

The final chapter discusses the implications for higher education in general, and is divided into four parts. The first part examines the immediate consequences of the student perceptions identified in the studies. Lewis, referring to the above studies as well as other studies in England and the United States, suggests that "the respective and misconceived assumptions which lie behind the perceptions of both staff and students provide the key to the problem of more effective student learning". In the second section, he explores some implications for approaches to more effective student education in higher education. In the third section, the author emphasizes that research in higher education should place a greater emphasis on qualitative research. In the last section of this chapter, Lewis raises some general questions about future developments in higher education and encourages academic researchers to perform research within their own institution in an attempt to identify and better understand the problems affecting learning among their own students.

While this book reports results from studies performed at one particular university in England, it can be of value to researchers by serving as a reminder of the importance of a qualitative dimension in the design of studies in higher education. If this book has a weakness, it is in the omission of studies or even a discussion of the advantages of combining qualitative and quantitative approaches.

Norman P. Uhl
Mount Saint Vincent University

Jaroslav Pelikan, *Scholarship and Its Survival: questions on the idea of graduate education*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983, pp. xv + 100.

In its report on humanities programs, the Committee on an Assessment of Quality-Related Characteristics of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States observed that:

The genius of American higher education is often said to be in the close association of training and research – that is, in the nation's research-doctorate programs. Consequently, we are not surprised at the amount of worried talk about the quality of the research doctorate, for deterioration at that level will inevitably spread to wherever research skills are needed – and that indeed is a far-flung network of laboratories, institutes, firms, agencies, bureaus, and departments. What might surprise us, however, is the imbalance between the putative national importance of research-doctorate programs and the amount of sustained evaluative attention they themselves receive.¹

The same observation could, of course, apply equally to Canada; and certainly the approach taken by the committee is something that Canadian higher education should examine carefully. Nonetheless, that study seems to lack an important prior consideration. It does offer ways of assessing whether institutions are doing well what their rhetoric and tradition say they are doing. But it does not (and, in

fairness, could not under its terms of reference) come to grips with the question of whether those institutions are in fact doing what they should be doing – whether the assumed and traditional goals are today the proper mission of the graduate enterprise.

It was in part as a reaction against this current tendency to quantitative assessment (a necessary but not sufficient approach), that Jaroslav Pelikan wrote *Scholarship and Its Survival: Questions on the Idea of Graduate Education* under the aegis of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. As Sterling, Professor of history at Yale University and former director of the division of humanities and dean of the graduate school, Pelikan is well situated to examine the issues of graduate education with both the distance of the scholar and the immediacy of the administrator. Quite remarkably, these two quite different lenses manage a congruence that is surely a challenge to the theory of optics. We are given a study which is at once an elegant synthesis and reaffirmation of traditional interpretations of the role and nature of the graduate enterprise, and a realistic assessment of the changes and adjustments required by contemporary circumstances. We are spared the twin dangers of enticing but irrelevant nostalgia, on the one hand, and calls for reforms that are fatally insensitive to living tradition on the other: the dangers that vision through only one of the lenses could so easily produce.

The study is a relatively brief one (indeed, it is styled as an “essay”). One cannot turn to it for detailed prescriptions for implementation of the ideas it presents. But that is hardly its purpose. What it does do splendidly is to provide an agenda for a fundamental reexamination of the academy. As Earnest L. Boyer notes in his Foreword:

In this “little book” Pelikan avoids the quick fix, the simple bromide. Rather, with astute analyses and lucid prose he confronts us with fundamental problems about the uses of critical intelligence and points to answers that will enable scholarship to both survive and flourish.... Our response to Professor Pelikan’s provocative questions will affect the future of the university and the nations. (p. xv)

A central theme in the study is the proposition “that the various levels of formal learning cannot operate in isolation”. Pelikan explores the important relationships between undergraduate and graduate education, professional and graduate education, and college and university education. But at the same time as he emphasizes the vital importance of viewing those elements in terms of their relationships, he makes just as clear that the unique characteristics of each element must be scrupulously observed and maintained. The danger of fudged boundaries is just as great as that of blinkered isolation. And in the case of graduate studies he impresses one fundamental principle: “graduate teaching is not an extension of a professor’s undergraduate teaching, but an extension of a professor’s research.” (p. 15). When this basic principle was lost sight of, he suggests, “the number of graduate programs grew, but the mechanisms for monitoring their quality did not” (p. 15). Indeed, the admonition is even sterner than this. Pelikan goes on to say

that: "Everything else that the graduate school of a university does must...be subordinate to the demands of scholarship" (p. 53).

