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Topless Management or
The Anatomy of Data Systems*

HAROLD TEMMER

THE PURPOSE of this paper is to discuss the gap that exists between top management on the campus and the lower echelon of management in systems analysis and computer techniques. By understanding the anatomy of data systems and being sensitive to the topless management phenomenon, you, as middle management, will be able to bring about a measurable closure in the management gap.

Robert V. Head, writing in the November-December, 1967, Systems and Procedures Journal, observed, “'Topless' management information systems are characterized by a lack of management understanding of the systems capability being developed, and lack of interest in making use of this capability once it becomes available. In the opinion of this commentator, there is a growing isolation of the people at the top from the mainstream of systems technology.”

In the March-April, 1968, Systems and Procedures Journal, Milton Reitzfeld reported, “Technicians, not management, are deciding how to use computers. Nearly three-quarters of 2700 executives responding to a Diebold survey stated that recommendations for new uses of computers in their companies came from sources other than senior management. About 60 per cent said that suggestions for new uses were coming from data processing personnel or from management

* A talk given to several regional associations of AACRAO by its President Elect, 1968-69.
science staffs—people skilled in implementing applications rather than in determining the real needs of their companies. This abdication by management is one of the prime reasons that companies often do not realize true potential from their data processing investment.

A delightful critique of the black box revolution was written by Arnold E. Keller in Business Automation. Listen to what he had to say.

A machine, be it adding machine, cash register, accounting machine or computer, can only add horsepower to a system. The machine is not a system. Unfortunately, many companies have bought the dream that all one had to do was plug in a computer and ‘presto’—before you could say ‘rerun,’ you had a management information system. These firms wanted a system in the worst way . . . and they got it.

It is no secret that a large number of business firms have, in the past 10 years, been on the greatest hardware binge in the history of the business equipment industry. It has cost a lot of money, and it has produced a colossal hangover. Were it of the alcoholic nature, it would task the resources of the aspirin industry to cure it.

We hasten to add that this is not necessarily criticism of the business equipment industry, for seller and buyer alike were captivated by this new-found electronic systems power, even though many sellers and buyers often didn’t really understand the power. And, more often than not, the buyer didn’t have the proper system current to handle the power. There were those who cautioned against putting the cart ahead of the horse, but, nevertheless, there are quite a few high-powered carts out far ahead of the horses.

The problem centers on the fact that third generation systems power has arrived, with fourth generation power already looming on the horizon. But for the most part management has yet to grasp the significance of the first generation of systems power. In short, management, like the mythical Rip Van Winkle, has been asleep for 20 years as far as systems are concerned.

Now the significance of Rip Van Winkle’s long sleep was not that he slept for 20 years. Figuratively speaking, we all know people who have done that. Some of them may even work for us. Some of them may even be our bosses. The important thing is that Rip slept through a revolution. He went to sleep with a picture of King George III hanging in the town square, and awoke with a picture of George Washington in its place.

And, like Rip, many business bosses have slept through a revolution—the information revolution. They went to sleep with accounting
machines and punched card equipment clattering away in the corner of the office, and awakened—those who have awakened—with a million dollar computer system as the office centerpiece. It has been an expensive sleep.

Before World War II we had students laboriously copy their program at registration on countless different documents (and many of them not different) so that data concerning the student could be placed in the hands of "need-to-know" faculty and administrators. Then right after the war we learned about punched cards (the unit record system was launched), then computers (second generation, third generation, and soon, if we continue to be *unlucky*, fourth generation).

What this means to many of us is that with the unit record system we did our chores faster than we could manually—why on those first sorters we could sort 450 cards per minute. With the advent of second and third generation hardware we simply stepped up the pace of production so that the computer was no more than a fast unit record system; or, worse yet, the third generation computer is being used as a fast second generation computer. I shall not embarrass either of us by asking how many of you are running your 1401 programs through an emulator on a 360 series computer, which simply means you have a faster 1401.

Now, then, what is this all about?

First, let us deal with the problem of buzz words. I have already referred to "unit record systems." I blush to say how long it was before I felt secure enough to ask somebody what that meant.

More recently we have heard the phrase "data systems." A few years ago I used the phrase "total student data systems" with reckless abandon and was quite successful in overwhelming the lay person with this vulgar display of technical genius. I quite soon learned that nothing is *total*. *Total* means it contains everything—and, unfortunately, I kept forgetting something.

The presently accepted buzz phrase is *information system*. Fortunately, someone has kindly and gently removed *total*. Systems theorists are presently defining data as a group or collection of elements. For example, the name of a student is an element of data. A class roster listing students is information.

We have student information systems and management informa-
tion systems. I shall not attempt to define just what these mean. There will probably be a new phrase before I understand the old.

Let us, then, deal with the second part of the title of my paper—the anatomy of a data system, or information system. You see, things have changed since I selected my title several months ago.

If someone said, "Here, let me show you my student information system," what would you expect to see? A stack of flow charts, maybe. Boxes of IBM cards, maybe. Horribly frustrated clerks trying to wade through page after page of audit trails, missing information reports, and error lists, certainly!

Or perhaps an information system consists of paper, flow charts, cards, etc., and evidence of something quite esoteric such as management objectives and skills.

Let us dissect an information system and lay bare its anatomy. A word of caution—or is it an apology? My anatomical examination will not penetrate the computer room. I have never really understood what goes on in those black boxes—and I do not want to know. "Analog" and "digital" have no meaning to me. Nor do I understand FORTRAN, COBOL, AUTOCODER, or any of the other machine languages. As a data manager I do not feel that I need to have anything more than a nodding acquaintance with the technical anatomy.

Thus, it is the non-technical anatomy we shall examine. What follows then is valid with or without hardware. Perhaps your only claim to automation is carbon paper and ballpoint pens (not many of us are this fortunate).

The head of an information system is its objective. Just what do you want the system to accomplish? Here I must invoke the theory of types. There are levels of objectives. I shall give you, as examples, two objectives of an admissions information system. Both objectives are valid and necessary. They cannot be classified as primary and secondary. They are at different levels.

OBJECTIVE—LEVEL I: The objective of the Admissions Information System shall be to select those students most likely to succeed in the college consistent with the philosophy and character of the institution, to improve the quality of the student body, and disseminate timely and usable information concerning the student to the advisers, deans, etc. . . . or,

OBJECTIVE—LEVEL II: I wish to capture a given set of personal, de-
mographic, and academic information about the applicant in the system. At certain points in the processing I wish to generate address labels to the housing division, financial aids officer, placement office, and counseling center. I wish to generate a student acceptance letter as well as a thank-you-but-no-thank-you document, an academic profile, and a set of registration forms.

You, as a manager, must deal with both levels of objectives. I am sure you can even come up with other levels.

As a manager you must involve top management with level I type objectives. After today we do not want TOPLESS SYSTEMS. You, as a manager, must develop the level II objectives to provide top management with management tools; and you must show to management how to use a whole new workshop of equipment which, in many cases, the top did not even know existed.

Our systems anatomy has still another level. If an information system is to have character, form, warmth, personality and function, there are some elements of anatomy you must categorically create, design, control, and even cherish.

AACRAO has developed a training seminar,—re-training perhaps is a better word—a seminar to re-train in the profession. The seminar tells us we are managers of data for students, or, more simply, data managers—we manage data. We examine data with reference to students; we make admissions decisions based on the data; we manipulate the data—we prepare statistics; advise the advisers; structure class schedules; enroll students; report them as enrolled; on and on.

A manager of data must have the prime responsibility for decisions concerning the following parts of the anatomy: 1. Data lexicon; 2. In-put, nature and method; 3. File maintenance; 4. Back-up; 5. Output.

**Data Lexicon.** The data lexicon, or data bank, or data elements are nothing more than: What information are you going to collect, store, modify, preserve, and in what form? In structuring the data lexicon you are going to be involved with everybody on the campus. You are not going to store everything for everybody, but almost. You will decide how to store it. You will decide the number of bits of information you need to meet your objectives; you will then negotiate with the technicians for storage space, but the final decision is yours.

**In-put.** You will decide how to in-put, be it key punching, type-
writer console, optical scanning, electronic pencil, character reading, or whatever. Remember, you gather the information. You will have to, in one way or the other, in-put it.

**File Maintenance.** This, in my opinion, is the heart and soul of an information system. File maintenance simply is the technique of keeping your information in the system correct, accurate, timely, and up-to-date.

I tell my colleagues at home that the first level of sophistication of an information system is to be able to in-put a student’s name and address, keep it current, accurate, and get it back out—current and accurate.

It has been my personal observation that most information systems get designed and implemented without regard to file maintenance. I have gone through the excruciating pain of seeing a foot-high stack of audit-trails, missing information reports, and error lists without even knowing what they were.

Now I have learned my lesson. Any move towards automation must be supported by staff augmentation exclusively for the purpose of file maintenance.

File maintenance as a principal member of the anatomy has five sub-parts. These are data validation, updating, operating controls, error analysis, audit trail, and reconstruction. These sound like buzz words escaping understanding. If you are going to be of long life as a data manager, you had better understand them. Study *IBM Data Processing Techniques, Bulletin C20-1638-0.*

**Back-Up.** You must make decisions concerning back-up. Simply, if your records are lost, how do you reconstruct them? Remember, you are the data manager and you must protect your data.

**Out-Put.** You decide what comes out of the system, when it comes out and how, i.e. in what form. Here is where you will have an excellent opportunity to sharpen your educational statesmanship. As a professional you will put the top on the management system by involving top management in creating management tools in terms of out-put. You will even be involved in training department chairmen how to use all the data you can now give them—data they have not had before.

As a data manager you must create data-information systems that are responsive to top management needs. Quite often you will even have to tell top management what his needs are. As a data manager
you must understand the anatomy of data systems to know what decisions you must make and how. Let me illustrate what I mean.

One of my colleagues recently told me that he wished to be able to make an analysis of the change of majors in his college. In other words, what happened ultimately to those thirty-eight freshmen who came in as biology majors and who, subsequently, finished in psychology, physics, or sociology, or not at all?

Understanding our file maintenance anatomy I pointed out to the gentleman that we did not capture historical data in our student academic file. A change of major would simply wipe out the old major and record the new. Hence, the need now for historical data.

Or perhaps another example closer to your hearts. The chief executive officer on a campus asked his director of admissions and records for data on the number of new and returning students for the purpose of predicting FTE (the life-blood of tax-supported institutions). The director (student data manager) wisely gave him an analysis of this year’s incoming class compared with last year’s, reported the distributions by majors by level, reported class enrollments (pre-registration was well along), and analyzed problem areas in the class schedule which could reduce FTE by prematurely closing needed sections in lower division general education requirements. He analyzed, predicted, recommended, and presented alternatives. As a student data manager he understood the anatomy of his system. He understood the many complex relations existing on the campus. He used his understanding, his data, his systems to involve all management levels of the campus in solving management problems as well as developing management strategy.

We have touched only lightly on some aspects of management problems related to systems design. I would hope that perhaps you understand a little better the anatomy of information systems, that you see your role in the developing of such systems, and that you can begin to get a feel for using your management skills and responsibilities to bring the top back into our topless management of systems.
Dimensions of Academic Data

EDGAR WIRT

It's too bad that we use so much the same terminology in several different arrays of academic data—for academic disciplines, degrees, curricula, major areas, course subjects, colleges or schools, departments. And how much more ambiguous their abbreviations are! If some change is considered in "CHEM" or "CE," does everyone understand clearly whether this change refers to the departmental organization, or the courses listed in the catalogue, or the degree program for students? Even in a single institution it is never safe to presume that the categories actually match between any of these different arrays of data, even though some of the terms may be identical. They are not unrelated, but their similarities are misleading. Their relationships are unpredictable; the categories get changed independently.

These are really different dimensions of data; they mark off the data in different ways or different directions. In the same manner we mark off the Earth in latitude and longitude. Latitude is somewhat like longitude; both are measured in degrees. But their structure is really not the same; their categories don't fully match. In order to classify "field of study" and other kinds of academic data we construct different maps of it, like a grid or coarse screen through which we all can look at the same data and, hopefully, see it alike. How many different maps do we need?

CHANGES AND DISTORTIONS

The administrative structure of a university, especially at the level of departments, tends to follow along after the changing patterns of academic specialization. Less rapid in change is the primary grouping, the school or college. One direction of change is to subdivide; another is to consolidate, especially into new interdisciplinary fields such as earth sciences, environmental engineering, aero-space, genetics, etc. The administrative unit for a new area may be labeled "institute" or "center" or "division"—something different from the traditional hierarchy of colleges and departments. The structure of a data system for administrative organization has to keep up with such diverse kinds of organization, and often is linked with the classification of fiscal accounts.

Classifying one set of data in the framework of another causes dis-
tortion of data. For instance, one function in administrative accounting is to allocate costs to the different activities and programs of the faculty in their respective departments and colleges. If the same costs are allocated to the activities and academic programs of students the picture will be quite different. It is noteworthy that effort in both areas is conceived more frequently in terms of programs. Even budgets are "programmatic"—structured in terms of desirable programs rather than a more piecemeal pattern that might be expected in a stores or cafeteria budget. Cost questions may be, "How much does it cost to train and graduate a chemical engineer, or an economist?" as well as, "How much will it cost to teach English 101 to freshmen next year?"

The U. S. Office of Education, perennially collecting and distributing data on higher education (HEGIS), maintains standard classifications of "student fields of study" and "faculty fields of teaching and research." The purpose is not to direct the classification of fields but to keep up with it. Colleges and universities, reporting on this basis, try to fit their local categories into the standard, uniform categories. It is important, obviously, that the responding institution is "tapping" that dimension of data which is truly relevant. "Field of effort" is a general designation for what we may identify locally as departments, subjects, programs, projects, major areas, etc. With respect to faculty, this points to the present allocation of their educational effort rather than to the fields in which they may have studied or specialized. Since the educational effort of the faculty is pretty much related to student programs, we can expect some parallel between the two—but not perfect agreement. Other distortion occurs when local source data are limited to "payroll" identification of faculty and "college" identification of students.

**HIERARCHIES OF DATA**

The college or school is the primary classification for undergraduate students, just as it is for faculty and administrative organization. But beyond this primary classification the categorical structures differ. A student is admitted to a college; his degree will be awarded by or in a college. Transfer from one college to another (within the same institution) involves formal documentation and decision much like the initial admission process. Responsibility for a student is vested in his current college until it is formally transferred to another college. There may be "casual" students who are not identified with a college, not committed to any program.
The *department* is generally the second level of classification in administrative structure and also for faculty. But their activities and fields of specialization may seem at variance with the name of the department. This is because department names and organization are partly the result of local history and expedience, and they are poor indicators as to the subject fields or specialties that may be grouped under those administrative tents.

For a student the second level of classification is his *program* and degree. Casually we speak of "art students" or "mathematics students," but these terms really do not describe students. Better to say "students in art" and "students in mathematics." Imagine patients in a hospital identified as "the tonsillectomy in 314, the pneumonia in 348, and the tumor down the hall." Much of the terminology that we associate with students is really identification of programs with which students are associated. Such a program may be a clear-cut "package" plan; more frequently it is further modified as to majors, minors, options, elections, etc.

