, on the whole, they seldom participate in the political process except by voting; and they exhibit a general lack of participation and interest in community affairs. In a word, they are apathetic about their civic responsibilities.

I have searched for investigations in which education in the social studies has been evaluated in terms of civic behavior, but I have found few. I suspect that the dearth of these evaluations reflects, not only a belief that the schools should not or cannot take responsibility for behavior, but also an unwillingness to come to terms with what is involved in the transmutation of intelligence into action. This process is obviously not that of conditioning men in pre-chosen ways. It is not that of sacrificing intellect to passion. "What is required," Professor Earl S. Johnson of the University of Chicago has said, "is something akin to the rule of goodness under the regency of wisdom in which the passions are instructed and disciplined by reason and reason is informed by passion. In a world which is disposed to overvalue science, there is much fear of the unthinking man. I should be equally fearful of the unfeeling man."

I think we may summarize these observations by saying that educational experience shows conclusively that no one discipline, no one approach to man, no single form of intellectual effort, not the sciences or scientists alone, will reveal all we need to know, prepare us for all we need to do. "No education is adequate," said Sir Richard Livingstone,

"unless it awakens the sense of value, in its various incarnations, unless it achieves a balance between the analytic intellect and something higher, and reveals the existence of realities beyond criticism, analysis, and even understanding; this is the sphere of the higher life of men."

The process of intellectual development is a subtle one. Objective in one domain, the mind may be prejudiced in another. Sophisticated in a given area, it may be naive in a different one. Open to new data in one case, it may be closed to evidence in another. It may be critical in one subject and irresponsible in an unrelated field. Cautious in one realm, it may be dogmatic in another. Humble in the face of the great unknowns in its special discipline, it may be arrogant though ignorant in another sphere.

Now and then, one finds a mind rich in intellectual virtues and empty of most intellectual vices. This kind of mind, unfortunately, is scarce. It emerges just often enough to give us a glimpse of how finely the instrument can be tuned, and to provide a model of pervasive excellence toward which we may strive. No discipline has any monopoly on the finely tuned mind, and no one discipline is enough to give the mind its proper form. No discipline yields its strength to casual contact. It will release its power only when the learner enters into its essential spirit and employs its peculiar methods in coming to terms with life and the world.

Summary of Discussion

Dean John Diekhoff, Mr. McConnell's interrogator, observed that one of the implications of the rising enrollment of "normal age" students in the college classroom is that the evening college may shortly have a different function. The "belated student" may one day disappear, so that the adult education program's function may be to deal with people who have already completed a university education.

Mr. McConnell, while recognizing that there will be larger day divisions with the enormously expanding enrollments, observed that it is equally certain that the adult education divisions will also continue to expand. Further, the failure of the liberal arts college to provide a liberal education leaves the adult education with important work to do.

In response to a question concerning the percentage of high school students who merit college education, McConnell indicated that the Truman Commission reported that one-half should have two years of college, and that one-third should have four. The question of whether or not colleges should let down their bars in the face of rising enrollment was raised. Mr. McConnell felt that private universities ought not to lower their requirements; and that state universities ought to be able to toe the line by shunting away the chaff off to other institutions—possibly the junior colleges. McConnell's remarks stemmed from his belief that the university has opportunities within the next fifteen years to become more of a university than has been possible in the last fifteen years. Particularly important in an industrial society, he felt, is a citizenry educated in depth, not just an education intellectual elite.

Issues for Discussion

1. The anticipated expansion in the demand for admission to universities and colleges is viewed by some educators as an opportunity to raise the qualitative level of the student body. Others see it as the responsibility of the university to increase and extend its resources to meet the demand. McConnell suggests that it is possible to pursue excellence at the same time that "everyone is educated up to the limit of his ability."

   As the university struggles with the pressures created by a growing demand for its resources, what will be the role of the evening college? Will the university withdraw its re-

sources from the evening college, or will it employ the evening college as an expedient device for siphoning off the less able? What can the evening college do to insure access to the resources of the university on an equal basis with the day divisions?

