DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 252 HE 001 292

AUTHOR BRENNAN, MICHAEL J.
TITLE A CANIBALISTIC VIEW OF GRADUATE EDUCATION.
INSTITUTION COUNCIL OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS IN THE U.S., WASHINGTON, D.C.
PUB DATE 4 DEC 69
NOTE 18P.; ADDRESS TO THE NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS IN THE U.S., WASHINGTON D.C., DEC 4-6, 1969

EDRS PRICE EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
DESCRIPTORS *DEGREES (TITLES), DOCTORAL DEGREES, EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, *GRADUATE STUDY, *HIGHER EDUCATION, *RELEVANCE (EDUCATION), SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP, SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, *TEACHER EDUCATION

ABSTRACT

GRADUATE SCHOOLS ARE FAILING TO MEET IMPORTANT EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF SOCIETY. THREE OF THE AREAS THAT NEED IMPROVEMENT AND CHANGE ARE: 1) TEACHER PREPARATION, 2) RELEVANCE OF DOCTORAL EDUCATION, AND 3) UNIVERSITY-SOCIETY RELATIONSHIP. MOST PHD PROGRAMS, AFTER PAYING LIP SERVICE TO THE VALUE OF GOOD TEACHING, PROCEED TO DEIFY THE NOTION OF RESEARCH TRAINING, THOUGH THERE IS AMPLE EVIDENCE THAT MOST PHD RECIPIENTS NEVER PUBLISH OR USE THEIR RESEARCH TRAINING. A NEW PHD DEGREE SHOULD BE DESIGNED FOR THE EDUCATION OF PROSPECTIVE JUNIOR AND FOUR YEAR COLLEGE TEACHERS. THE CURRICULUM FOR THIS DEGREE WOULD BE INTERDISCIPLINARY AND WOULD INCLUDE TEACHING INTERNSHIPS. THIS NEW DEGREE WOULD STRENGTHEN THE RESEARCH VALUE OF THE PHD. THE STANDARD PHD PROGRAM NEEDS TO BE MADE MORE RELEVANT BY LINKING THE CONSTANCY OF THE HUMAN CONDITION TO THE IMMEDIACY OF SOCIAL CHANGE. IMPROVED COMMUNICATION IS ALSO NEEDED BETWEEN UNIVERSITY AND SOCIETY BECAUSE THOSE WHO PAY THE BILL HAVE A RIGHT TO KNOW THE UNIVERSITY BETTER. IF THE UNIVERSITY DOES NOT CHANGE ITSELF, OUTSIDE AGENCIES MAY IMPOSE CHANGES UPON IT. IT IS VITAL THAT THE UNIVERSITY ITSELF ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR INITIATING THE NEEDED CHANGES. (AF)

Council of Graduate Schools
Annual Meeting, Dec. 4-6, 1969

A CANIBALISTIC VIEW OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

Michael J. Brennan
Dean of the Graduate School
Brown University

I take my sermon today from 48 letters containing 132 suggestions for reappraisal of graduate education. These are responses by graduate deans to the CGS Committee on Policies and Plans. By oversimplifying somewhat, I find the concerns expressed in these letters fall into 4 categories: teacher preparation, relevance of doctoral education, disadvantaged students, and what might be called the university and society. The financing of graduate education and research could have been allowed as a fifth category. However, I prefer to treat the question of money as it did in fact appear in the letters of the deans -- not as a separate matter but as a theme running through all discussions of academic issues. Because other panelists will address themselves to the important goal of expanded educational opportunities, I have chosen to speak on 3 topics: Teacher Preparation, Relevance of Doctoral Education, and University-Society Relationships.

I.

Although uniquely American strains have evolved in our graduate schools, after more than a century they remain essentially German universities superimposed upon English colleges. Today, however, this model of nineteenth century German scholarship and research appears to have outlived its usefulness as a uniform standard for all advanced study -- outlived its usefulness in the

sense that the graduate schools fail to meet important educational needs of American society. Advances in educational attainment (a rising percentage of the college-age population attending college, the explosion in the number of junior colleges and community colleges) and forecasts of further expansion (14 years of school rather than 12 years as the educational norm) demand an increase in the number of junior college and college professors. But more important than a crisis in numbers is a crisis in quality. If undergraduate education is not to degenerate -- some would say degenerate further -- into glorified secondary school instruction, then the task of producing qualified college teachers must be shouldered by the graduate schools.

Many, if not most, Ph.D. programs, after a respectful but sidelong bow to the value of good teaching, proceed to deify a rather strange notion of research training. Time does not permit me to comment at length on the avalanche of journal articles of questionable worth that we witnessed during the 1950's and 1960's. Neither shall I comment on the bandwagon effect, under which institutions crave new Ph.D. programs founded on meager resources in order to attract and keep a so-called "research-oriented" faculty. Instead, a few facts will suffice.