Good management of academic data keeps separate these different dimensions of data, even though their terminology may be common. It is possible to recognize two principal families or groups of academic data: 1. Dimensions and categories that stem from administrative organization; 2. Dimensions and categories that stem from student programs and degrees. Still apart from these are the categories that truly describe students. This separation is all the more difficult because the same term may refer to a department, a subject, a degree, a program; e.g., civil engineering, pharmacy, education. These two principal families of data might be diagrammed something like this (or make up your own variation):

**ADMINISTRATIVE**

- College (or school)
- Division
- Department
- Subject
- Course
- Class

**STUDENT PROGRAMS**

- College (or school)
- Degree
- Program
- Major-minor-option
- Course

The university catalogue specifies programs within degrees within colleges. And elsewhere it specifies courses by subject by department within colleges. For each element in this table there is an array of cat-
egories or varieties. Within "class," for instance, there could be lecture, recitation, laboratory, as well as sections 1, 2, 3, etc. No two of these arrays have to be the same and most likely they are not.

Courses and subjects are developed and differentiated by a department—and not restricted to one subject/one department. In such development there may be as much concern for expanding the opportunities for the faculty as for the students. Naturally a student program specifies courses, selected from various subjects taught by different departments in different colleges. The "courses" in a student program mean, in general, the "courses" that are catalogued by the departments. But even here the registrar will find discrepancies: courses on a student's record that no longer exist in the catalogue, or courses that were transferred from another institution.

The same faculty who develop the courses also develop the degree programs for students. At this level there is very general interpenetration between programs and subjects. But we can't presume therefore that their organization and structure are the same. They can be changed independently. A program is established and administered by a school or college, which also assigns its appropriate degree. In one sense undergraduate programs (not to mention graduate programs) may be departmentalized, since the major area may be mostly one subject, and student advisers for a program may be drawn from specialists in the department that teaches this subject. But the student in his program is also involved with other subjects in other departments. Then, too, there are cross-departmental or interdisciplinary programs, the administration of which may be assigned to a committee or some inter-departmental agency—within one school or among two or more schools. Students in such a program may be identified all in the same college, or divided.

The "college" level is basic and common to both families of data. But there may be programs (especially at graduate level) that are administered in some interdisciplinary area that has no identification or equivalence with any college.

GRADUATE FIELD OF STUDY

At graduate level the "field of study" has rather different characteristics because of several factors. The fact that a student is in the Graduate School says nothing at all about his field of study. There are less likely to be two student programs identical. The supervisory function of a graduate school may be nominal, the student programs being su-
supervised at department level with little reference to the undergraduate school in which the department is, or by a select portion of the department staff, in highly specialized areas, with maybe some coordinating function at the department level. An area of graduate study may be a pioneer area or a new hybrid area not represented in undergraduate programs nor in administrative structure. A graduate student may be employed in one specific area while he approaches a degree in another or a more general area. Consequently the categories of "graduate field of study" may be more like the most advanced categories of academic specialization, and not like undergraduate areas nor even like administrative organization.

However, each graduate student is in contact with administrative organization at least at one point: his "major professor" who is himself in one department or another. Tagging graduate students by department may be convenient for communication, but it doesn't help much to identify their specific fields of study and more varied programs. Two different sets of data would be needed to satisfy both horns of this dilemma. The one for administrative contact and responsibility might be borrowed from administrative structure—or would even this lead to some absurdities in your institution?

**OTHER DIMENSIONS**

Cutting across those dimensions are other dimensions of level. It isn't necessary to remind anyone about levels of rank among the faculty. Courses are rated lower level, upper level, graduate level. Student progress within a program is rated by his level or "year" in that program. (This designation becomes so readily attached to the students, constituting them the "freshman class" or the "senior class"—though this notion of homogeneous, continuing student groups is less and less tenable. How long a student has been taking courses might be still another dimension.) And the whole program itself also has a level, which is sometimes stated as a "sector of the total spectrum of education beyond high school." Some mystical portion of this spectrum is "higher education." These levels are identified pretty much in terms of the degrees, or the terminal level, of students who complete the programs. And these may be grouped into some debatable hierarchy such as graduate, professional, undergraduate, pre-professional, and so on.

A free-lance or "honors" program looks like one more program.
But it might include honors in social science, in languages, in chemistry, or any other area. These are really modified versions of other programs. Likewise a cooperative work-study plan is a version of another program. A program to attain a specific teaching license might well be a different version of the same program not for teaching. While all these could be considered new programs, they might just as well be considered variations or modifiers of other programs—another direction or dimension of categories.

MANAGEMENT OF CATEGORIES

In every dimension, or every set of categories, the array is potentially unlimited. But in one institution at one time each array is limited and specific. Only certain categories are recognized and acceptable. Day-to-day operations and transactions have to be monitored and restricted to the existing, authorized categories. Otherwise new categories would appear that are meaningless. Doesn't this presuppose that all legitimate categories are somewhere a matter of record and control? And the controller, of course, the Manager of Data, is always flexible to adjust quickly to any authorized change, adamant to unauthorized intrusions, alert for any possible pitfalls and confusion!

More realistically, the nub of the problem can be "boiled up" and "summed down" in one basic proposition: Don't try to make these different categories alike; do try to keep them separate—in your own mind, in all operations. Use more different fields in the data records to represent more dimensions that are really different in some way. Does this complicate the management of data?

If these different dimensions of academic data are kept separate, each with its own array of acceptable categories, the management problem is more extensive than it is complicated. Complications arise when they are not kept separate, when analysis has not disclosed the difference or when, for convenience, one set of categories is adopted for two dimensions that look similar but are not fully equivalent. With the new thrust of emphasis on "programs" and "field of effort" it is important that these be divorced from any other dimensions such as departments or subjects or degrees. Failure here not only causes complications in data management; it may, in subtle ways, constrain some of our valid educational objectives. We might find that our data system has us in a straitjacket.
A simple truism which guides a behavioral scientist in his understanding of people is: The way in which a person behaves in any given situation, is the product of that situation and his past experiences. Only if well adjusted, or in very simple situations, can a person operate totally on the basis of the reality of that situation. The more complex the circumstance, and the more average the person, the more his response is dictated in large measure by his past experiences rather than what is actually happening now.

In school a student learns a multitude of facts and myths about the animate and inanimate world, not only from what he is told, but from the context in which he is told these things. (If this were not true, the job of the educator would be infinitely easier and a paper such as this would be unnecessary and inappropriate.) Teachers must be as consciously concerned about the medium through which a message is communicated as they are about the message; they must be as concerned as to what type of model they (individual and institution) present, as they are about the experiences to which the student is exposed.

To answer the question posed in the title, permit me to take as our example two areas: the area of civil rights and responsibilities, and the area of learning. We all wish students to finish college and to take part in the democratic process in a democratic way. It has been said, "If the young have experience with the practice of civil liberties, there will be liberties for future generations of adults. If they continue to exist in an authoritarian atmosphere, they will transfer that authoritarianism to society as a whole."¹ We see this authoritarianism daily in the exploits of our youth on college campuses and in riots. Although the conscious message they offer is liberalism and individual rights, the medium of expression is more often similar to that of Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin. The extent to which students use such dictatorial methods is the extent to which we, the schools and the older generation, have failed in teaching them and convincing them that democracy, the highest and most sophisticated political system, can work for them.

To what extent do our students have civil rights? Generally, *they are not permitted to dress as they wish, or to wear their hair as they deem best*. There are innumerable court cases contesting the right of school officials to legislate and dictate personal style. There was one case in Ohio in which a high school boy was expelled from school for having his hair too long, and then arrested for truancy and given a six-month sentence. He was told that the sentence would be waived only if he cut his hair.

Our students generally *have no voice in decision-making processes which vitally affect their lives*. They have a student paper or publication which is closely supervised or censored, and they have a student council which is most often just a pretense. We say that we hope schools will mold the lives of our youngsters, yet they are given no voice regarding the shape that mold should take. "A school is a community of people. Like any other community, it has to have rules and regulations so that it can conduct its affairs with tranquility, justice and benefit to all of its citizens." But, can you think of many other communities in which the majority of the inhabitants or constituents have so little to say about the practices that govern them? And this is true on all levels of education, elementary, secondary and college.

I want to make clear that I am not only speaking about the unusual and dramatic case such as the one cited above. I am not speaking of the ameliorative efforts of a few schools where student councils are really given an appropriate degree of power; I am speaking of the plight of the great majority of our student body. Too often our student councils are given some semblance of power while the reality of power is withheld. In such cases, the administration presents a model of hypocrisy, and hypocrisy is what students accuse us of most.

To demonstrate, let us take an average college student—a young girl. She comes to school with the avowed purpose of becoming a teacher. First she is told that she must take a prescribed number of courses, many or most of which seem irrelevant to her. If they are relevant, no one has taken the trouble to explain how or why. Then, when she enters the classroom, she is subjected to the most antiquated and anachronistic teaching techniques. A professor gives lecture after lecture about facts without consideration of his student’s readiness, interest or wishes.

He does this despite his awareness (1) that facts are readily forgot-
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ten; (2) that we do not possess sufficient facts and, indeed, often lack the salient questions for the solution of the major problems confronting the world; (3) that the world’s knowledge has doubled in the last decade, and that facts now believed in will more than likely be outdated in the next decade; and (4) that emphasis upon facts invidiously reinforces passivity and feelings of inadequacy in the pupil. (The student is taught to believe that answers and facts are available for all questions, and that all he needs to do is find the proper source; if he cannot do this, he must therefore be inadequate and inferior.)

Despite these objections and many more, the transmission of codified information via lectures or other passivity-inducing methods is still the most frequently demonstrated definition of teaching.

After suffering through endless lectures, the student is given excessive amounts of homework, despite overwhelming research evidence which demonstrates that the amount of assigned work bears no relationship to the mastery of any body of knowledge. This is continued even though we know that behavior cannot be militated—except through fear. How many colleges exist where students have been given poor grades in a subject because they have not turned in their assignments regularly, despite the fact that on all measures they seem to know the material? One wonders if such schools are dedicated to the general acquisition of knowledge or to the acquisition of knowledge through specific channels predetermined by the administration.

After the lectures and homework, the student is given tests which are seldom used to determine teaching efficiency, or for student feedback, but rather are used to compare her with her peers and therefore to encourage competition. Although we say we believe in cooperation as a principle of human interaction, to what degree is cooperation encouraged in the school? Although we say we want to develop mature, independent, self-controlling and self-critical individuals, to what degree do our practices promote or inhabit these goals? Do we encourage independent study utilizing the existing interest of the students? Do we encourage committee studies and reports? Do we insist that material can only be learned in one fashion? Do we encourage students to evaluate their progress and behavior or do we always tell them what it has been and how acceptable it is?

Some of the essential characteristics of an effective learning situation are almost totally ignored in the contemporary classroom. Let me enumerate just some of these characteristics. For learning to occur:
(1) The material must be relevant. How can course material be relevant if the student is never consulted about what he needs to learn, what he feels he wants to learn, the sequence of the presentation of material, or the time required for its acquisition? I am not suggesting that the responsibility for course content be turned entirely over to the students. Being somewhat immature, they do not always know what is best for them or what they need. However, if motivated students are our goal, then our task is to demonstrate the importance of the material to their current life needs.

(2) The learner must be active. Most teachers prefer passive students. They prefer them to sit still during their lectures. They want them to read the books they suggest; they demand specific answers to their questions; and more importantly, they wish students to think the way they prescribe. (Some questions are asked of the student, not to help her think, but to ask her to guess what is on the instructor's mind. Such questions are not worth asking.)

(3) The activity must be pleasurable. This principle of learning is almost always totally ignored. Often we insist that it be tedious, boring and difficult. Our puritan heritage seems to dictate that mastery of only tasks characterized as difficult can build strong personalities.

(4) It must involve effects as well as cognition. If we define learning as the acquisition of something which somehow changes the organism rather than acts as an addendum (something simply added to the host organism), then we can no longer concern ourselves with only cognitive activities. There must be a recognition that feelings are a legitimate aspect of human behavior, and hence are worth our attention and our efforts to understand their role in groups, classes, and learning situations. Feelings deserve legitimate outlets for expression under tolerant supervision of one's supervisors. At present no such mechanisms exist.

(5) A significant human relationship should exist. Meaningful human relationships can only exist when the needs of both parties are substantially fulfilled. Unless instructors make an attempt to create a viable relationship, they deprecate their role as a model to be emulated, and serve only as a transmitter of facts—similar to a machine.

(6) The learner must feel respected. Our students feel, and are treated like, one of a herd. They are almost never individualized.

This then, is the atmosphere in which schools operate. An atmo-
sphere that, to a degree, disregards the basic necessary conditions for effective learning. This is the medium through which we attempt to get our messages across, and the disruptions on the college campuses today are testimony to the incidental learning that takes place. This is the so-called democratic atmosphere in which students are expected to grow. Is it so surprising that they occasionally act in an undemocratic fashion? How can we expect to produce scholars, excited about the discovery of new relationships or the acquisition of knowledge, when colleges are dull and tedious and instructors indicate over and over that the purpose of acquiring an education is not for obtaining knowledge, but for a grade, or for a lucrative job? If this is the implicit message, what explicit content is taught in our schools today? In the United States we are faced with enormous problems which can conceivably destroy our nation—the war in Viet Nam, the problems of race discrimination, the urban crisis, overpopulation, pollution, our inability to get along with each other and so on. To what extent do our students have an opportunity to learn about the complexities of these massive difficulties under guidance—not indoctrination, but guidance?

In the experimental teacher-training program in which I teach, I had the opportunity to discuss the war in Viet Nam. I was shocked to see how few facts any of my students had—dove and hawk alike. I heard platitudes and clichés about "the Red Menace," the "Yellow Peril," "Killing is no good," and so forth. Yet, very few of the students could substantiate their position. When I asked, I was told that this had never been discussed in any of their college courses (they are juniors), and they did not have time to read on their own because they were so inundated with homework. Are college students more able to take their place in society and assist in the solution of these difficulties than, say, an equivalently bright high school graduate who never went to college? Are schools becoming high-class vocational schools rather than citadels of learning dedicated to producing scholars?

I do not espouse these beliefs simply because some kids are complaining about the establishment. Very often adolescents complain, not primarily because they are dissatisfied with something, but rather because it allows them to differentiate themselves from the adult culture and aids them in the process of establishing a personal identity. As a matter of fact, one of the most difficult and serious tasks for a school's administration is to determine the motivation underlying student complaints. If it is the result of the developmental task of adoles-
cence, then granting the request (which may be desirable) will not put an end to demands.

Since the end of World War II, our world has progressed at a dizzying rate of speed. The student population has changed radically, and yet the colleges and universities seem only to have grown larger. I do not feel that colleges are adequately preparing students for the future. To do so, they must make conscious and consistent all their activities—direct and indirect—which affect and educate young adults. Simply adding courses is not enough. In order for higher education to fulfill its heritage, it must extend the liberty and responsibility which is its hallmark to all inhabitants of the academic community.
The Conflict of Authority in the University

LOUIS C. VACCARO

Most persons acquainted with American higher education are aware of the usual problems which have occurred as a consequence of the growth experienced during the past two decades. Such problems as finding adequate facilities, monies and staff are usually identified as pressing by most colleges and universities—though alumni sometimes claim that the fielding of a first-class football team is the most fundamental struggle facing dear old Alma Mater. The more recent problems of campus disruptions and student rebellion are also well known. There is, however, a more subtle problem which has become an irritating companion to the growth in higher education. This is the conflict which arises from the confrontation of professional and administrative authority in the modern university. The confrontation occurs as a result of the introduction and growth of bureaucratization in the university. This growth and bureaucratization has developed as a consequence of the changes which have occurred in the American model of higher education. To understand these changes one must view them first in light of the historical development of American higher education.