2. The fact that students appear to attend college less for a particular program than because they think it is the thing to do suggests that higher institutions can exercise greater control over the content of the curriculum than many of them have in the past. Some concern needs to be evidenced for motivations of adults in pursuing university level education.

Do adults come to school because it is the thing to do, for therapeutic reasons, because they are highly motivated in the fulfillment of a clearly defined personal or professional objective, or all of these? Are there implications here for the leadership which the institutions must take with regard to credits, degrees, vocational courses in the evening?

3. Mr. McConnell reported on research which indicates a lack of terminal curricula existing among junior colleges. The image of students and parents of college does not embrace a vocational objective for the first two years.

Does this suggest that the evening college will increasingly serve a role as a terminus? What is implied about the vocational nature of the offering of the evening college as against the liberal or general offering?

4. The full-fledged university generally offers itself and is accepted as a model by state teachers colleges, junior colleges, and liberal arts colleges. There is an "academic pecking order" which both the public and the faculty employ in evaluating higher institutions.

To what extent is the image of the evening college formed by the desire of the day school to move up in the "academic pecking order"? What alternative image might the evening college hold of itself? To what extent is the evening college adopting this daytime image as a form of protective coloration? That is, does it feel that the more like the day it is, the more acceptance it will receive? Is this true?

5. McConnell suggests that 1) no one discipline will produce the intellectual or cultivated man, and that 2) how one learns is as important as what one learns. The interdependence of one discipline on another for creating the educated man is as great as the dependence of one man on another for existence.

> Is there a leadership role for the evening college as a synthesizer and adapter in the educational process. Since it is in one sense above the battle, can it mediate educational differences and conflicts in the interest of providing optimum learning experiences for adults? Is there a particularly vital role for the evening college in assuming responsibility for the action implications of the findings of social scientists—curricula in community and international problems, etc.?

G. H. D.

ADULT EDUCATION, FOR WHAT?

by

Robert J. Blakely

The themes of this conference reflect the national mood: "the changing university," "the major influences shaping the university," "the impact on higher education," "the university as a creature of its external environment."

The mood is one of analysis. There is nothing wrong with analysis, provided you use it for action. The aspect of the national mood that I do not like is its attitude of passivity. The questions asked are, "What is happening to us?" "Where are we being taken?" "What is shaping us?" instead of such questions as, "Where do we want to go?" "What do we want to do?" "What do we want to make happen?"

The issue that the American people face is one that other people of the world will face in the future, provided, of course, that the human race survives.

For the first time, it is possible for great numbers of people to be negatively free: free from hunger, free from unnecessary disease, free from the exhaustion of debilitating toil; free to . . . do what? What do they want to do?

What happens when many persons get, and all people see the prospects of getting, a margin above brute nature's needs? More food than one can eat, more clothes than one can wear, energy beyond what it takes to exist, time to do something besides survive? A deep sea fish explodes when brought to the surface. All fishes die when they are kept long in the air. Man's blood evaporates in the higher atmosphere. Can man explore the reaches above mere animal wants only if encased in a totalitarian spaceship? Will the day come when men are collectively free to choose between going to Venus and going to Mars and man is not individually free to walk the earth in dignity?

What is freedom, anyway? Is it an end in itself, or is it a means to

an end? If it is a means, what is the end? These are the kinds of questions we have to ask, and they are ones that we Americans are not very good at asking, because we tend to be contemptuous of such questions, which are essentially philosophical.

The dangers we face today are both obvious and subtle. The obvious ones I don't need to mention to you. One is that at almost any moment somebody might make a mistake in judgment, and there will be a war—war with all modern weapons that are publicly known and many others which are not.

A more subtle danger is that we Americans will set our national course simply by steering against that of the Soviet Union and Red China —that we will do that which we ought to do and that which we should do but for the wrong reasons.

