

The Berkeley experiment uses a combination of lectures, seminars, and individual tutorials, along with readings from original sources. Tussman presents his view of the roles of students and teachers in such a program, and he reproduces his reports to the Berkeley faculty, which give a sense of the problems he encountered in creating and sustaining the program. In particular, he makes clear that the central problem has been that of staffing. After the first two years, he has found it impossible to obtain faculty from within the university and has had to hire visiting faculty from outside. The institutional structure of the American university, in which promotions are determined by academic departments and based primarily on research output, simply does not allow faculty members—especially the younger and presumably more innovative ones—the “luxury” of concentrating on lower-division students in a program such as this.

Tussman has carried out this radical experiment in a conservative context. He, like Schwab, tends to view student activists as misguided and immature, and he suggests that their desire to exercise authority over course structure is a “feeble joke.” In his program the curriculum is laid out with a firm hand by the faculty, an approach which seems unlikely to appeal to the very students who would be most attracted to an innovative program. He has presented one possible scheme of education, but it is hardly consonant with contemporary student attitudes, nor does it provide the students with either the experience of shaping their own lives or the opportunity to explore subject matter that meets their personal concerns. Other plans should certainly be tried, and anyone wishing to attempt experimental programs can learn much from Tussman’s experience, even if he does not wish to follow the authoritarian pattern Tussman has adopted.

Those interested in a clear, incisive examination of the attitudes of contemporary students would do well to read *The Student in Higher Education*, a study chaired by Dean Joseph Kauffman of the University of Wisconsin and supported and published by the Hazen Foundation of New Haven, Connecticut. This report describes with compassion and sensitivity the attitudes and hangups of contemporary students and provides a number of useful suggestions for an educational process that can meet their needs, especially in the critical (and at present dismal) freshman year.

These books all deal with reforms within the university as it is now constituted, and they tend to ignore the world outside the university. William Birenbaum, president of Staten Island Community College, in a provocative book entitled *Overlive* seeks the roots of student protest in the society that surrounds and envelops the university rather than in its internal structure. He charges that the university itself is an anachronism in our urbanized society, that in spite of revolutionary changes in our society the university has not changed its essential style since medieval times.

He uses the somewhat pretentious term “overlive” to describe a society in which a substantial number of citizens do not share in the affluence enjoyed by the many and in which even the affluent fail to discover any meaning in their success. To Birenbaum the inequities and discontents of the society have led to the obsolescence of our university system but have been caused by it as well. Many of our universities either are in major cities or are moving toward them, and yet they seem wholly disconnected from the critical problems that distress urban America and trouble our students. He believes that the university has retained a structure which may have been appropriate when its student body was an elite but is totally inappropriate in an era of mass education. Just as the society is spreading out, with the growth of suburbia and the decentralization of industry, so, he suggests, should the university disperse into the community. Even the idea of “campus” seems to him archaic in the modern urban setting, and he suggests that universities house themselves in temporary structures (he calls them “tents”) which can change as the society changes, rather than be frozen into monumental anachronisms.

Birenbaum believes that the university can survive only if it learns to treat its students as adults, recognizing that in this technological age no one knows very much and that the students have at least as good a view as their teachers of what they need to know to survive the future. He observes that there is persuasive evidence that students have a greater educational impact on each other than do their teachers and that designers of higher education who think only of the classroom and the lecture hall and not of the dormitory and the campus are omitting from consideration the most important part of the educational process.

Birenbaum also raises, by implica-

tion, the issue of whether the education we provide today is really appropriate for the students now entering the university. While many of us like to think that all students can, with proper encouragement, taste the joys of intellectual life, it seems apparent that many are in the university simply to obtain their union cards, not because they find academic life especially agreeable. If the university becomes engaged in the reconstruction of society, it can provide other paths a young person can follow in making the transition from adolescence to mature participation in the society.

Although, as Birenbaum says, our universities seem organized to resist change, change they must if they are to survive as viable institutions. They must encompass alternate paths for the variety of students descending upon them, they must enable students to gain the understanding that will sustain them in a changing society, and they must provide continuing education for older people returning for refreshment and revitalization. Perhaps these books will be followed by others which will explore in a creative way the new directions American universities must take to satisfy these needs.

LEONARD S. RODBERG
*Department of Physics and Astronomy,
University of Maryland, College Park,
and Institute for Policy Studies,
Washington, D.C.*

Recalculation

Crosscurrents in College Admissions. Institutional Response to Student Ability and Family Income. HUMPHREY DOERMANN. Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York, 1968. xii + 180 pp. \$5.75.

In 1954 Ronald Thompson, of the Ohio State University, published a demographic study—“College Age Population Trends, 1940–1970” [*College and University* 29 (Jan. 1954)] that announced an impending tidal wave of secondary school graduates battering at the gates of the nation’s colleges and universities. All institutions of higher education, public and private, were to be swamped by applicants; higher tuition charges would reduce only slightly the massive flow, and each entering class would be measurably stronger academically than its immediate predecessor. Hundreds of new four-year colleges were to be needed to handle the larger numbers

of fully qualified applicants, and far more applicants, presumably, would be "fully qualified" than not.