As the early pastoral college in America took on the new forms of the European university (with emphasis on the German model), it also acquired the seeds of an inevitable conflict with the adoption of a hierarchical arrangement of administration which, theoretically, was to facilitate and maximize the efficiency of the important work of the professionals.

The consequence of growth from the small pastoral college to the large complex university is summarized best by Frederick Rudolph in his excellent volume, *The American College and University—A History*:

The American colleges and universities, in their development from simple institutions to complex organizations, not only replaced the old-time professor with the academician, that trained specialist who knew the rights and privileges and responsibilities of a profession and who in so many of his experiences was indistinguishable from other organization men, but the colleges and universities also required a
new kind of executive officer, new methods of financing, new areas of administration. Growth fed upon growth, and the answer to the problems of growth—unless it was to be chaos—was organization.

The history of American higher education from the Civil War to the early 1900's contains not only a classic illustration of the growth in organization, but also includes an immense number of changes which affected the administration of the more complex university. And, as the student of organization knows, these changes, i.e., the addition of codes, standards, committees, departments and hierarchies, often tend to frustrate the professionals' striving toward originality and imagination—the life blood of true professional activity. Organizational principles and bureaucratization—the results of this growth—are now being strenuously reacted to by the faculty and students, who view them as anti-professional.

This struggle is so pervasive that some see it as the most crucial problem facing organizational maintenance. Amitai Etzioni has discussed this issue and reduces the problem to the inevitable strain imposed on the organization by the use of knowledge. In his analysis, Etzioni takes issue with Weber, whom he accuses as having overlooked the distinction that the subordinate views his superiors as more rational, or right because of superior knowledge, (since the superior holds a higher position in the organization) and that this fact is established when the person gains promotion through merit. While not totally rejecting Weber's ideas, Etzioni, in making clarifying distinctions, claims that:

To a degree, this conception is valid. There is considerable evidence that persons who have only a high school education will be more frequently found in lower ranks, and college-educated persons in the higher ones. There is probably some correlation between IQ and rank, in the sense that on the average the IQ of the top third of an organization is likely to be higher than that of the lowest third. One could argue that when the superiority-of-knowledge requirement is not fulfilled, when the higher rank knows less or has a lower IQ than the lower rank, his orders might still be followed because of his power to enforce them; but Weber would counter that such orders would not
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be considered legitimate and hence the official would have power but not authority.

Still the reader is correct in his intuition that there is something fundamentally wrong with the notion of viewing the bureaucracy as a hierarchy in which the more rational rule the less rational. There are two reasons. First, by far most of the trained members of the organization are found not in the highest but in the middle ranks, and not in the regular line or command positions but around them. Depending on the type of organization, they are referred to as experts, staff, professionals, specialists, or by the names of their respective professions. Second, the most basic principle of administrative authority and the most basic principle of authority based on knowledge—or professional authority—not only are not identical but are quite incompatible.

Why is this issue referred to as a dilemma? And what lies at the root of the conflict? These are the questions one must answer if we are to understand the problem in its entirety. In a sense, the dilemma is inevitable because of the diametrically opposed views of administrators and professionals. Neither professional nor administrator sees the validity of the other position. This is quite apparent in the university.

On the one hand, as the professionals’ body of knowledge increases and as the profession seeks to make such knowledge available to more people, it becomes necessary to structure the activity of knowledge getting (research), knowledge letting (teaching or application), and the training of more professionals. What has developed to facilitate this activity, we call complex organization. And within this organization two fundamental types of activities take place—professional and bureaucratic. One opts for creative, imaginative approaches; the other strives to achieve orderly, codified, and regularized activities. Fundamentally, the two pull in opposite directions. That is, they operate from quite different value bases and assumptions. It is not so much that the goals of the organization are seen as different, but that rather, they (Administrators and Professionals) see their own activities as demanding different approaches. W. Richard Scott discusses this differing attitude in his contribution to Vollmer’s and Mills’ Professionalization.

Authority has very different roots in the two systems which are being contrasted. In the bureaucratic form, authority is created by fiat: the need for bringing together the various activities which have been separated and for enforcing the rules is met in part by creating
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new positions which have as their major function coordination and supervision. Workers filling these positions may or may not have had experience in performing the various tasks they supervise. In either case, however, their authority does not stem primarily from their competence in the tasks being supervised but from the fact that they occupy a position which has been allocated certain supervisory rights.

Professionals are unaccustomed to such authority relations. Their own authority vis-a-vis clients or subordinate occupational groups is based on their superior competence, not on their occupancy of a particular organizational position. The fact that they have acquired complete skills and have internalized norms and standards makes unnecessary the existence of workers specialized in supervision. Each worker is expected to function independently and autonomously. Although he may seek out the help of his more competent or experienced colleagues, he receives advice and counsel from them, not orders, makes his own decisions, and faces the consequences.4

When this problem is viewed within institutions of higher education, it again becomes necessary to understand the development and function of the university in order to fully comprehend the nature and complexity of the dilemma.

Historically, with the self-rule of the teacher and the student guilds that comprised the medieval university, authority was based upon collegiality. In a true sense, the type of governance employed in the medieval university could be classified as "shared authority." It was, hence, anti-bureaucratic form. There was a close sense of community which characterized the enterprise—gemeinschaft as contrasted to gesellschaft. The non-complex nature of the university's role did not demand anything more elaborate. Furthermore, the professions of law and medicine, for which the university prepared men, were themselves non-specialized and did not, therefore, rest on endless subdivisions and departments as presently obtains. Later, however, with the rapid increase in specialization and increased knowledge, there evolved greater and greater demands for more rigorous control on the part of responsible associations—but, as the situation developed in Europe, the universities did not take up this responsibility; the professions themselves provided the necessary societies or "bureaus" to care for this controlling function.

The situation in America, however, developed quite differently.

Perhaps the peculiar values which have characterized the shaping of the American character—such as thrift, time as money, and organizational efficiency, had much to do with the different approach that has directed and shaped the American university. From its earlier collegial form the American College and University developed into a more formal and bureaucratized institution. However, more recent changes indicate that the more traditional notion of authority—normally existent within bureaucratic organizations, does not hold within the University. This shift is summarized by Burton Clark in his essay, "The Sociology of Educational Administration," appearing in *The Study of Academic Administration*:

Faculty authority is now evolving away from its traditional collegial form, under the impact of modern expertise and the growing size and complexity of the campus, but the form to which it tends is also largely anti-bureaucratic. As the campus moves from characteristics of community to characteristics of loosely-joined federation, faculty authority moves from the meeting of the assembled faculty and the informal interaction of a small body to the numerous, dispersed units (departments, sub-schools, sub-colleges) that are the foci of the disciplinary interests of the faculty, and to a more formal representative government in which there is greater differentiation between those who participate and those who do not.8

Here, then, is the essential dilemma. On the one hand, the university, which purportedly exists for the discovery and imparting of knowledge, finds that to do so it needs to adopt structure. It needs to become a more bureaucratic organization. It finds that to do this successfully it must utilize the services and expertise of administrative specialists (or those who are drawn into such activity because they view such activity as rewarding and necessary). The inevitable consequence is that the professional (teacher/researcher) is brought face to face with the bureaucrat and, due to their fundamentally different approaches to achieving organizational goals, conflict results.

If we view the modern complex university as a bureaucracy—and there are increasing claims that such is the case—there arise, in the words of W. Richard Scott, "Four more or less distinct areas of conflict. . . ." (1) The professional's resistance to bureaucratic rules; (2)

The professional's rejection of bureaucratic standards; (3) The professional's resistance to bureaucratic supervision; and (4) The professional's conditional loyalty to the bureaucracy. Anyone acquainted with what is going on in large complex universities will easily recognize the specific issues and conflicts which fit into these four categories.

The increasing militance on the part of faculty, graduate students, and in an ever increasing body of undergraduate students, speaks volumes about resistance to the bureaucratic rules which have been introduced to make the modern university more efficient. One need not consult the experts to realize that during the past ten to fifteen years (as the rules and bureaucracy have grown) resistance on the part of the professionals (faculty and students) has also increased.

With respect to (2) there is simple and growing evidence to demonstrate the rejection of bureaucratic attempts to codify and standardize promotion and salary criteria which ignore the primacy of the professional's knowledge and ability to evaluate his peers. Specifically, such professional organizations as the American Association of University Professors are more and more asserting the necessity for such involvement on the part of the professionals.

There is almost no need to offer discussion of (3) since only the most unenlightened university administration attempts to develop a bureaucratic system of supervision over the professor. However, many age-old forms of supervision over the students (guised under the ancient principle of in loco parentis) are still present and give way only slowly and painfully under the onslaught of enlightened students and faculty.

It is area (4) which highlights a most recent and interesting problem, and which promises to provide fuel for increasing conflict between professional and bureaucrat.

Along with the rise and advance of the modern complex university have come forces which have made it necessary for the various professional societies such as the American Chemical Society and the American Psychological Association to increase their pervasiveness and hence their influence in the lives of their members. The consequence has been that members (who are for the most part university professors and researchers) view such associations and their codes of conduct as the center of their professional lives. Where once their loyalty
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was to a particular (and usually a single) university, such loyalty today has shifted to the professional society. Increased faculty mobility — though welcomed for the economic and professional advancement of its members — creates untold problems for the organizational aspect of the university in the way of faculty recruitment, retention, and the like. As the proverbial saying goes, today’s professor does indeed find “the grass greener on the other side of the fence.” And who can blame him? It is perhaps his quest for a less bureaucratic and more professional association that he seeks the less restricting confines of the professional society. Inspection of the so called non-bureaucratic professional societies, however, makes one wonder if Robert Presthus’ contention that, “We live in a bureaucratic society” is not absolutely correct.

To the extent that an organization is classified as a non-professional organization, i.e., a manufacturing plant, a supermarket, the dilemma mentioned above is usually not encountered. This is so because such organizations do not rely primarily on the kind of expert knowledge that exists within the university. If and when expert knowledge is ever needed, the non-professional organization enters the knowledge market and purchases the amount and quality needed. Hence, the conflict which usually arises between the professional and the non-professional is minimized, if not avoided altogether. For example, if a non-professional organization is in need of specialized knowledge in the area of chemical analysis so that it can manufacture Brand X, it can pay a professional chemist, or a chemical research company, for its knowledge and service. The chemist or research company, under most conditions, is not really interested in knowing the uses to which its knowledge is being put. The chemist or the research company merely performs a service for which X number of dollars is paid. No friction or conflict need arise (unless the two parties cannot get together on the price of the knowledge and/or service).

However, in the case of a professional organization, a university, for example, — the chemist, or chemistry department — is interested in the outcome or use of its service. Taken to a higher level of involvement, the total academic community — as professionals — is most interested in the uses or applications of its service and knowledge. It is for this reason that we find academic senates and faculty advisory committees an integral part of most modern complex universities. And it is for this reason that many university professors choose the university as
the place to exercise their expertise—because they have the opportunity (even the responsibility) to exercise active concern in the use and application of their knowledge and service.

Given such a view, it is no wonder that the professional in the university demands the right to shape institutional policy and goals. It is no wonder he will object and even strike when an administrator (who presumably is not expert in his area) purports to tell him that he is denied promotion to the next rank or is passed over in the recent salary review. The professional, because he does have this specialized knowledge, will not usually sit still to see his work evaluated by a non-peer. It is his colleagues who are most capable of evaluating his work—and who ought to be allowed to evaluate it. To argue that it is more efficient to set up standard codes of evaluation is to miss the point. Of course it would be more economical—but the university is not in existence to produce economical and efficient procedures, although such procedures can be incorporated into the properly developed and assigned activities. The university's essential purpose is to discover, transmit, and apply knowledge. And the issue to face is how this can be accomplished most effectively.

The problem then pivots on differing values—those held by the professionals and those by the non-professional administrator. Is it possible that one can, under the present circumstances, find professionals who would be sufficiently interested in functioning as non-professional administrators? Or would the best approach be to structure the university in such a manner that bureaucracy is held to a minimum, or is in fact prevented from developing? Or, are there, in fact, other avenues which might be explored in order to circumvent and/or reduce this conflict which appears as inevitable? These are questions which must be faced if the dilemma is ever to be solved. Perhaps it may never be possible to eliminate the conflict altogether, but it does seem possible and desirable to reduce it to a tolerable level.

It has been argued that a certain amount of creative conflict is beneficial for the vitality of organizations. If this is so, then effective means should be sought which will channel and contain the conflict which results from the interaction of professional and administrator in the university. The present occurrences of conflict and disruption on our campuses clearly indicate that immediate and decisive thought must be given to this problem.
Student Residence and Academic Performance

Richard D. Grosz and Kenneth Brandt

The question is often raised as to the wisdom of a high school senior's decision to reside at home and attend a local college or university. Similarly, the question is raised as to the wisdom of a local student's decision to live in a college or university residence hall. Often, the underlying factor associated with the final decision is concerned with the prospective student's eventual academic performance. Will the student be able to achieve better grades if he or she decides to live at home? Or will he or she perform at a higher academic level while residing in a student residence hall?

Prior research in the area of academic performance and student residence has been inconclusive and somewhat inconsistent (Prusok and Walsh, 1964; Schraeder and Sledge, 1966). Elton and Bate (1966) have shown that the housing of students with like educational majors has little or no influence on grades earned during the first semester of college. A student will earn a certain grade point average regardless of his roommate's major and also, regardless of the roommate's grade point average.

Despite the fact that the student residence and assigned roommate has little to do with any particular student's academic performance, student placement within residence halls still seems to occupy a great deal of the student personnel worker's time and energy.

This study was undertaken to determine the effect of freshman residence for the first year of attendance at the University of North Dakota.

The following questions were explored in the investigation:

1. Will there be a difference in the first semester grade point averages of three matched groups of freshmen?
2. Will there be a difference in the second semester grade point averages of the same three matched groups of freshmen?

Procedure

The population for this study consisted of 87 college freshmen (male and female) attending the University of North Dakota at Grand Forks for the academic year 1965-66. The three matched
groups consisted of (1) the total population of 29 local resident freshmen residing in university residence halls; (2) a matched sample of 29 local freshmen residing at home; and (3) a matched sample of 29 North Dakota resident freshmen, other than local, residing in university residence halls. All subjects for this study were full-time students carrying a course load of 12 or more hours each semester.

A local freshman is defined as one whose home residence is located in the Grand Forks area; Grand Forks, East Grand Forks, Minnesota and the Grand Forks Air Base. The matched sample of North Dakota freshmen residents is defined as any freshman who is a resident of the state, does not consider the Grand Forks area his home residence, and does not commute to and from classes. The North Dakota sample was included in the study as a control group for purposes of comparison with the two Grand Forks or local samples.