Remember Benet's "The Devil and Daniel Webster"? Neighbor Show, wanting to renege on the sale of his soul to the devil, goes to Daniel. Daniel addresses a jury made up of the great villains of history. He was about to "bust out" with lightnings and denunciations, but he paused, saw the glitter in the eyes of the jury, and wiped his forehead:

"For it was him they'd come for, not only Jabez Stone . . . if he fought them with their own weapons, he'd fall into their power; he knew that, though he couldn't have told you how. It was his own anger and horror that burned in their eyes; and he'd have to wipe that out or the case was lost . . .

"He started off in a low voice, though you could hear every word . . . he didn't start out by condemning or reviling. He was talking about the things that make a country a country and a man a man."

At a certain point—perhaps it has already been passed—there will be no more meaning in the arms race because each side can not only destroy the other one completely, but individually and together contaminate the whole atmosphere. At this point the grounds of the competition will have to be shifted. It will have to be shifted to the grounds of ideas and what church people used to call "good works." What conception of man can call forth from people their creative activities, can give them affirmative reasons for living?

Therefore, we come to education. Education is close to the essence

of being human. Human beings are the most helpless of all creatures. When we are born, we don't know how to do anything except suck and cry for help. A chicken gets out of the shell and immediately knows how to do certain things. A colt, about three minutes after birth, stands on its wobbly legs and walks around. But a human being is helpless.

Of all creatures, the human being has the least heritage of instinct, that mysterious transmission of knowledge. He is dependent for the longest period of time. He can learn more because he has to learn almost everything. He learns things in different ways. Thus, education is close to the essence of civilization.

A civilization is a way of life. Education is the conscious deliberate enterprise of a civilization to transmit and create its way of life. At the heart of a civilization and its education are a set of values and an orientation toward life.

What is at the heart of American civilization? What are the values that give us meaning? Toward what star are we oriented?

The answer, it seems to me, is the worth of the individual—his dignity, his importance, his potentiality. If that isn't the meaning of American civilization, then I don't think that we have any meaning to our civilization, or even a civilization.

The role of freedom is to help people become the best that they are capable of. Freedom is not an end in itself. Freedom is a means to an end. The essence of freedom is educative. You learn things by being free that you cannot learn if you are not free. Therefore, we come back to the whole role of education in our civilization.

In education, considering it from the point of view of the cultural anthropologist, as I am doing, formal schooling is a rather recent invention. The so-called primitive societies don't have formal schools. Their whole life is educative—the home is educative, play is educative, worship is educative, the rituals of war and of work are educative. The important role of education is not entrusted to any single institution, and it doesn't end at a certain age. It goes on through all of life.

With this conception, let's look at what we have done with education in the United States. In the first place, we have specialized. We have created an institution called the school and assigned it the role of edu-

cation. Last week I was building up my woodpile. As I cut down a tree and sawed it up and split it, I thought about education. The tree of life is cut down, sawed into segments of time—primary, secondary, higher, adult—and then split up into pieces. These pieces, I guess, are called "functions." One educates for a job. One educates for leisure. One educates for citizenship. Finally, you have a nice neat cord of wood. After it dries you can burn it. However, you do not have a living tree anymore.

The living tree of learning is cut down, sawed, and split. This is particularly true with respect to adult education.

Since the first Sputnik went up into the air about eighteen months ago there has been a great debate about education. The crude people said, we must now fast turn out mathematicians, scientists, engineers, and technologists in order to compete with the Soviet Union. Back came many wise and eloquent answers, saying that more is at stake than an arms race; a conception of man, a way of life is also at stake. However, almost all of even these people still think of education in terms of formal schooling. The American people, probably, are the first people in history who have ever confused education with schooling. This error is recent. Even in our own history, it has always been assumed by wise men that education for freedom should be the education of a person to be a human being, rather than to do a job or perform a function; that education continues throughout life; that a person can learn things when mature that cannot possibly be learned when young. However, the bulk of adult education in this country is functional. Its aim is to get certain jobs done.

Look over the scene of adult education in this country; name almost any secondary purpose. I can give you an example of educational opportunities to achieve it. Do you want to have a better executive or a corporation? We have executive development programs. Do you want a union officer more skillful in negotiations of contracts? We have educational opportunities for it. Do you want to have the farmer raise more corn to increase the surplus that we don't know what to do with? Well, we have educational programs for it.