The thesis of Humphrey Doermann's study is that Thompson's tidal wave, while clearly upon us with respect to sheer numbers of students, has sent only a trickle into the pools where the flow is regulated by the academic quality and the economic affluence of the applicants. Doermann shows that these pools, when defined by high scores on the verbal section of the College Board's Scholastic Aptitude Test and by substantial family financial capacity, contain many fewer candidates than has generally been assumed. By way of an example, he estimates that there were 1,353,000 male high school graduates in 1967-68, and that of these only 71,000, or 5.15 percent, could score better than 500, the median, on the SAT-V and also came from families whose gross annual income exceeded \$14,800. Doermann provides tables showing the annual volume of candidates for 1954-55 through 1963-64 (actual) and for 1964-65 through 1974-75 (estimated or projected). The implication of these tables is clear. The rather large number of colleges that seek to enroll well-qualified students who can pay their own way are competing for a very small portion of the total candidate pool.

Doermann's use of verbal aptitude scores alone to define academic quality is, of course, open to challenge. So is his formulation of the financial capacity of new students on the basis of the annual income of a "normal-budget, three-child family" residing an "average" distance from a residential college. But the challenger should be able to suggest other, more valid empirical measures than those Doermann uses, and more adequate measures simply do not exist. Doermann recognizes, throughout his study, the problems inherent in the use of the only data available. He regularly advises the reader that his estimating procedures are rough rather than precise. The cells in his distribution tables contain, for example, two pool figures—one resulting from a "conservative" correlation of 0.4 between aptitude scores and family income and one from a correlation of 0.7, probably "too high" but included to suggest "the largest reasonable estimate of the candidate pool." Various elements of uncertainty do exist, but none serious enough to damage significantly Doermann's major conclusions.

Doermann's study has much to say to the trustees, faculties, and administrative officers of private colleges, people who must make policy decisions on admission standards, tuition charges, size of freshman classes, amounts budgeted for student financial aid, and a host of other institutional concerns. But these matters are of tremendous concern also to the public sector of higher education, to government at all levels, and to the taxpaying public. Doermann speaks of the need to "preserve and encourage flexibility in the mechanisms by which students distribute themselves throughout many kinds of colleges." He fears that "important elements of flexibility seem in danger of being withdrawn from our system of higher education," primarily as a result of increasing tuition costs in the private sector of higher education and decreasing numbers of students who can exercise genuine choice (on educational rather than economic grounds) in selecting a college or university.

If the narrowing market Doermann describes leads to either a qualitative or a quantitative loss in the private sector, all of higher education and all of the nation will be the losers. If, for whatever reason, private colleges no longer are able to enroll the number of high school graduates they are equipped to handle, the flow of new students into the public institutions will be accelerated. As Doermann puts it, this is "an important financial and edu-

cational issue, not only for individual private colleges, but for the taxpayers who will be called upon to pay the bill for sharply increased enrollment capacity in public higher education." The solution, clearly enough, is to expand federal and state programs offering financial assistance to the individual college student. Doermann's study is a first step toward determining just how many public dollars will be needed to close the gap between the amount available from nonpublic sources and the amount needed to provide not only equal opportunity for higher education but also equal opportunity for meaningful choice by the individual student.

The first version of this study, Doermann tells his reader in the preface, was written as a Ph.D. dissertation. The published version is remarkably free from the self-conscious detail and pedantic formalism one often associates with such efforts. The statistical system used to develop the joint distribution tables, along with the principles of computation, are wisely relegated to the appendix. All in all, this is an immensely readable little volume, tightly constructed and very much to the point in the case it presents. Its conclusions are sobering. The author has performed a valuable service in focusing the attention of what should be a wide spectrum of readers on an increasingly serious educational problem.

BERNARD S. ADAMS

Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin

Quick Thinking

Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding. Community Action in the War on Poverty. DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN. Free Press, New York; Collier-Macmillan, London, 1969. xxii + 218 pp. \$5.95. Clarke A. Sanford Lectures on Local Government and Community Life.

The former Assistant Secretary of Labor who was once honored as "an architect of the nation's program to eradicate poverty" has written a book to explain what has happened to part of that program, why it is in difficulty, and (despite what the jacket says) who is to blame. He has a wide variety of human targets but only one programmatic one: the somewhat diffuse idea of "community action."

The origins of the community action idea are located in the thinking of some officers of the Public Affairs Program of the Ford Foundation and the views of two faculty members of the School of Social Work at Columbia University. The ideas of the latter were embodied in a plan called Mobilization for Youth, designed to combat juvenile delinquency in New York's lower East Side. Moynihan shows the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to be remarkably parallel to those of the Mobilization proposal. He traces the line of influence—through meetings, conferences, and memoranda inside the White House staff—from Mobilization through the President's Committee on