The three groups under study were matched on the basis of sex and composite standard scores received on the American College Test (ACT). No attempt was made to control for such factors as similarity of course, college major or size of students’ high school graduating class. Grade point averages for the first and second semester for the three matched groups were computed on a 4.0 system: A = 4.0, B = 3.0, C = 2.0, D = 1.0, F = 0.0.

An analysis of variance for matched groups design was used to determine possible differences for the three matched groups (Edwards, 1950) at the .05 level.

RESULTS

The means for the first and second semester grade point averages are presented in table I.

An inspection of Table I indicates the mean grade point average similarity for the groups involved. The range of first semester grade point averages for the various groups was: Grand Forks freshmen (residence halls) 0.47 to 3.63; Grand Forks freshmen (home) 0.61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Grand Forks Residence Halls</th>
<th>Grand Forks Home</th>
<th>North Dakota Residence Halls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
SECOND SEMESTER GRADE POINT AVERAGES
GROUPS MATCHED ON BASIS OF SEX AND COMPOSITE
ACT STANDARD SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between rows</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between columns</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual (error)</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F, not significant.

to 3.96; North Dakota freshmen (residence halls) 1.17 to 3.78. The range of second semester grade point averages for the groups involved was: Grand Forks freshmen (residence halls) 0.00 to 4.00; Grand Forks freshmen (home) 0.00 to 4.00; North Dakota freshmen (residence halls) 0.83 to 4.00.

Tables II and III show the results of the analysis of variance for matched groups for the first semester and second semester grade point averages respectively.

Table II indicates that there is no significant difference in the first semester grade point averages of the three matched groups involved in this investigation (.05 level). No significant differences were detected in the academic performance of these three groups despite a difference in place of residence.

Table III similarly indicates no significant differences in the academic performance of the three matched groups for the second semester. The mean grade point averages did not differ significantly (.05 level).

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
FIRST SEMESTER GRADE POINT AVERAGES
GROUPS MATCHED ON BASIS OF SEX AND COMPOSITE
ACT STANDARD SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between rows</td>
<td>33.71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between columns</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual (error)</td>
<td>35.35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F, not significant.
SUMMARY

Freshman residence was apparently of little significance in the outcome of the first and second semester grade point averages for the three matched groups in this study. The results of this study coincide with the results of a number of similar studies in the same general area. It would seem that this and other studies indicate that entering freshmen would tend to achieve equally well regardless of residence and that academic ability is of greater importance than student residence.
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Variability in the Measurement of Campus Climate

PETER P. GRANDE AND EUGENE J. LOVELESS

COLLEGE FACULTY, administration, student personnel workers, and, in many cases, student groups are vitally concerned about the environments within which the educational enterprise is transacted. No fewer than fourteen hypotheses, for example, have been suggested (5) to account for student unrest. And each of these hypotheses acknowledges, implicitly or explicitly, the impact of the college environment, or climate.

The wide acceptance of the measures of college climate developed by Pace and Stern (7) and, more recently, the College and University Environment Scales (6) is a function in part of the widespread need and interest in this area of study. Another factor is the claim of objectivity and representativeness of the content of the scales and of their potential usefulness for comparisons between different institutions.

The scales are designed “to describe the prevailing atmosphere or climate of the campus (6, p. 1).” The purported objectivity permits the use of relatively small samples with the attendant claim that the scales appear to be free of much of the sampling bias of other scales. While it is suggested that a “reasonably representative group of qualified reporters (p. 11)” be administered the CUES, it is noted that “small and even presumably unrepresentative groups have been found from past experience to answer CUES statements in ways which do not differ very much from a larger more representative group (p. 11).” The recent evidence advanced by French (4), however, would appear to qualify the total objectivity of any such measure, especially when there is a high probability of differences among the groups being compared. This would be a most important consideration where the campus climate under study would be expected to possess selective and unique characteristics which were underrepresented in the sample selected for study.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the CUES is free from the limitations of sampling bias and whether “small and even presumably unrepresentative groups . . . answer CUES statements in ways which do not differ . . . from a larger more representative group.”
PROCEDURE

Three samples of students at a private Midwestern university were drawn for participation in this study. The first sample \( (N = 152) \) was a random, stratified sample of university undergraduates (freshmen excluded). The second sample \( (N = 52) \) was drawn from a population of general psychology students (which included sophomores, juniors, and seniors), and the third sample \( (N = 58) \) was drawn from the same population of general psychology students. The CUES was administered to each of the three sample groups and the responses scored and tallied according to the "66 plus method" advocated by Pace (6, p. 5).

If the purported objectivity of the scales is valid, then the general null hypothesis of no difference in response tendency among the three samples, "reporters," to use Pace's term, would be supported.

The strategy for data analysis was to focus only upon the items which were answered in the keyed direction by 66 per cent or more of the students in at least one of the samples. This is consistent with the recommended "66 plus method" of scoring.

RESULTS

Of the 150 "climate characteristics," or items, on the CUES, 88 were answered in the keyed direction by 66 per cent or more of the students in at least one of the samples. Of these 88 items, there were 23, or 26 per cent, for which no statistically significant differences were found among the three samples. On the other hand, there were 65, or 74 per cent, for which statistically significant differences were found among the three samples. Using a Chi-square test with 2 degrees of freedom, three items were significantly different at the .05 level, six at the .01 level, and 56 at the .001 level.*

These data would tend to place into question the suggestion that CUES is free from the limitations of sampling bias and that small and even unrepresentative groups answer CUES in ways which do not differ from a larger, more representative sample. In fairness to the CUES instrument, it is essential to point out that while the statements cited above regarding sampling bias and unrepresentative groups appear in the CUES Manual (6, p. 11), it is suggested that the CUES

* A table of item responses for the three samples with Chi-square values is available from the authors upon request.
user "select a reasonably representative group of qualified reporters (p. 11)."

While it might be possible to interpret the data presented thus far as representing merely a demonstration of the possibility that a sub-sample can differ significantly from the parent population, (in this case the general psychology samples might be considered as sub-samples of the larger stratified random sample), further analysis provided data relevant to this point.

Disregarding for the moment whether or not the two samples of general psychology students are representative of the university as a whole, they are representative of the population of general psychology students at the university. For these two groups, thus, the null hypothesis regarding no difference in response tendency would be expected to be accepted. That this condition did not obtain is evident from the Chi-square Analyses performed on the two groups of general psychology students. Chi-square was computed for the two groups of general psychology students only on the 65 items for which statistically significant differences were found in the analyses reported above. Of these 65 items, statistically significant differences were obtained for 60 items, four items at the .05 level, six at the .01 level, and 50 at the .001 level.

A second approach to data analysis yielded results which have relevance to the differential pattern of scale item endorsement which has been shown to exist among the sample groups. In order to ascertain whether the five scales produced differential rates of agreement, a ratio called the index of agreement was computed for each of the five CUES scales, i.e., Practicality, Scholarship, Community, Awareness, and Propriety for all possible combinations of the three samples. These possible combinations include (1) the three samples (A, B, and C), (2) Sample A with Sample B, (3) Sample A with C, and (4) Sample B with C. Sample A was the stratified random sample (N = 152), Sample B was one group of general psychology students (N = 58), and Sample C was the second group of general psychology students (N = 52).

The index of agreement represents the ratio of item endorsement agreement among or between the sample combinations to the total number of items endorsed by the samples comprising the combinations. These ratios are presented in Table I. Thus, for example, on the Practicality Scale there was a total of 17 items endorsed by one or
more of the three samples in the "A, B, and C" group. Of these 17 items, however, on only 4 was there agreement among the three samples. This provided the fraction 4/17, or the ratio .222. Similarly, for the groups "A and B" on the Practicality scale, 15 items were endorsed by one or both groups. Of these 15 items, there was agreement on 10 of them. This provided the fraction 10/15 or the ratio .667.

Inspection of the data in Table I indicates that a high degree of item endorsement agreement exists between Sample A and B, i.e., the stratified random sample (N = 152) and the first group of general psychology students (N = 58). On the other hand, a low degree of item endorsement agreement exists among the three samples.

In an effort to determine whether a differential degree of item endorsement agreement exists among the five CUES scales, the data presented in Table I were rank ordered by sample and a composite rank was computed across sample combinations for the five scales. These data are presented in Table II.

It is interesting to note that the highest item endorsement agree-
ment seems to be for the Community and Scholarship Scales, while lowest item endorsement agreement tends to be for the Propriety and Awareness scales. This suggests, perhaps, that the items comprising the five scales differ in their capacity to reflect collective opinion. Additional research may show that the items comprising the Scholarship and Community scales reflect more self-relevant statements while Propriety and Awareness items may reflect more "other" relevant statements. In terms of psychological distance a self-relevant statement would be one in which the environmental climate, or press, is such as to more directly affect individual functioning and behavior. An "other" relevant statement would be one in which the "reporter" is called upon to observe and comment more on "others" behavior.

**DISCUSSION**

This paper focussed upon the serviceability of CUES as a dependable measure of campus climate. The data presented tend to bring into question the purported objectivity of the scales and the efficacy of using "small and presumably unrepresentative groups" to describe a given campus climate. A secondary consideration was whether there is any indication that the five CUES scales differed in the item endorsement agreement ratios among different samples. The data suggested that a differential ratio exists, i.e., Scholarship and Community were higher in agreement ratios while Awareness and Propriety were lower in agreement ratios. Further research aimed at an item analysis along a self-relevant—"other" relevant continuum might explicate the apparent differential pattern of item endorsement agreement which seems to exist among the five CUES scales.

The data presented in this study would support the conclusion reached by Berdie (2, p. 775) that "an instrument such as CUES can be used to generalize about parts of a University, but only to a lesser extent can it be used to generalize about the entire University." Indeed the fact that the two samples of general psychology students used in this study differed so greatly may be used, in the presence of additional empirical data, to support a stronger conclusion which would bring into question the objectivity of CUES even for sub-group description and analysis. Data of this nature are crucial to the issue of the adequate description of the campus environment. If the researcher takes the position articulated by Becker (1, p. 64) that "all students are subject to the discipline of the college’s system of grades, credits,
and degree requirements," i.e., that the common orientations that result are the important ones, then a measure of campus climate that elucidates these common orientations but which may be insensitive to sub-group differences is necessary. On the other hand, along with Clark and Trow (3), if the researcher is impressed by sub-group variation and regards it useful to consider a finer set of distinctions which point to several different sub-cultures, then a measure of campus climate capable of eliciting sub-culture differences is necessary. It would seem that CUES falls short of both marks.
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Graduate Education and College Teachers

An Interview with Dr. Nelson Bossing

John Paul Eddy

Introduction

The following interview with Dr. Nelson L. Bossing, Professor of Education at Arizona State University, includes experiences that Dr. Bossing has been involved with during his 44 years of teaching in institutions of higher education. He began his 45th year of college teaching at Arizona State University in a new assignment in the summer of 1968.

Dr. Bossing graduated from Kansas Wesleyan University in 1917. In 1921 he received his B.D. from Garrett Theological Seminary and a year later received his M.A. from Northwestern University. The University of Chicago conferred the Ph.D. upon Dr. Bossing in 1925. After finishing his doctorate, he started his college teaching career at Simpson College where he was Associate Professor of Education, Head of the Department of Education and Psychology, and Director of Summer Sessions until 1927. He moved next to the University of Oregon where he was Professor of Education, Director of the University High School, and Director of Teacher Training until 1938. From 1938 to 1961, he was Professor of Education at the University of Minnesota. Since retiring in 1961, he has been Visiting Professor of Education at the University of Indiana (1961-1962) and at Southern Illinois University (1962-1968). Over the years, he has also taught at many other colleges and universities in this country and overseas.

During his long and illustrious career, Dr. Bossing has been internationally known for his teaching and writing in education. He has been the recipient of numerous honors such as Fulbright lecturer to the University of Chile, and he is listed in Who's Who in America. Dr. Bossing has also served on many important international, national, regional and local committees associated with education. Upon the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, he recalled how he had been on a committee at the University of Minnesota that selected Dr. King for outstanding service to humanity years before he was widely known throughout the nation and world.
INTERVIEW

Dr. Eddy. In terms of graduate education that is going on in this country today, we find that master’s degrees are granted in many colleges of education where there are no theses written and we have doctoral programs in some of our colleges of education going to the point of lessening the requirements on a dissertation so that some colleges call the dissertation a project paper. What is your opinion on this whole de-emphasis of writing the master’s thesis or the doctoral dissertation? How does this affect or will it affect future graduate education as well as teaching and writing itself in education?

Dr. Bossing. I have a very definite conviction about the matter. I realize the difficulty that institutions face in providing adequate guidance in a master’s degree thesis with the number that are coming through our schools. Thus I sympathize with the problem that is faced. On the other hand, I have a conviction that unless the prospective educator has the experience of undergoing the rigor that is required to research a problem, organize it, put it together and express it in understandable English, that if he does not get such experience as part of his degree work, he is likely to be graduated without one of the most valuable benefits that can come to him. I am convinced that whatever we do at the master’s degree level, a failure to write a thesis is a serious weakness in the training given, but it is a travesty that should never be permitted to happen to a candidate for a Ph.D. degree.

When I went to say goodbye to Dr. Judd on the completion of my Ph.D. work at the University of Chicago (Dr. Judd was always a very cryptic-speaking type of person) he said to me, “Dr. Bossing, your future depends on your writing, and you are going to use this position you are now going to as a jumping-off spot. Writing will help you jump.” I have just completed teaching a semi-graduate class in which a semi-research paper has been required. Over half the class admitted that this was the first research paper they had ever written. I seriously question the quality of education many of our graduate students get in such situations.

Dr. Eddy. What importance do you place on academic freedom today?
Dr. Bossing. Academic freedom is of the first importance, particularly in higher education. Unless we are searching for the truth and have complete freedom to find the truth where we may, then I think what we are doing is almost worthless. If we are not in position to speak our own mind with naturally some concern for the amenities of the situation, rather than the correctness of it, again I think we no longer deserve the name of an institution of learning searching for the truth. To that extent, the accuracy and quality of our education is questionable.

Dr. Eddy. What are some of the forces that detract from the effectiveness of college teaching?

Dr. Bossing. Well, I would say there are several forces effective for and against. I think one of the most pertinent factors affecting college teaching would be the extent of the teaching load. One cannot do the kind of teaching that is desired in the average small college requiring anywhere from a 12 to 15 hour teaching load and keep abreast of what is going on, reading all that he should, reserving time for creative thinking so as to be a fresh, intelligent, alert person in the classroom. Likewise, I think every college professor should devote a certain amount of time to writing and to research. Moreover, if he is overwhelmed with his teaching chores he cannot do an adequate job in his chosen field. On the other hand, if he is weighted down as many people are in our universities, with too much committee work, that will detract as well. For he has only 24 hours in the day in which to do a certain amount of living, a certain amount of reading, a certain amount of writing, and to keep himself alive and abreast of his time. I think he cannot become sidetracked with what people call “moonlighting” because he isn’t paid an adequate salary and has to pick up some other work in order to make a decent living. In certain countries, I found few educational books written by local educators. The reason, I discovered, was because salaries were so low professors had to take on other jobs to provide a decent living.