For <u>functions</u> we have many opportunities, but for the larger purposes of life we have very few opportunities for continuing education.

There are developments toward a wider conception. One of these,

for example, is in the liberal education of executives. Another is in the liberal education of leaders in labor.

However, one question has not been sharply asked or clearly answered: What are you trying to do? Here we come to the matter of loyalty. If a corporation spends money for an executive to stretch his mind, and the executive discovers that he doesn't really want to be an executive: that he wants to write poetry or to go to the South Seas and paint, then, was the program a failure? Or, if a union officer takes a liberal education program and challenges the rightness of union policies, was the program a mistake? I don't think that you can have a liberal education without having loyalties open to question—and to creation; without dealing in values, purposes, and ends. In the adult education in this country we must ask such questions frankly. And the answers, I am sure, will be opportunities for adults to educate themselves just to be <u>people</u>, not executives, not union officers, not farmers or lawyers, but people, and, in particular, to be people who are good citizens and, more particularly, citizens who can give leadership.

To many people leadership is a nasty word. They become embarrassed. It is rather obscene. Or it is indiscreet. Or it is proof that one is an "elitist." However we may manipulate euphemisms, one cannot escape the fact of and the need for leadership. A free society needs leadership more than any other society. It needs it more because it relies more upon initiative, persuasion, and consent.

The literature of leadership has a curious history. In 1896 there wasn't a single book in the Library of Congress with leadership in the title. Leadership as a discrete subject of analysis belongs to this century. The first rough attempts at analyzing what leadership is hunted for <u>a</u> quality that made a leader in all times and all places; no single quality was found. Then the search was for a <u>set</u> of qualities; no single set of qualities was found. Along came Mussolini, Hitler, and Tojo and their theorists. The idea of leadership became discredited. In this country there was and still is a reaction against the idea. Either it is bad or it doesn't exist.

Leadership does exist and in itself is neither good nor bad. Leadership, like education, is meaningless unless you talk about ends—leadership for what? Education for what? At the core of the question, what is

good leadership, is again the matter of education. A good leader for democracy is a person who, more than most others, has a vision and an end; he has the ability to make people want the things that they didn't know they wanted; to work toward things they didn't know they could do; to develop capacities within themselves which they didn't know they had.

The point is that good democratic leadership is educative. Can we expect to educate for action and educate for education and not educate for democratic leadership? We need a deliberate, systematic program of education for public leadership.

This in itself, of course, is not enough. Opportunities for continuing liberal education should be extended, as we are able, to everybody. Everybody matters. All people are equal in the sight of God. All people have rights to the basic liberties. All people are equal before the law, according to our ideals. In our society everybody has a role, one way or another, negatively, affirmatively, or inertly, in self-government.

However, in the consequences of decisions that people make, we are not equal. There are those whose decisions have ramifications far beyond the ramifications of most others' decisions. Therefore, it seems requisite to provide educational opportunities for people to be leaders for the public good, not just for the good of corporations, not just for the good of universities, not just for the good of professions, but in terms of the common weal.

Here we come to the university. Of all of the educational institutions, the university is dealing with people who are and who will be in positions of leadership. If this were not so, there would be something fundamentally wrong in the way our civilization finds, prepares, and uses intelligence. But it is so.

The university is the one institution in our country, in our civilization, which was created deliberately to give scope for the play of the mind—to follow thought no matter where it might lead; to see things whole, to see life in terms of time, in terms of space, in terms of relationships.

The university, in its great periods of history, has always been concerned with the adult community. Its role of teaching the young and its role of research are of no greater importance than its role in the world

of adults. The main role of the university in its great years in history has been its participation in the adult life, its influence in the decisions of the hour.

Therefore, a major responsibility of the university, in co-operation with all sorts of organizations and agencies, governmental and nongovernmental, is to create, to invent and to promote educational opportunities for leaders and emerging leaders in the world beyond the campus, among those who have left the campus and entered the arena of mature affairs.