In saying this, however, Pelikan is not attempting to sanctify the present structure of scholarship. He freely recognizes that the shape of graduate programs will alter in unpredictable ways; and it will be the task of undergraduate programs to prepare prospective graduate students for that indeterminant scholarly future. Somewhat ironically, he argues that the present structure of the undergraduate "major", as a "miniature graduate program" may in fact be counterproductive if it is approached as preparation for advanced study. If the next generation of graduate students is "pre-selected" from that pool, they may in fact prove not to be the best suited for the emerging world of scholarship. "If there are to be fewer Ph.D.'s in the next generation, then let them be the ones with ... imaginativeness and critical temper" (p. 33). These qualities are to be sought, he suggests, through general and interdisciplinary studies, properly conceived. Pelikan harbours no illusions about the potential dangers in that area, particularly at the graduate level. Many programs seem to proceed, he argues, on the equation: "An M.A. knowledge of one field + an M.A. knowledge of another field = a Ph.D. knowledge of the interrelation between the two fields." (p. 36). But these dangers do not provide a legitimate grounds for perpetuating the status quo. Pelikan urges the graduate school to find a compromise "that is intellectually and politically preferable both to the present departmental rigidity and to an admissions policy based on the inscription of the Statute of Liberty" (p. 36). What he calls for is an intriguing notion of "divisional admission" to graduate school, based on a "divisional major" at the undergraduate level. A movement in this direction, he acknowledges, will call for a major act of will and courage on the part of administrators and professors. But it is no less necessary for that fact.

Pelikan boldly proceeds into yet another arena remarkably free of angels: the meeting ground of the professions and graduate education. "Are the professional schools *in* the university and *of* the university, or only *at* the university? And if they were not there, would anyone – in the professional school itself or in the faculty of arts and sciences – notice the difference?" (p. 44). His answer combines both encouragement and warning. Professional schools do belong (indeed, at the graduate level, the arts and sciences arguably fall under that rubric); but they belong only so far as their orientation is in harmony with that of the university, only so far as they subscribe to the tenet that "scholarly research defines the nature of the university." And when they have that orientation, he argues, they can add dimensions to the academic enterprise that the arts and sciences themselves are incapable of providing. If properly integrated into the research life of the university (and Pelikan warns strongly that they must not be allowed to opt for an isolated existence), the professional schools can serve to "mediate" the world outside, and ensure that the graduate school is not "engaged in answering questions that no one is asking any more." (p. 48). Pelikan is quite obviously aware of the dangers inherent in such a partnership, especially in a time when external forces are increasingly attempting to shape the character of professional

education; but he does provide the criteria for developing a desirable and probably necessary symbiosis.

A range of additional issues of topical concern is examined: the fostering of morality in the graduate enterprise, and the need "to go beyond competence to integrity"; the too frequent ignoring, especially in the social sciences and humanities, of the primacy of the research role for graduate faculty; the need to find and accept alternatives to the traditional academic career for the Ph.D. recipient – "and the faculty of the graduate school must welcome such alternatives for their students less grudgingly than they have tended to do." (p. 76). And of course there is the obligatory assessment of the relationships among elitism, equalitarianism and equality.

Although he invests the graduate school with a heady mandate ("custodian of scholarly quality and guardian of specialized excellence"), he does leave some major areas of practicality unexamined. The study does not indicate, for example, how the limited authority of a graduate school – a seemingly endemic result of the balkanization of the university and the heterogeneity of scholarship – can effect the fundamental changes in attitude and organization for which the author calls. Nonetheless, the work remains a fundamentally important piece and obligatory reading for anyone seriously sharing Pelikan's concern with the survival of scholarship. "...the profound crisis in which the universities and graduate schools are caught demonstrates the need to overhaul graduate education before it is too late. For mindless retrenchment is even more dangerous than mindless growth" (p. 77).

Alexander D. Gregor,
University of Manitoba

REFERENCE

1. Jones, L.V. *et al.* *An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Humanities*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1982.

Michael L. Skolnik, Norman S. Rowen, "Please, sir, I want some more" – Canadian Universities and Financial Restraint. Toronto: OISE Press/The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1984, 216 pages.

This OISE study examines the impact and implications of financial restraint for Canadian Universities in the 1980's. The breadth of its approach and the perception of its analysis and discussion make it an important work for academics, bureaucrats and *amici curiae* of higher education in Canada. To produce a significant contribution on this theme is not an easy task for, as the authors correctly point out:

Advances in this field have been retarded by a dearth of relevant theories and conceptual frameworks, weaknesses of data, absence of useful methodological tools, and, perhaps, above all, insignificant research effort relative to the magnitude of complexity of the task at hand.