Dr. Eddy. How much do you believe a college teacher should take on in terms of doing research, accepting private or government grants and of writing in his field? In other words, could you develop the research function of the college teacher? Is there not a problem in
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quality teaching today and giving the students a fair share of time, especially in the graduate school with masters and doctoral candidates who have theses and dissertations?

Dr. Bossing. The big problem in research, of course, is that it may be a minor consideration in his teaching load or it may become a major function. Under the present policy of the government to increase the help that is given particularly in college and university work through research grants, there is a tendency of many good professors to cease to be teachers and cease to carry on what I regard as the main function of the college teacher. He really becomes a researcher. I think research should be held to a modest amount that would differ with different individuals, certainly an amount normally that would stimulate him and keep him mentally alert, but at the same time would not be a drag on his time and efforts to keep himself qualified immediately in terms of his teaching role. The attitude frequently voiced these days by college administrators, that budget increases must come principally by the staff securing government research funds, is not a very intelligent way to build up the quality of college or university activities.

Dr. Eddy. What teaching method do you prefer and why?

Dr. Bossing. Well, I've written a book on teaching methods for the secondary school and I would say that much of what I said there would be applicable to the work of the college teacher. As I have said before, learning is the same whether teaching in the secondary school or teaching in the college. It should not be too dissimilar. The psychology of learning is essentially the same at all levels. Certainly there are things that may be short-circuited in terms of the adult that would be much more modified or controlled for the child or the adolescent. I think, however, that basically learning must center on problems and I am very much committed in my thinking to a general problem teaching approach. Now there are a number of problems that we face in our society in which we are committed to study in a world of accelerating change. One thing that we do know is that the so-called facts of life that are thought true today may be found untrue tomorrow, or true but irrelevant for tomorrow's needs. Consequently, the best kind of preparation we can give secondary school or college students today is
to make them face problematical situations of contemporary importance. The attempted solution will develop problem solving skills, especially if our instructional procedures give constant attention to the overall principles that underlie all problem solving.

**Dr. Eddy.** How should a professor improve himself as a professor?

**Dr. Bossing.** This is a very large question. May I limit myself to a few suggestions as I see them. 1. A very important source of personal improvement has been provided by most colleges and universities through the provision of sabbaticals. These make possible needed additional study for many, extensive travel combined with study, writing for others, and for some much needed rest. Incidentally, I have had a deep conviction that the wonderful purpose underlying the sabbatical idea is much vitiated by the general provision that provides a sabbatical at half salary. Our younger professors usually find themselves weighted down with growing families, heavy home mortgages, and other drains on a modest income that often make a sabbatical leave financially inadvisable. It would seem more realistic to grant sabbaticals at full pay, even better to add an additional stipend with a sabbatical that involves travel. 2. Attendance and participation should be practiced in educational conventions, state and national. While higher institutions should provide generously for such attendance and participation, every staff member should set aside a certain sum each year for attendance at educational conferences important to his area of professional concern. A valuable experience I had early in my career came with the statement of a college dean during my employment conference. He said, "We expect every member of our staff to attend state and national conferences, to participate and provide leadership." Attendance at these conferences has proved to be a most fruitful educational experience. 3. Previously, I mentioned research and writing which in some measure every professor should undertake as part of his educational responsibility and for his professional improvement. 4. Certainly, every educator should participate in community life both for his personal development, and because he owes something to his community as a representative of its intellectual leadership.

**Dr. Eddy.** Who are some of the greatest teachers in higher education you have known?
Dr. Bossing. I think the implications of your question restricts the answer to those college teachers under whom I have studied. A number of men in the seminary were men of stature, but, my major advisor for the M.A. degree at Northwestern University and Garrett Seminary under whom I did considerable work, Dr. F. C. Eiselen, always impressed me as a great educator and person. He was a recognized Old Testament scholar, and I considered him a master teacher worthy to be emulated. Kindly and sympathetic, he was always approachable by his students and popular with them. His teaching technique was to modify ideas by carefully creating new ones that seemed to slough off old ones without the emotional disturbance so often present when in other classes brilliant professors made frontal attacks on old cherished beliefs they wished to destroy. As one personally very likeable but blunt professor often remarked at the beginning of a class period, "Well, you know we must tear down before we can rebuild."

At the University of Chicago, I met men whom I regarded as great teachers, no two of them alike. Foremost among them I would put Dr. Charles H. Judd, head of the Department of Education, and my Ph.D. adviser. He was clearly a scholar, stern in manner, precise, but a brilliant dynamic scintillating lecturer. He could hold a class or audience spellbound by the force of his delivery, the choice of words, and the organization of his thinking. It was an unforgettable experience to be in his classes or to hear him speak to large audiences. Dr. Franklin Bobbitt, whose specialty was curriculum, was recognized as a pioneer and authority in the field. His was an entirely different type of teaching personality. His scholarship was unquestioned. He wrote extensively. He was diffident before a class, chose his words carefully, used a manuscript before a class, yet students crowded his classes. He was obviously conscientious, deeply earnest about his subject, approachable, likeable. Dr. Frank N. Freeman was a quiet somewhat austere-mannered person, much dependent upon his prepared lecture before a class, very careful in the choice of language in free discussion with a class. You had a feeling that he was never fully at ease before a group. Like the others he was a writer and all acknowledged his scholarly approach to his subject as a careful thinker. He was popular with students.
More fighting erupted today between police and a handful of Central University students. Students, continuing their vigil in the registration building, have thus far been successful in their attempt to bring the university to a standstill. The president, while reluctantly calling off classes for an indefinite period, called for an end to the hostilities and asked students to go home. In a press release issued this morning, he named a twelve man committee composed of students and faculty to investigate the crisis and make recommendations. Out of the controversy came a list of demands presented to the president. The list called for:

1. Increased freedom for all students regardless of race or sex.
2. Student membership and voting rights on important academic and legislative committees.
3. Removal of the academic dean and registrar. The statement cited the academic dean for ineptitude and asked that the registrar be replaced by an imaginative person who would say something other than "no."

Although the foregoing statements are fictional in nature, they follow a familiar pattern. Student demonstrators may not yet have called for the removal of a dean or registrar, but it may occur. This writer, while not advocating student power, urges that in these changing times college administrators submit to introspection concerning their positions, their relationships with students, and their roles of leadership in the college community. Will we become the "sitting ducks" of next week or next year? What, if anything, can we perceive from an analysis of the contemporary student and his demands for freedom?

As a worker and spectator in the field of higher education, I am somewhat ambivalent in my assessment of college students. However, I do think that we can be justly proud of them. Today's student represents a more knowledgeable individual than ever before in the history of higher education, better prepared academically, and better informed about the world around him. He realizes that within his life span man may walk on the moon and travel to far distant planets. He is concerned with "human" as well as "civil" rights. He is interested in seeing injustices removed, and in the elimination of poverty, dis-
ease, and desolation. Through active participation in organizations such as the Peace Corps, Vista, and I.F.Y.E. he serves witness to his belief in ultimate world peace through understanding.

On the other hand, today's student is typified in the news media as a dirty, shiftless non-patriot existing solely for instant personal gratification through free rides, free sex, and free speech. What then is the trend or truth regarding the contemporary college student?

THE BERKELEY SCENE

To understand the situation more fully, we must take a closer look at the Berkeley phenomenon of 1964-65, which served as a catalyst or springboard for subsequent student protests and demands. Over the years the Berkeley campus has been politically active. At the Republican National Convention held in the summer of 1964, a band of Berkeley students publicly aired its dislike for the conservative candidate. Campus action followed and a group of students ultimately revolted in the name of "freedom of speech." The Freedom of Speech Movement (FSM) culminated in the arrest of approximately 800 Berkeley students and attracted national attention.

From this, the contemporary image of "the student" was born. Aside from the tactics used, the real issues enunciated by the student protestors were freedom of speech, freedom to participate in or advocate political action, freedom to assemble, and freedom to participate in university decision making, all counterparts of basic freedoms enjoyed by citizens of this nation, and guaranteed by the Constitution. News media headlined fringe demands for free love, filthy speech, and anarchy. These, in contrast to the real issues, received nationwide if not worldwide coverage.

Clues to the meaning of the rebellion are found in the fact that many of the demonstrators had previously been actively involved with the Civil Rights Movement. In the summer of 1964 many of these students, along with students from hundreds of campuses throughout the country, took part in voter registration drives in the South. These students participated in sit-ins, kneel-ins, and wade-ins and many were ultimately jailed for their commitment to the Civil Rights cause. This was the formative experience for the student activist, the boot-camp for student rebellion. The Civil Rights Movement instructed students in the tactics of Civil Disobedience, the very tactics that were soon to become evident on the college campus. And so we uncover both the roots of student commitment and the tools and
procedures that once learned were so adaptable to the college campus.
The concept of civil disobedience as used by civil rights leaders and
adopted by student activists was not new. It had been most cleverly
outlined as early as 1857 by Henry David Thoreau\(^1\) and practiced
faithfully by the late Mohandas Gandhi.

Soon the furor over civil rights became passé. The new issues were
the war in Viet Nam, the draft, and drugs, and we can only speculate
on the next issues. Whatever the cause, the tactics of civil disobedi-
ce seem destined to become a permanent tool of student generations
to come.

**WHY STUDENT REVOLT?**

Current research and literature describe the reasons for the so-called
"revolt" of students. Any analysis of these reasons will undoubtedly
misstate and omit important factors; however, a concise analysis is at-
tempted here. An attempt will be made to delineate five answers. The
first four are familiar and often quoted. The fifth is seldom discussed,
but it may be the most important.

*Alienation*

The central theme, "they are rebelling because they are alienated,"
is that the world and the modern university is so big that it is becom-
ing impersonal. The student feels that he is only a number on an
I.B.M. card, a card he is cautioned not to staple, tear, or mutilate.
This concept is enhanced by the cold war idea that we will soon perish
in a self-induced "atomic holocaust." Current authors put it more suc-
cinctly. Clark Kerr's concept of the modern multiversity establishes a
basis for the existence of alienation through such things as supposed
neglect of undergraduates by absentee professors, hugeness of the in-
stitution, and large size of classes.\(^2\) Wise presents a favored interpre-
tation that student reaction is direct evidence of the impersonality of
the large campus and the low quality of teaching in our large
universities.\(^3\) Kristol states that "Berkeley is too large, too anonymous;

\(^1\) Henry David Thoreau, "Civil Disobedience," *Man and Society* (Encyclopaedia

\(^2\) Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press,
1965).

\(^3\) W. Max Wise, "The Meaning of Berkeley," *The Journal of the Association of
Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs*, October, 1965.
there is no possibility of a face to face community of scholars, young and old." Potter makes the stinging remark that "the reality of universities was to a great extent the opposite of what students had hoped for. In the place of intellectual and personal seriousness was substituted the academic grind of large classes, intense competition for grades, exams that were irrelevant and intellectually damaging. For most, it was the first encounter with the full inflexibility of mass bureaucratic organization, the first experience with the rat race."

To add another dimension to the spectrum of alienation, Peterson suggests that we "lay aside all matters of alienation, impersonality, loss of identity and the like, because sheer size of student body must be associated with almost any other kind of activity, simply because of the greater likelihood on the big heterogeneous campus that there will be some student who wishes to start something and that he will find others who will sympathize." Heyns further amplifies the idea of minority involvement. "The fact that the number of students involved with these incidents is almost always a minority of the total student population, however, does not reduce the significance of the question. These exceptions rise out of a universal state of unrest and tension. The civil rights struggle, the war and the draft. Under these conditions, the ideas and proposals of the minority are especially contagious."

Media-Conditioned Responses

The underlying concept here is that students by and large are little different than they ever were, but are often miscast by news media. Through wholesale generalization of students and youth in general, a peaceful demonstration involving youths, a few of whom are bearded, is chalked up as a hippie, or beatnik, or vietnik happening. Thus, a type of news-media-induced alienation occurs through what is almost a "pavlovian" conditioned reflex, and leads to the premise that students begin to act and react in the image that the media portrays.

---

Self-Alienation Through Education

Williamson suggests a type of self-alienation that occurs within the student through education. Through the process of becoming "educated," the student becomes alienated from his familial and social origins and his pre-college environment. Thus, education would seem to have a built-in alienation factor, and that is as it should be. This writer believes that we have known for centuries that change takes place through and as a result of education. As individuals, we progress upwards and become mobile as we learn. The youngster, through higher education, strives for and often attains a socio-economic level that is higher than that of his parents. Over a period of time he no longer speaks their (his parents) language, as it were. This concept, if it can be termed self-alienation, is not a new concept at all, but one of the basic arguments for an organized educational system.

The Arrived Syndrome

The fourth major grouping describes the philosophy expounded by that group currently referred to as "Hippies," "Yippies," or what have you. Their philosophy is explained or excused as the result of not having a sense of national direction or commitment. Through the nineteenth century the citizenry of this nation was intensely committed to the acquisition of land and the establishment of governments. With the coming of the two world wars, our youth dedicated themselves to the fight for freedom and the preservation of all that was near and dear. After Korea, the scene began to change. Students were no longer committed to broad nationalistic causes and there seemed to be time to ponder and think, and time to question. These uncommitted "thinkers" began to evolve a new ethic, an ethic that questions such cornerstones of conventional society as Christianity, "my country right or wrong," the sanctity of marriage and premarital chastity, civil obedience, the accumulation of wealth, the rights of parents, the schools, the government; in sum, the Establishment.

This type of student seeks an existence in which he is committed neither to past values nor future causes. With his focus on the present,

---

8 E. G. Williamson, "Alienation of Students: Have We Missed Their Signals?," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Fall, 1966.
he is determined to experience everything he can. Some of the "hippies" carry this questioning and experimentation to extremes and in so doing have developed a genuine need for an escape mechanism. Unfortunately, the escape hatches may be labeled LSD, STP, or something worse.

For Renewal of Freedom

One fact emerges from a study of today's college students. Students are currently attracting more sustained attention than they have in many years. Keying in on the situation at Berkeley and other universities, Williamson and Cowen set out to study and determine just what freedoms students do enjoy. The concept of their study was that the academic method of studying student freedom as a "phenomenon" would yield needed understanding preparatory to thoughtful actions in the actual enactment of student rights. Their lengthy questionnaire was sent to a thousand colleges and universities throughout the United States, and resulted in what should be "must" reading for all administrators. Their findings were too elaborate to report in this paper, but can be summarized by saying that students enjoy those freedoms guaranteed to them by the Constitution only in direct proportion to the popularity of the questions they ask, the topics they debate, the causes they champion, the personalities they invite to speak, and the editorials they write.

In support of their concept of a participatory democracy, responsible students throughout the country have been working toward, lobbying for, and in some cases demanding, more freedom. The specific freedoms they desire are:

1. Freedom to participate in the academic community without regard to race, religion, ethnic origin, or sex.
2. Freedom to discuss issues and problems of the students' own choosing.
3. Freedom to invite and hear speakers on a wide variety of subjects.
4. Freedom to editorialize.
5. Freedom to participate in university decision making.

6. Freedom to participate or not to participate, depending upon individual convictions.

These demands are very similar to the recommendations put forth by Committee "S" of the American Association of University Professors and are in harmony with the "student freedoms" approach of the American Civil Liberties Union.