With regard to the education of leaders there are at least two levels. One of them is the people who "have arrived." Perhaps not much can be done on this level. In the first place, these people are generally older and fixed in their ways. In the second place, they are inclined to be satisfied with the education they have had because, after all, it made them what they are today. In the third place, they are crushingly busy. However, the university can have institutes, conferences, workshops, and so on for the people who have arrived at top in the national, state, and local leadership in order to help them become concerned about the need to divert energy and money and time for educational opportunities for public leadership.

On the second level are the people who are "on the way," but who have not arrived yet: younger people, in their late twenties or thirties; people who still are dissatisfied with themselves, who still have hopes of realizing capacities which they feel they have but which they have not developed; people who not yet are so busy that they don't have time for education.

I began my talk by commenting on the national mood of analysis and passivity. I protested against the passivity, saying that we ought to be asking, where do we want to go? what do we want to make happen? Call it intuition, call it faith, call it intuition, call it hope. I don't care. I sense that the American people are getting tired of being afraid; that we are getting tired of being purposeless. We have great energy and a great past. I believe that we also have a great destiny. I think we are ready to start taking the initiative in building for the future.

The most impressive thing in the so-called "undeveloped parts of the world" is the mood of anticipation. To use an example which I saw

last summer, take Jamaica. It is 7 o'clock of an April morning in Jamaica, while in the United States it is 4 o'clock of a rainy November afternoon. We Americans are afraid of the future at the moment because we are over-satisfied with the present. Most of the peoples of the world don't like the present; they don't want to look at the past; and they are impatient for the future.

We too will have to look for the future. We have to help bring a good future into being for ourselves and others. I think that we will do so. I feel a spirit quickening in the American people which will turn toward affirmation, toward seizing the initiative. If this judgment is correct, it can be made so only by leadership—with much of it coming from the university in co-operation with other institutions in providing opportunities for continuing education in public responsibility.

Publications of

THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

The prices of Center publications, with exceptions noted, are:

Discussion Guides	**$1.00**
Reports	**Single copy free. Bulk rate quoted on request.**
Notes and Essays	**Single copy free. Extras $0.25 per copy. Bulk rate quoted on request.**
Offprints	**Single copy free.**

Discussion Guides

Analytical Reading
International Political Behavior. $3.00
Looking at Pictures: A Guide to Intelligent Appreciation. $5.00
Our Modern Art: The Movies
Scientists at Work
Themes and Variations: An Invitation to Literature
Understanding Group Behavior
Ways of Mankind

Reports

Administrative Policies and Practices of Evening Colleges. 1953.

Why Students Drop Out: A Research Report

How Much Does Adult Experience Count? An Interim Report of the Brooklyn College Experiment

Adults Grow in Brooklyn. Report Number 2 of the Brooklyn College Experiment

Conference Reports: (1) ***The University's Responsibility for the General Education of Adults***, Chicago, Illinois, March 1955; (2) ***Evaluating the Evening College as a Teaching Institution***, New Orleans, Louisiana, November 1955; (3) ***Evening College and Extension Administration as a Profession***, Chicago, Illinois, 1957; (4) ***New Dimensions of University Responsibilty for the Liberal Education of Adults***, Daytona Beach, Florida, 1956; (5) ***The Changing University: A Report on the Seventh Annual Leadership Conference***, Chicago, Illinois, May 1959.

Adult Education and Adult Needs. 1956

New Directions in Programming for University Adult Education. 1957.

Vassar Institute for Women in Business. 1957.

A Review of 1956: Center Activities and Projects. 1957.

A Review of 1957: Center Activities and Projects. 1958.

New Directions in Liberal Education for Executives. March 1958.

Offprints

Benne, Kenneth D. "Adult Education in a University," ***Journal of Higher Education***, Vol. XXVII, Nos. 8 and 9 (November and December, 1956).

Diekhoff, John S. "The Alumni University," ***Journal of Higher Education***, Vol. XXVIII, No. 7 (October, 1957).