SUMMARY

That opinions vary regarding the reasons for student unrest and revolt is best summed up by Lievallen. "The current student unrest is generated in a variety of ways, the identification of the principal motivation depending upon the inclination of the reporter." Thus, it must be concluded that these and other concepts are very much in need of further research and scientific appraisal. Alienation of youth is a serious problem to be faced by colleges and universities and by society itself. We cannot ignore this seemingly unavoidable problem and yet we must not delude ourselves into thinking that this is the only problem, or a problem unique to education. Media conditioning is a phenomenon to be lived with and understood. The hippie culture must be studied without panic, and recognized for what it is—a small minority of students and non-students who have been lumped together by fate and the networks. It is a minority that deserves attention and publicity, but only to the extent that attention is not diverted from the majority of sincere, dedicated students.

Today's students project a double image, riotous and destructive on the one hand but dedicated to education and equality on the other. It is this dedication that we must recognize and accept. It can be a source of great strength to the university. We must see to it that dialogue is generated with students. Dialogue can be successful; riot and sensationalism is not the only way.

Academic Performance of Cuban-Teacher Students at the University of Miami

ROBERT A. ELTING AND MARY BUTTERFIELD

Many university admission officers currently are reviewing applications from individuals who have attained degrees from Cuban universities. Often, because of a lack of official documents and information about higher education in Cuba, it is difficult to evaluate the previous course work completed and to determine academic placement. Therefore, admission officers cannot easily predict the academic success of the Cuban students in pursuing degrees at their institutions and, thus, may have reservations about admitting them.

Since large numbers of Cubans have attended the University of Miami in recent years, the University has been able to collect useful data bearing on the problem. The most complete data were available from the records of the participants of the Cuban Teacher Program. The records of these students, therefore, were used in this report. Selection for admission into this program is made by a committee which considers the applicant's English proficiency, academic and professional background (3, 8), and motivation to complete the program. Much of the motivation of the applicants is associated with the goal of being gainfully employed as teachers. Those who are accepted take twenty-four semester hours of credits in regular, undergraduate course work with U.S. students. Individual programs are planned, based upon courses completed in Cuban universities and State of Florida certification requirements.

An attempt has been made to relate the overall letter grade average achieved to standardized test scores and a consolidation of the results of the original study is reported here.

THE STUDY

The following is a study of the relationship between grades attained by the Cuban-teacher students and their test scores on the Cooperative English Test (CET) and the National Teachers Examination (NET). One hundred and thirteen students with Cuban degrees

\[\text{\footnote{This program has been supported during the past six years by funds from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.}}\]

\[\text{\footnote{For a more complete description of the Program, see Wey (9).}}\]
roughly equivalent to U.S. bachelor's degrees were included in this study and, in addition, nineteen students were included who had completed one of the programs in English in Cuba representing less than a U.S. bachelor's degree. The special programs in English were either a three year diploma course of study leading to the title "Professor of English" or a four summer session course leading to the same title.

The Cuban Universities represented include the Universities of Havana (4, 5), Oriente (6), and Villanueva (7). The data did not include the following: Students who had attended a U.S. University, those who completed fewer than twenty-four credits of course work and those who had not completed work for a degree, certificate, or diploma at a Cuban University.

One of the tests used was the Cooperative English Test, Form Y, which was administered before the student entered the program. Scores were recorded in percentiles, using national norms published in the manual. The other test used was the National Teachers Examination which the student took at a regularly scheduled administration following his entrance into the program. The scores were reported as standard scores. Since one of the requirements for certification in Florida was a NTE score of 500, it was necessary for some students to take the test more than once. When this occurred, the most recent score was reported.

There were nine fields represented among the Cuban degrees held by the students, most of which were in social sciences, with education predominating. These degrees are at least equivalent, in terms of years in school, to a four year bachelor's degree, but this is not the case for the special programs in English.

It was observed that there was little difference between the averages obtained on the first twelve credits and the averages received on the second twelve credits. For the sake of consolidation only the second twelve credits are reported. In this study the average of 1.0 to 1.5 was referred to as D, 1.6 to 2.5 as C, 2.6 to 3.5 as B, and 3.6 to 4.0 as A. The students usually registered for only six credits at a time because all but one or two held full-time jobs.

RESULTS

Data about the total group is presented in tables followed by a discussion of the material beginning with the scores on the CET and concluding with the NTE scores. General statements are made concerning the overall academic success of each group. Where possible, data are
included which are not available in the table but which further clarify the results. Interpretations of the findings of this study are limited by the lack of a comparison group of Cuban students not selected by the Cuban Teacher Program.

Cuban Teacher Program students who had evidence of attaining a degree, diploma or certificate at approved Cuban Universities succeeded academically in the University of Miami. That is, they earned passing or better grade point averages. Mulligan (2) found similar results in that about two-thirds of the Cubans in the evening session at the Baruch School who had some course work in Cuban Universities attained a "C" or better average.

In the present study there was a full range of grades, with some obtaining "A" averages and some "D" averages. None failed any semester. They generally received satisfactory ("C") or better ("B," "A") grades. Of the total group, 50 per cent had better than a "C" average and scored above the ninth percentile on the CET and above 549 on the NTE.

Since nearly half of those with degrees scored below the 10th percentile on the CET (see Table I), it is difficult to make any valid comparisons of CET to an overall average for the twelve credits. Although most of the students who scored below the twentieth percentile received a "C" average or below, many were able to obtain a "B" average and some even an "A" average. There did not seem to be a clear relationship between test scores and overall averages. The per-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CET Score</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
formance of the students who completed the special English programs was at the "C" level or better throughout; however, the range was large ("A"-'D").

Over half of the students scored low on CET—below the 20th percentile. However, those with a Philosophy and Letters degree and those with a three year English certificate performed better on the CET than did the group in general.

The second part of the study was concerned with the comparison of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTE Score</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700-749</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650-699</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-649</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-599</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-549</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450-499</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-449</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350-399</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NTE scores with grades. When germane, individual CET and NTE scores are discussed in conjunction with overall averages.

Table II shows that over half of the students scored between 500 and 600 on the NTE while less than 10 per cent were below 450. One student scored very low and also maintained no better than a satisfactory average at the University. The other student who performed at the University at a low level was able to obtain a score of 522 on the NTE. It is interesting to note that he also received a score at the first percentile on the CET. However, many students who scored low on both of these tests received satisfactory or better grades. Thus there was a definite relationship between grades and NTE scores, on the positive side.

Those with a diploma of Professor of English received a wide range of NTE scores, from 450 to 707. There seemed to be a positive relationship between NTE scores and overall averages. The range of

*This program included extensive study of the English language.
scores of those with a four summer certificate in English was narrow, and all scored at least 500 on the NTE.

As with the CET data previously stated, those with a Philosophy and Letters degree or a diploma of Professor of English received better NTE scores that did the group in general. It also appears that throughout all the groups there was a positive relationship indicated between the NTE scores and University of Miami grades. This was most pronounced with those who held a diploma of Professor of English.

CONCLUSIONS

1. For prediction purposes, it is possible for admission officers to use the Cooperative English Test as an indication of English proficiency.

2. Cuban teachers with Cuban university backgrounds and successful completion of United States university work should be able to attain at least average scores on the National Teachers Examination.

3. The admission officer should consider carefully the course of study previously followed by a student at a Cuban university. Those with extensive English course work in their programs, i.e., those who hold Philosophy and Letters degrees or completed one of the English programs, perform better than those who followed curriculums without English.
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What's in a Name?
Management of Record Names

EDGAR WIRT

Miss Merrie-Mae Cathryn St. Ives (who happens to be called Kate) might be distressed if any college record of hers is identified as:

STIVES MERRIEMA C

Perhaps J. Edgar Hoover is annoyed by a conversion to JOHN E. HOOVER. These are typical, however, of various corruptions of name that appear from a mechanized system. We rather expect people to be sensitive about their names and to prize the niceties that they prefer in displaying their names. Universities, more than commercial firms, are likely to be criticized for mismanagement of names; but mechanization has pushed us into many such compromises. We ask for "full legal name" on applications, but we take liberties with it in routine operations.

One of the niceties that has generally gone by the board is title of address. At a southern university one student wrote to the president his objection to receiving mail with his name in a mechanized style: "At least most people address me as 'Mr.' " Promptly came a directive from the president that henceforth all mail to students would address them as "Mr." or "Miss" or "Mrs." Isn't it in the keypunched records? Then put it in!

DOE, JOHN STUDENT on a letter contains just as much information as JOHN STUDENT DOE. It may be incumbent on letter carriers to offer for delivery any letter that has a valid address, but some of them have testily returned such letters with the notation: "No such Person." Perhaps both the letter carrier and the addressee are affronted by a name that is backward.

Restrictions inherent in early data processing set the pattern for many of our compromises, especially that a name had to be stored in exactly the form it was to be printed. In current data processing systems many of those restrictions can be lifted; but the old pattern persists, partly because some related problems have not been resolved.
MANAGEMENT OF NAMES

In re-studying the management of student names in a computer system, the crux of the problem is to differentiate between the name as it is displayed in printed output and the name as it is stored. They don’t have to be the same. The stored name can be in a form that is never displayed but from which we can readily derive any display form we want. The display form may well be different on different occasions or for different uses. Still a third major differentiation is the unique name format whereby normal sorting will alphabetize names into proper directory sequence. Too often the grand compromise is to record and display only one name format which then has to serve all display purposes and also serve for alphabetic sequencing. Hence the maximum and most objectionable corruptions.

With increasing storage capacity and longer records it is feasible to record one name in two or more forms. Or with high speed processing (much faster than printing) it is possible to store only the most complete form and to create from it any other form as needed during printing. Whatever rules and instructions can be taught to a keypunch clerk for extracting some standard name format can also be taught to a computer programmer—who has to master it only once. Shorter names can be constructed by formula from longer names; but, of course, the reverse is not true. It may be more convenient and economical to store a second form of each name, likewise constructed by formula from the full name. Most likely this would be an “alphabetizing” format or an abbreviated “name key” for use in enquiry or calling out a specific record.

To take advantage of the new flexibility in managing names, it could defeat the purpose to start with the corrupted forms as now recorded. Fortunately most names did not have to be modified or shortened to get them into the space we had allotted. But it is a chore to discover which ones have been modified and to look up other records in order to recapture the full, elegant name. If we don’t look now, but start a new procedure for recording future names, in a few years our file will have converted itself. What we will examine here are the possibilities and means for adhering as much as possible to the preferred form of names, with as much as possible of the conventional niceties. There will be compromises and limitations—but not all of the old ones. One hoary restriction that most of us expect to live with for a time is CAPITAL LETTERS ONLY.
THE FULL LEGAL ELEGANT NAME

The full legal name may need to be displayed no more than twice in a student's tenure: on the historical (permanent) record when it is initiated, and again on his diploma—for which it may have to be retyped anyway. If the student has the option, he may even then alter his “diploma” name. For only these uses we bypassed the mechanized system, which then never did record the full name for some students. More useful in day to day operations is a name form that is restricted in total length. However, the newer practice of producing complete record copies by print-out, from tape or disk storage, warrants the full name in accessible computer storage.

An earlier occasion for display of full name might be when the admissions office first gleams the name from an application and prints out, for the applicant to audit, the information that has been recorded from his application. Such an audit helps to correct errors early in the process and also points up missing data. While he is auditing, why not let him see also how we propose to represent his name in a directory or in our routine workaday operations?

The full legal name can grow—when a woman student marries and her new surname is added to the previous full name. Elegance and clarity suggest that the original or maiden surname be preserved in parentheses. Normal caution certainly dictates that it should not be deleted or “scrubbed.” The Dean of Women is only one of various persons on the staff who plead that the maiden name should be displayed even in a shortened version of the name, for better continuity and cross reference. Somewhere on the record there has to be a cross reference forward with the new name and backward with the old name, and this can also be indicated within the name itself.

If the full name is keyed into storage, with suitable rules and conventions, it can be displayed in full form or shortened form, in normal “diploma” style or reversed “directory” style. Also it can be reformed for strict alphabetizing sequence, or into a condensed “name key” for various uses. The stored image of the full name needs a gimmick to facilitate such manipulation of the name—a gimmick that is never displayed. The stored image does preserve most of the niceties, which are to be displayed.

The gimmick is to identify four possible parts in each name and to mark them off in the stored image:
WHAT'S IN A NAME?

First-name / Middle-name(s) / Last-name / Suffix (Jr., etc.)
Merrie-Mae/Cathryn/St.Ives
Merrie-Mae/Cathryn (St.Ives) / O’Rourk
John/DeWitt/McDonald/III
Le Roy//Fox/Jr.
Carlos/Juan Jesus Maria/Fernandez/y Gonzalez

It may be a toss-up whether the name is to be recorded always in normal sequence (1-2-3-4) or directory sequence (3-1-2-4); either can be reconstructed from the other. But in either case the parts have to be predetermined and marked off in the stored image of the name. The slash (/) is used here as the marker because it does not call for keyshift out of alphabetic into numeric characters on the keypunch. Commas might be used, or the digits 2,3,4, but preferably not when they involve keyshift.

*First-name* may be a divided name (Le Roy), hyphenated (Jo-Ann), or have an internal capital (LaVerne). It is whatever the student says is his first-name. The *last-name* may likewise be complex: separated prefix (Van der Grift), punctuation (O’Day, Duke-Elder, St.Ives), a mixture of capital and small letters (McCoy, laMothe). It is whatever the family name is, what is used in common by all members of the family. *Middle-name(s)* includes everything between. Maiden name (with or without parentheses) becomes the last part of middle-names. Absence of any middle name is indicated by a double marker (//) as in: Le Roy//Fox/Jr.—not by any introjection such as "NMI." The *suffix* properly comes last, whether the name is displayed in normal or directory style. Only the suffixes “Jr.” and "Sr." are preceded by a comma and followed by a period in either sequence. In directory form all suffixes still come last and are probably preceded by commas.

The preferred, elegant spacing, capitals, and punctuation that are within any part of the name are recorded, one way or another. With only capital letters for the record, an internal capital (like McCoy, deBoy) can be represented by introducing another internal space (MC COY, DE BOY). When apostrophe is not available, an extra space represents it (O DAY, L ESTRADE). Since there may be internal spaces within one formal part of a name, it is not possible to rely on spaces to demark the true parts. Hence the deliberate and necessary in-
insertion of markers. They are deleted before the name is displayed in any form.

From the full name (with internal markers) other formats can be derived by formula—by subroutines within a computer program. One or more of the derived forms may also be stored as part of the record. Any others can be reconstructed on demand. Following are some varieties:

Source name:
Merrie-Mae Cathryn St. Ives
Merrie-Mae Cathryn (St. Ives)
O’Connor
Le Roy Fox, Jr.

Record image of name:
MERRIEM-MAE/CATHRYN/ST.
IVES
MERRIEM-MAE/CATHRYN
(ST. IVES)/O’CONNOR
LE ROY/FOX/, J r.

Normal display:
MERRIEM-MAE CATHRYN ST.
IVES
LE ROY FOX, JR.

Reversed (directory) display:
ST.IVES, MERRIEM-MAE
CATHRYN
FOX, LE ROY, JR.

Arbitrarily curtailed:
ST.IVES, MERRIEM-MAE CA
FOX, LE ROY, JR.

Shortened by formula:
ST.IVES, MERRIEM-MAE C.
O’CONNOR, M. C. (ST.IVES)

Shortened, normal array:
MERRIEM-MAE C. ST.IVES
M. C. (ST.IVES) O’CONNOR

Alphabetizing form:
ST.IVES MERRIEM-MAE CATH-
RYN
OCONNOR MERRIEM-MAE CA-
THRYN ST.IVES
There is no limit to the varieties of display. There are also other ways to record a name. One compromise pattern is to record the full name in directory style (last-name first) and to replicate the two initials in front of it:

M C ST.IVES, MERRIE-MAE CATHRYN

For full name, read the record beginning in the third letter position. For short name, read the initials and name up to the comma or first marker. This leaves any suffix to be attached somehow.

DIRECTORY SEQUENCE

Data processing from its earliest time has spawned various shortcuts, alternatives, and approximations to establish and maintain alphabetic sequence of names. It took so much longer to sort on a string of alphabetic characters than on a number. And at best automatic sorting does not produce true directory sequences—especially if the recorded names have any of the niceties. Any punctuation or internal spacing in a name messes up the alphabetic sorting (and so does a mixture of capital and small letters). If a satisfactory sequence could once be established by one means or another, a serial number could be assigned to each name so that numerical sorting recreated the alphabetic sequence. Most computers today make little more work out of sorting on a long name than on a short number; but there still are drawbacks. Alphabetizing is involved so many times in so much of the output from student records. When a file is sorted into subgroups or some other sequence, even though the original file entered the operation in alphabetic sequence, the various segments of the output may not retain their alphabetic sequence—not in a tape or disk sort, unless the alphabetic sequence is again part of the sorting operation. And automatic sorting does not produce true directory sequence unless the names are first reformed according to certain rules.
There is no requirement that any college must observe standard directory sequence in its own output. But what is standard directory practice today? Some of us remember when all the "Mc's" were filed ahead of all other "M's" but this has not been directory practice for 30 years or more. It is illuminating to examine some large modern city directories or telephone directories. Most of them are published in just a few large printing plants and their pattern is uniform. To illustrate the pattern, names that are displayed in the directory as de Boy, Jo-Ann O'Rourke
St. Vincent, Harry McConnell, Jr.
are alphabetized as though they were:

DEBOY JO-ANN OROURK
SAINTVINCENT HARRY MCCONNELL JR

Full names can be reformed for automatic sorting into directory sequence by observing the following rules, which are necessary in most computers if not all:

1—Arrange the name parts 3-1-2-4 (last-name/first-name/middle-name/suffix)
2—Change all letters to capital letters
3—Change ST. and STE. to SAINT and SAINTE
4—Keep hyphens, but delete all other punctuation
5—Delete all internal spaces
6—Delete the markers, leaving single spaces between parts of the name.

The programmer may throw up his hands; that Saint business is the last straw. As a matter of fact, it produces an anomaly in the directory: names displayed as "St" are filed among the "Sa's." But Saints are rare, and a small compromise is acceptable: let them be recorded as ST. IVES and ST. ANNE. Keep the period and then, without further concern when they sort, at least all the "Saints" will come marching in together ahead of STAAN, and not be scattered between STAAN and STYZAN. Why not propose a similar departure for O'CONNOR and O'TOOLE, to keep the apostrophe which would sort them all ahead of OAKES and the other "O's"? But internal spaces do have to be deleted; they make too much difference in directory sequence. Whether the name you hear is displayed "de Boy" or
"Deboy," "Van de Vere" or "Vandevere," look for it in the same place in directory sequence.

Another compromise saves much bother. Telescope last-name and first-name according to rule, but any agglomerate of middle-names can be left intact as a "literal." Any resulting discrepancies in directory name sequence would be minor and rare.

THE WORKDAY NAME

Full name may require the allocation of 40 or more letter spaces in each record, whether they are needed or not. It can be done in less space if there is some preliminary tinkering with over-long names—some sacrifice of completeness probably in the middle-names. Who would object, when, and how much?

Often it is desirable to display all names in smaller space, as in mailing with a window envelope or with labels of limited size, or on a list or directory or some other document where there just isn't enough room to print everything we want. One crude way, when last-name is first, is to chop arbitrarily at some fixed length. Again, who would object, and how much would their objections weigh? Such curtailment would be unthinkable in normal sequence with first-name first, and last-name chopped.

Another alternative is to convert first-names and middle-names to their respective initials. But this abridges even names that were not too long in the first place. Only a small minority of names need to be abridged in order to fit into a predetermined maximum length of 22 to 24 characters. Any transforming subroutine could be triggered only if full-name exceeds that length. A more elegant subroutine might be selective: abridge first- the middle-name and if that much contraction is sufficient, skip any further modification. Another permanent subroutine would convert the shortened name from normal to directory format or vice versa.

THE NAME KEY

Another compromise, not for display but for other purposes, is a combination of telescoping and curtailing the full name. For example, fixed separate fields are assigned for last-name (up to 12 characters), first-name (up to 8 characters), and middle initial (1 character)—like the ETS format for names in reporting College Board test scores. Un-
used space at the right in any field is filled out with blanks. Besides this curtailment, the name in each field has been telescoped according to the above rules (or somebody's rules) for alphabetizing format. With proper rules for format, full names can be alphabetized by name-key alone into something pretty close to correct directory sequence. There will be some small clusters of identical name-keys for different people whose full names may be different when they are displayed in full. And when they are so displayed, it may be discovered that some of them did not happen to fall quite accurately into their proper directory sequence; some are out of place to the extent of one or more lines. Any ensuing penalties and objections would weigh—how much? In a list of 50,000 names there will be at least several sets of triplet and quadruplicate name-keys, and a sprinkling of doublets. Within each set of two or more the individual students are always distinguishable by supplemental data: the full name, or birth-date, or Social Security number, etc.

Another use for name-key is search or inquiry into a file that is organized by name-key—the full name and other data being also part of the record. Given a unique name-key, the computer will produce the full name and record for that student. If the name-key is identical for two or more persons, the computer says so. Then there are several alternate procedures, such as:

1—Produce the records for each one of the several; throw away the ones you don't want.

2—Introduce also some other part of the data for complete identification.

3—Get an immediate feedback from the computer, telling you the full name plus some other data on each of the several; signify your selection among these and then get what you wanted in the first place.

This discussion has somewhat belied the true nature and significance of what may be called a name-key. As a matter of fact, any "key" for entry and selection in a file must be unique; there can not be two alike. The condensation of name into name-key produces only part of the complete, unique identification. In other words, there must be more to the complete key. This might be no more than one additional character assigned so as to distinguish always between otherwise identical name-keys. Or it may be another unique element of data,
such as the Social Security number—which itself could be a unique key for records in a file that is organized by Social Security number. The reason for using name-key as the primary part of the complete key is to be able to inquire with name only, though it is only part of the complete key. In most instances it will be adequate because it is unique. In other cases there has to be some additional operation such as those mentioned above.

An adequate, standardized name-key is a not-quite-perfect means of alphabetizing names and a not-quite-perfect means of identifying or specifying a record. If there are not uniform rules for compiling and using the name-key, the same name may show up two ways that don’t match and thereby create two records. Or in a search the same name might have to be tried “for fit” in several ways:

- O’CONNOR JO ANN C
- OCONNOR JOANN C
- O CONNOR JO A

However, any incoming name can be intercepted and edited in the computer in order to normalize or standardize it as a valid name-key. In a search or inquiry, if the full name-key does not find a “hit” among the records, this could trigger a secondary routine that would search again on the basis of two initials and last-name to find any possible correspondence.

The name-key is no way to display a name on documents; it is for other purposes—an “in house” device. The same kind of things could be done with a name-key comprised of only two initials and last-name. But, of course, there would be many more duplicates, and directory sequence of the full names as displayed would be much more distorted.

OTHER NICETIES

Should there be periods after all initials and abbreviations? That is (sigh) another nicety that has pretty well gone by the boards—in directories, on pay checks, credit cards, and about all the appurtenances of mechanized systems. In directory format it is very desirable to mark off the complete last-name (which may be divided) and any suffix with a comma.

Some religious titles (Sister, Father, Frater, Brother) might be treated as first-name. There is a compromise solution for the “Mr.-
Mrs.-Miss’ problem—without opening the door to questions of "Prof." or "Rev." or "Maj.," etc. It is a reasonable presumption that no male should be insulted by being addressed as "Mr." There is a growing practice, already acceptable in business circles, to address all women as "Ms." These two universal titles don’t need to be part of the record; if the record includes any designation of sex, the titles can be created as needed.

Those of us (about one in ten) who go by our middle names are in a continuous hassle with those others who want to shorten our names their way. If a student has the opportunity to signify his preference for his middle name, we can record it:

John #Edgar/Hoover/Sr.

The (#) or some other character different from the slash (/) as the marker ahead of middle-name says, in effect: "If you shorten this name, keep me and curtail first-name."

Parentheses around the maiden name (as part of middle-names) say, in effect: "If you shorten this name, keep me and curtail the rest of middle-name or even first-name." Instead of parentheses, some special mark could be recorded ahead of maiden name, to be deleted before printing.

In the management of names obviously some compromises are inescapable—but not all the old ones! With more competent hardware and good programming some of the old compromises are no longer necessary—and especially the grand compromise of only one limited name format for all purposes, which satisfies none of them. Niceties of name (like manners) may be a thing of the past, but in colleges and universities it behooves us to respect them and to observe them in our management in so far as it is practicable. It is now more practicable than it was before in mechanized systems.
A QUESTIONNAIRE was mailed to 317 member institutions of the Middle States Association of Collegiate Registrars and Officers of Admission. Responses were received from 292 institutions—a 92 per cent response. These are summarized below. The numbers in parentheses indicate percentages to the nearest integer. The 292 institutions fall into the following categories:

Senior Colleges 230 (79) Private Colleges 213 (73)
Junior Colleges 61 (21) Public Colleges 79 (27)
Other 1 (0)

I. Data on Repetition of a Failed Course

A. If a student fails a course and then repeats it with a passing grade, do you record both the original failure and the repeated grade on the transcript?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO ANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>284 (97)</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. If a student fails a course and then repeats it with a passing grade, do you count both grades in the grade point average (CBG); count only the passing grade in the grade point average (COP); count only the failing grade in the grade point average (OTHER)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBG</th>
<th>COP</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO ANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>187 (64)</td>
<td>98 (34)</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 (66)</td>
<td>72 (31)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 (56)</td>
<td>26 (43)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 (64)</td>
<td>71 (33)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 (63)</td>
<td>27 (34)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. If a student fails a course and then repeats it and fails again, do you count only one failure in the grade point average (COF); count both failures in the grade point average (CBF)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COF</th>
<th>CBF</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO ANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98 (34)</td>
<td>183 (63)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 (30)</td>
<td>151 (66)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>8 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II. Data on Repetition of a Passed Course

A. Do you permit a student to repeat a course in which he received a passing grade?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YAO*</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>193 (66)</td>
<td>72 (25)</td>
<td>19 (6)</td>
<td>8 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Colleges</td>
<td>149 (65)</td>
<td>57 (25)</td>
<td>17 (7)</td>
<td>7 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Colleges</td>
<td>43 (70)</td>
<td>15 (25)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Colleges</td>
<td>130 (61)</td>
<td>58 (27)</td>
<td>19 (9)</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Colleges</td>
<td>63 (80)</td>
<td>14 (18)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Yes, but only on an audit or non-credit basis.

B. If repetition of a passed course is permitted, is special permission needed (figures based on "Yes" answers to A)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>108 (56)</td>
<td>72 (37)</td>
<td>13 (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Colleges</td>
<td>88 (59)</td>
<td>52 (35)</td>
<td>9 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Colleges</td>
<td>19 (44)</td>
<td>20 (47)</td>
<td>4 (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Colleges</td>
<td>77 (59)</td>
<td>44 (34)</td>
<td>9 (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Colleges</td>
<td>31 (49)</td>
<td>28 (44)</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. If special permission to repeat a passed course is needed, who gives this permission (figures based on 108 "Yes" answers to B)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>ANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Dean</td>
<td>70 (65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Committee</td>
<td>12 (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Advisor</td>
<td>14 (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>12 (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Several schools indicated combinations of the above selections, hence total does not equal 108.)
D. If repetition of a passed course is permitted, may only a D course, not a course with a higher grade, be repeated (figures based on "Yes" answers to A)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO ANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>95 (49)</td>
<td>62 (32)</td>
<td>36 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Colleges</td>
<td>70 (47)</td>
<td>55 (37)</td>
<td>24 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Colleges</td>
<td>25 (38)</td>
<td>7 (16)</td>
<td>11 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Colleges</td>
<td>66 (51)</td>
<td>43 (33)</td>
<td>21 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Colleges</td>
<td>29 (46)</td>
<td>19 (30)</td>
<td>15 (24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. If repetition of a passed course is permitted, is only one repetition per course permitted (figures based on "Yes" answers to A)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO ANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>57 (30)</td>
<td>78 (40)</td>
<td>58 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Colleges</td>
<td>43 (29)</td>
<td>60 (40)</td>
<td>46 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Colleges</td>
<td>14 (33)</td>
<td>18 (42)</td>
<td>11 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Colleges</td>
<td>42 (32)</td>
<td>50 (38)</td>
<td>38 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Colleges</td>
<td>15 (24)</td>
<td>28 (44)</td>
<td>20 (32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. If repetition of a passed course is permitted, does the original, as well as the repeated grade, appear on the transcript (figures based on "Yes" answers to A)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO ANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>189 (98)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. If repetition of a passed course is permitted, do both grades count in the student's grade point average (figures based on "Yes" answers to A)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO ANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>95 (49)</td>
<td>94 (49)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Colleges</td>
<td>78 (52)</td>
<td>68 (46)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Colleges</td>
<td>16 (37)</td>
<td>26 (60)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Colleges</td>
<td>69 (93)</td>
<td>58 (45)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Colleges</td>
<td>26 (41)</td>
<td>36 (57)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. If only one grade is counted, which is it (figures based on "No" answers to G)?
Also requested from the respondents were comments or suggestions on the rationale behind their policy on repeat courses. It is interesting to note that almost all favored the inclusion of all grades in the cumulative index. Here is a sampling of the comments:

We feel that the transcript must reflect the total academic story. This is fair to all—to those who do not repeat and to those who do repeat courses. If you record and count only the higher grade, it is unfair to those who do not repeat. Moreover, from a purely mechanical point of view, this simplifies the bookkeeping.

Since a course is included in the student's load each time he takes it, we consider it both logical and necessary to include it on his record and in computation of his GPA. Elimination from the record of a failed course (even if successfully repeated later) would destroy the accuracy of the permanent record or transcript, which describes the academic progress of a student semester by semester and cumulatively. More philosophically speaking, failures in life may be overcome by subsequent successes, but are not made non-existent.

The transcript is a historic presentation of a student's academic work—all of it. In fairness to the student who makes a C grade or better after taking a course the first time, we feel a repeated course meriting such a grade should be identified as such on the permanent record. Similarly, all work completed by a student affects his cumulative average. The "history" of the transcript is additive. We do not omit or delete past history because it is not particularly pleasant for an individual.

Our faculty committee feels that the inclusion of both grades in the cumulative index places a severe burden on the student.