Dyer, John P. "What Do We Fear?" ***Adult Leadership***, March, 1956.

Gould, Samuel A. "Quality in Adult Education." Address to the Association of University Evening Colleges, Louisville, Kentucky, November 17, 1958.

Guthrie, E. R. ***The Evaluation of Teaching.*** University of Washington, 1954.

James, T. F. "Adult Education," ***Cosmopolitan***, September, 1957.

Kaplan, Abbott. "Liberal Education in a Business Civilization," ***Research Developments in Personnel Management***, Proceedings of First Conference, University of California, Los Angeles.

Leys, Wayne A. R. "The Terminal Master's Degree," ***Harvard Educational Review***, Vol. XXVI, No. 3 (Summer, 1956).

Love, Robert A. "AUEC Background—From Coffee to Capers to Educational Leadership," Association of University Evening Colleges *Newsletter*, Vol. VI, No. 1 (November, 1957).

Miller, Harry L. "What's Your Line? The Task of the Adult Educator," *Adult Leadership*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (September, 1957).

Miller, Harry L. "Why Don't We Have Better Teaching for Adults?" *Adult Education*, Vol. VII, No. 2 (Winter, 1957).

Schueler, Herbert. "The Method of Adult Education," *Adult Leadership*, April, 1957.

Schwertman, John B. "General Education and Specialized Education: A New Notion about Their Relationship," *Journal of General Education*, Vol. IX, No. 1 (October, 1955).

Siegle, Peter E. "The Adult Learner," *Adult Leadership*, March, 1955.

Siegle, Peter E. "The International Conference on Residential Adult Education," *Adult Education*, Winter, 1956.

Siegle, Peter E. "Something for Everyone," *Vassar Alumnae Magazine*, March, 1957.

Smith, Huston. "Teaching to a Camera," *Educational Record*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 1 (January, 1956).

Storr, Richard J. "The Public Conscience of the University," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. XXVI, No. 1 (Winter, 1956).

Others

Liberal Education in a Technical Age: A Survey by the National Institute of Adult Education. London: Max Parrish. $1.00.

John P. Dyer. *Ivory Towers in the Market Place: The Evening College in America.* Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill. $3.00.

Notes and Essays

(Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8 permanently out of print.)

5. "Television and the University." A report of the Committee on Educational Television of the University of Chicago.
6. Paul A. McGhee. "A School for Optimists." August, 1953.
9. C. Wright Mills. "Mass Society and Liberal Education." June, 1954.
10. Daniel I. Malamud. "A Participant-Observer Approach to the Teaching of Human Relations Classes." February, 1955.
11. Stuart Demarest, Galway Kinnell, and Alvin Johnson. "New Directions in University Adult Education: A Symposium." March, 1955.
12. Gardner Murphy and Raymond Kuhlen. "Psychological Views of Adult Needs." April, 1955.
13. John S. Diekhoff. "Schooling for Maturity." May, 1955.
14. Royce S. Pitkin. "The Residential School in Adult Education." March, 1956.
15. "Professional Preparation of Adult Educators: A Symposium." December, 1956.
16. K. T. Elsdon. "Reality and Purpose: A Visitor's Reflection on Some Aspects of American Adult Education." May, 1957.
17. James E. Crimi. "Adult Education in the Liberal Arts Colleges." September, 1957.
18. "Liberal Education." Summary of a Discussion by the Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (reprinted from the 1955–56 Annual Report). September, 1957.
19. James B. Whipple. "Especially for Adults." October, 1957.
20. Burton R. Clark. "The Marginality of Adult Education." June, 1958.
21. John B. Schwertman. "I Want Many Lodestars." September, 1958.
22. Ida and William Hill. "Learning and Teaching through Discussion." September, 1958.
23. "Pleasures in Learning." December, 1958.
24. Cyril O. Houle. "Major Trends in Higher Adult Education." March, 1959.
25. Marc Belth and Herbert Schueler. "Liberal Education for Adults Re-examined: The Queens College Program." April, 1959.