Many schools indicated that they were presently studying their policy on repeat courses.
Editorial Comment

S.A.N.

This became a familiar signature to readers of COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY during the period 1955-1966. Sam Nock’s editorials had substance and literary quality. They reflected what the writer of his AACRAO honorary membership citation described as “our scholar and our model of a modern Renaissance man.”

Sam’s last editorial was directed to me. It ended with the words Joseph Auslander inscribed to him when he gave him a book of his poems: “Toward more leisure in a moving world.” Sam savored these words, in which leisure meant not loafing, but unhurriedly (at least outwardly) and persistently probing, evaluating, reflecting, enjoying, contributing—living the full life of the “Renaissance man.” His efforts contributed significantly to bringing AACRAO to its position of leadership in education’s “moving world.”

R.E.M.

* * *

Sam A. Nock died on January 14, 1969.

* * *
Book Reviews

CLIFFORD L. CONSTANCE

The Mirror of Brass, by Mark H. Ingraham and Francis P. King. (1968; 350 pp., paper) University of Wisconsin Press, Box 1379, Madison, Wis. 53701.

This report is subtitled "The Compensation and Working Conditions of College and University Administrators." It includes descriptive data on the persons who are administrators—age, sex, degrees, years of service—and indirectly considerable insight into the nature of administrative hierarchies. Facts and comments were gathered from 6275 individual administrators in 877 four-year liberal arts and general institutions; this was a questionnaire study made by the Association of American Colleges with the collaboration of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. Ten administrative positions were identified and studied separately: president, academic vice president, dean of the liberal arts college, dean of the graduate school, director of libraries, chief business officer, dean of students, director of admissions, registrar, and director of development. The other half of the book takes up various forms of compensation as they apply to all administrative positions, with chapters on salaries, retirement, insurance, leaves, travel, housing, and other matters.

The purely statistical section is nearly fifty packed pages in an appendix. Summary tables are included also in the principal pages of comment and analysis where they contribute most clearly. The author thus explains his organization plan:

Part I of this report deals with the various benefits about which information was requested in the fact-finding portion of the questionnaire. Beyond reporting and analyzing statistics, it attempts to reflect the opinions of administrators about these benefits, to assess the different types of compensation, and to make suggestions concerning many of them. Part II deals with the incumbents of the ten positions considered, their work, the conditions under which it is done, and their reactions to their situations. The larger portion is devoted to selected quotations taken from the questionnaires. . . . Throughout, but particularly in the concluding chapter, I make a few expanded remarks and draw certain conclusions.

This data-based report is kept refreshingly readable by the author's light and perceptive touch, especially notable in his choice and juxtaposition of quotations.

Chapter 20 on "The Registrar and the Director of Admissions" is rela-
tively short and filled mainly with comments from our fellow officers on such universal problems as "attractiveness" of the position, overwork and extra duties, staff, communication and relationships, attitudes of faculty and students, specific frustrations, and suggestions for improvements in our offices. This is an experience in sharing the grief. It is disconcerting to find in the "Salaries" chapter that we are at the bottom of the list of ten administrators, the median of 689 registrars being $9,000 per year, and the median of 670 directors of admissions being $10,500. (This difference between these two positions may be due to sex rather than to status, since only 59 per cent of the former are male as compared to 82 per cent of the latter.) The range is from around $5,000 in some small institutions to over $20,000 in some large public universities. The average registrar is paid 70 per cent, the average director of admissions 79 per cent as much as the average full professor (adjusted to a year-service base). However, we share almost equally with other administrators the various forms of supplementary compensation. Nor are we alone in our inability to take the vacations to which we are entitled, for we are almost at the median of 50 per cent realized vacation time reported by all these administrative officers.

This book is a pleasure to read, and deserves a place on the reference shelf; its facts and philosophies will not be outdated soon.


This book of international perspective opens with a theoretical discussion by Prof. Curle of Harvard. One summary that he makes is "three new things in which education is involved: social mobility for the individual, development for society, and technological revolution." Regarding the last of these he says "The antidote to the problem of technology is not less technology but more of it." His concluding statement emphasizes the need and inevitability of more "openness" and less "cloister."

A sudden change appears after 24 pages with Dean Alexander's view from Antioch, Ohio, of "England's New Seven." The University Grants Committee laid down eight basic principles to be followed by Sussex beginning in 1961, with others issued to Essex in 1964. These principles, though general (to enrich the culture), were adjusted rather quickly. Alexander wrote freely about structures within the universities, but could say little about the success of the various divergent attempts because he wrote his speech only a year after the last of these institutions began taking students.

Pro V-Chancellor of the University of Warwick wrote about some prob-
lems of new universities. His article was very general and could serve as the first lecture to a graduate class in education. His references were comparatively few and therefore this might have been used as the first article in the book, to be followed by the history given (later) by Karmel.

To understand, and possibly appreciate, Sheffield Prof. Armytage's "Thoughts after Robbins" the reader needs to be familiar with the Robbins Report. Armytage quotes frequently, but only a well-read Britisher can assimilate what he says. The article might better have concluded the collection or been made a supplement to it.

James Dundonald offers "Advice to an Alderman," a general background of the problems to be encountered in establishing a university. It is like Prof. Curie's lecture in that it does not apply to a particular institution and is therefore somewhat theoretical. The emphasis is upon "distinction." The essay is aimed at lay educators, not academicians.

The most alive chapter is V-Chancellor Karmel's case study of Flinders in Australia. He gives a history of its birth at University of Adelaide, its planned separation, its growth to comparative maturity, and its independence (celebrated July 1, 1966, by students in a six-course breakfast with champagne at 7:15 a.m.). He explains the reasoning for various decisions and evaluates their success as far as possible. His account covers five years of planning under fairly definite conditions and therefore seems the most real part of the book.

The book ends with a chapter on the social, cultural, and economic conditions in New Zealand as they affect tertiary education. Prof. Oliver does not write of a single new university but rather of the general notion that because New Zealand is limited in resources it must "develop its strengths, not deplore its weaknesses."

The book is recommended as supplementary material for administrators, boards of education, and young persons ambitious in educational fields. It is not easy reading for a layman.


This book pictures the need of people in all walks of life for periodic and refresher learning, and how university-oriented adult education is answering this need for hundreds of thousands of adults annually. The author is Director of the Departments of Independent Study, Off-Campus Classes, and Special Courses at the University of Minnesota; the book was written for the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. It employs the "how-it-was-done, how-to-do-it" approach to that phase of Continuing Education which is defined as continuing study by adults, utilizing periodic learning experi-
ences within a university environment, and featuring a specially designed facility. This is the way it was done in the ten pioneering, self-contained adult colleges that came into being through the financial assistance of the Kellogg Foundation—Michigan State (the first, in 1951), Georgia, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Chicago, Notre Dame, and England’s Oxford—and the three that are still in the planning or construction stages—New England at New Hampshire, the International Center at Columbia, and California State Polytechnic. Discussed is the full range of topics from the genesis of the Center concept, the criteria for developing Centers, their day-to-day operation (including such details as keeping the house full and in the black), to the Center of tomorrow. Through this arrangement the purpose of establishing guidelines to assist those planning Centers is accomplished. The fact is stressed that the Continuing Education Center is designed to utilize all of the resources of great universities to the benefit of all who may find them useful, from poultry raisers to international adult educators.

Included in the book is a roster of the approximately eighty Residential Centers for Continuing Education in the United States. Many have roots in the Kellogg concept, and there is promise of many more coming into existence.

What of the future? The last chapter reports in conversational form the views of leaders in the Continuing Education movement, coming out of a meeting sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation at the Chicago Center. Sequence offerings and special degrees were among the many concerns of the participants. There was a question of whether the college graduate who does not return periodically for Continuing Education becomes a dropout from life’s self-improvement opportunities. However Continuing Education was set in its proper perspective by emphasizing, among other things, that adulthood is a time when we may choose to—or not to—pursue to our own benefit and the benefit of society the special kinds of learning which give to each life its special interest and savor.

Here is an interesting and useful handbook for educators and non-educators who wish a picture of a phenomenon of education that the author views as a significant new frontier of human activity. It is a book that universities which contemplate establishing a Center for Continuing Education must make available to their planners. Photographs, floor plans, and organization charts are but a few of the extras that make the book interesting and practical at the same time.

_Ethics and Academics_, by James F. Harris, Jr. (1968; 33 pp., paper; $0.50) Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 30601. Review by Robert E. Mahn, Secretary of Ohio University.

What are the problems of institutions of higher education that raise eth-
ical concerns? What are the general moral norms which ought to be operative? The author, speaking from his post in Georgia's Department of Philosophy and Religion, discusses the nature of ethics as a basis for understanding before he treats such social issues as arise between students and their institutions of higher education. Illustrations pertain to "students' rights"—the differences between legal and moral rights, the definition of absolute and *prima facie* rights, and evidence of each person's responsibility for all the rights of others. The important questions raised are in the context of higher education, and under what circumstances these can justifiably be denied.

Taking the stand that American higher education is logically and empirically linked to questions of ethical significance, the Nuremburg Trials and the Viet Nam controversy are drawn in to maintain that faculty members have a *prima facie* moral right to become involved in social issues, and that they have a moral obligation to become involved publicly because of their position of intellectual prestige. Activities of Stoughton Lynd and John Galbraith provide examples that a professor speaks as both a private and a public figure.

The author states without reservation that classified research—research that is known cannot be treated openly, honestly, and professionally as the advancement of basic knowledge—belongs in private laboratories. The obligation of an educational institution in respect to nonclassified research is to weigh the moral question of whether its efforts in search of funds are prompting it to neglect the quality of academic research and teaching.

The importance of basic ethical norms for internal situations found only in institutions of higher learning is discussed for the areas of admissions, classroom ethics, faculty-administration relations, and students' rights. Admissions, for example, is viewed as the continuing question of who is entitled to an education, and therefore has profound ethical implications. The principle of equality—the right to equal consideration and equal treatment—is tempered by justice in the form of distributive justice (to assure appropriate treatment of disadvantaged groups, for example). In respect to faculty-administration relations, emphasis is on the responsibility of "academic respect" in contrast to "personal respect." Consideration of students' rights is limited primarily to off-campus situations, student records, and due process; the goal is assurance that the act of becoming a student does not endanger a person's moral and legal rights.

To higher education administrators directly involved in relations and rights issues on a day-to-day basis, the section on ethics of internal policy may offer little that is new. To one less directly involved it offers a short intelligible summary of some essential considerations. The addition of a well-selected bibliography of 22 books and 65 articles makes this a publication well worth the time required to read it, remembering that its real meat
is in its first 14 pages. In this reviewer’s opinion it is one of the best of the Institute’s publications, which are listed on the inside of the back cover.


The editor, a former professor and dean and now the president of Vermont’s Johnson State College, has assembled nineteen articles from books and educational journals to produce an excellent portrait of the “first dean” of the campus (undergraduate and graduate colleges), whose special responsibilities are the faculty and the curriculum. This dean is the man in the middle—on one side is the president (representing unitary control); on the other side is the faculty (representing the traditional, diverse self-regulating community of scholars). Elements of his portrait have been gathered from deans describing their positions and former deans their former positions, and from “observers” of the office, some of whom give effective satirical descriptions.

Overlap which occurs between articles reinforces rather than diminishes the overall impact of the book. It prompts us to avoid making reference to particular sections and rather to mention authors, most of whose names and accomplishments are familiar to students of higher education and to readers of literary and professional journals. From Gerald E. Dupont, John J. Corson, and John W. Gould we gain historical perspective and descriptions of the everyday duties and responsibilities of the position. An appreciation of the basic roles of the position is gained from Harold Enarson, Roy F. Nichols, and W. Gordon Whaley; Nichols and Whaley also give insights into the graduate deanship. Lewis B. Mayhew, Francis H. Horn, G. Bruce Dearing, Louis Joughin, and Marten ten Hoor interpret the position of dean; they look at relationships and potential conflicts between the dean, his president, his faculty, and other personnel. Satirical comment on the position and the dean’s image is provided by Eldon L. Johnson, John Ciardi, Edward L. Gilligan, Max S. Marshall, and Edward Rosenheim, Jr. Finally Harlan Cleveland, William C. DeVanem and Harlan C. Koch delve into the philosophical aspects of the position, and comment on its satisfactions.

Can a dean exercise educational leadership while burdened with administrative chores? Can he be the president’s man and at the same time the faculty’s man? Can he strengthen the institution’s academic standing in the face of strong faculty control of the curriculum? Can he manage tensions between administration and faculty? How can he manage things, when he can’t manage faculty? Many are the questions posed. Many are the observations and answers given.
From the content the editor distills some positive generalizations about the deanship. The result is a book that has value not just to the dean and prospective dean but to every administrator and to every student of higher education. That a dean can be more than a reflection of his president, or of his faculty, is the obvious conclusion.

The "Additional Reading" section adds to the value of this publication as a textbook in higher education administration. The book deserves a place on reading lists for courses in organization and administration of higher education. The editor's "Preface" deserves special mention as containing the elements of a model for defining academic positions. Those interested in this aspect of educational organization and planning will do well to study it from this standpoint.


The Twentieth Century Fund Foundation sponsored a study to determine the feasibility of creating an "international baccalaureate," to serve as an educational maturity certificate that would be recognized as an acceptable university entrance document in most countries of the Western Hemisphere, Europe, and Africa. The study, which resulted in Mr. Mayer's publication, has relevance for admissions officers as it emphasizes the difficulties in preparing students for higher educational experiences in second-country systems that are philosophically and administratively different. He provides an excellent treatment of foreign and domestic attitudes regarding the acceptance of non-indigenous educational documents with their many ethnocentric ramifications.

The author has good credentials for undertaking this publication. He has visited schools, universities, and ministries of education on four continents, and has carefully researched the activities of several schools that are experimenting in bi-cultural or multi-cultural education. Mr. Mayer has compared the progress made in such well-known schools as the Ecole Internationale de Geneve (International School of Geneva), the United Nations International School in New York City, and Atlantic College in Britain. He has outlined the development of the Scholae Europaeae, a baccalaureate examination designed for acceptance by universities of the six Common Market countries, and has described the academic success of their graduating classes. The author's penetrating surveys of the French foreign Lycees, American overseas schools, and "western type" schools in developing nations is complete and insightful. It is particularly interesting to note the author's reference to the relationships between the many national examina-
tions, such as the College Entrance Examination Board, the General Certificate of Education, the French Baccalaureate, and lesser-known measurements of aptitude and achievement levels.

Although Mr. Mayer has over-generalized in some of his statements ("Everywhere outside the United States, entrance to university is by special examination, centrally prepared and administered or centrally verified"), he seems to have an adequate overview of international education which has enabled him to make a positive contribution to the printed material now available. The book is well-organized, written in an easy-to-read manner, and covers the subject exceptionally well. The author does not hide his pessimism regarding the possibility of creating an acceptable international maturity certificate, but he does give the reader good insight into the characteristics of the major educational systems of Western Europe. Mr. Mayer's publication might appropriately be included in the libraries of foreign admissions officers, study-abroad counselors, and high-school administrators.

The difficulty in establishing multi-cultural standards in a variety of education schemes is reduced to a simplistic level by Mr. Mayer's very appropriate example: Do you capitalize G in God only if you believe in Him?