One study has shown that 85 per cent of Ph.D. recipients never publish.[1] Another survey revealed that 70 per cent of Ph.D. recipients never publish; 20 per cent publish occasionally; 10 per cent publish regularly; and 1 per cent make what their peers

[1]Ann M. Heiss, The Preparation of College and University Teachers (Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 196

judge to be distinguished contributions to the literature of the field.[2] That is, 70 per cent never publish, and the remaining 30 per cent includes many who have contributed to the consumption of paper and ink in the form of marginal journal articles.

Secondly, the attrition rate in Ph.D. programs nationwide is in the neighborhood of 50 per cent. At best we have only scanty evidence of why this is so. At one institution, 80 per cent of those who dropped out of Ph.D. programs in the humanities and social sciences did so for nonacademic reasons, i.e., for reasons other than failure to meet performance standards. A comparable figure for the sciences is 35 per cent.[3] No doubt these nonacademic drop-outs include people with weak motivation and husband hunters. But we do not really know how many give up in sheer frustration. I have talked with more than a few students -- from my own institution and from elsewhere -- very capable students appearing to possess talent for effective teaching -- each of whom confessed that he would grit his teeth and do that damn dissertation so he could get the union card for an appointment at a college that confuses professional baptism with the Ph.D. degree.

We offer only one track to all comers regardless of their diversity in interest, talents, or motivations. Prospective teachers, scholars, government employees, industrial managers, writers, research workers broad and narrow must all follow the

---

[2]P. Woodring, "The Profession [illegible] College Teaching", The Journal of Higher Education (May, 1960) [illegible] 280-282.

[3]W.D. Cook, "Attrition Patter[illegible] f Graduate Students at Cornell", May, 1969, mimeographed.

same route. In defense of this practice, it has been argued that the research experience of the Ph.D. program is a valuable asset to the college teacher even though he may never do research. Yet I have never seen any evidence to support the claim, and I suspect it is a myth.

Some, particularly junior college faculties with M.A. degrees, have sought the solution in "making the M.A. respectable again." In my opinion this "solution" is folly. There is no hope for rehabilitation of the M.A. -- other than as an honors degree awarded simultaneously with the B.A. to undergraduates who complete an accelerated course of study, including graduate courses and a thesis, over roughly a four-year period.

Others have sought the solution in a new intermediate degree. With rare exceptions these are halfway measures: truncated Ph.D. programs with research-oriented courses and seminars and research-oriented general examinations aimed toward culmination in the dissertation, which then is not written.

A new teaching degree should be specifically designed for the education of prospective junior college teachers and four-year college teachers. A mere paint job on existing master's or doctoral degrees simply will not do. Moreover, a new degree should be a doctorate in order to lend respectability and to cope with the hang ups of accrediting agencies and college administrators who do the hiring.

Naturally, I have my own hobby horse that I would now like to ride in public. The curriculum should be interdisciplinary. While each student centers upon a conventional departmental discipline, his program should include courses in related disciplines. This prescription is based on the assumption that classroom exposition of subject matter at the undergraduate level is now overly fragmented and that "relevant" teaching must lean more heavily on related disciplines. Interdisciplinary studies are especially important in the humanities and social studies, but teaching in the sciences might include the history and philosophy of science, and the role of creativity in science, if contemporary method and content are to be brought alive.

Courses carefully chosen from the history of higher education in America, learning theory, teaching methods, and the sociology of education would also contribute to a student's development. For those who see the disgraceful spectre of the Teacher's College rising from its grave, let me assure you that such courses do not necessarily constitute the old "teach the student not the subject" line perpetrated by the unintelligent abusers of John Dewey. To put this suggestion in perspective ask yourself how much the professors in your institution know about the history and sociology of academia.

A one-year, supervised teaching internship, served in a junior college or appropriate four-year college, should be an integral part of the degree program. Cooperation between graduate schools and colleges would, of course, be imperative. Finally,

an expository, in contrast to a research, dissertation might be required. In the dissertation, of relatively modest length, the student would be expected to display in writing a clear and well organized presentation of a problem, theme, or idea -- drawing not only upon his major discipline but also upon his knowledge of other relevant disciplines.

I envisage a 3 to 3-1/2 year doctoral program consisting of approximately two years of course work followed by a year devoted to the teaching internship and the dissertation.

One might object that a teaching doctorate would further debase the Ph.D. On the contrary, I expect a teaching doctorate would protect and strengthen the Ph.D. as a bona fide research degree. By restricting the Ph.D. to prospective research experts and university teacher-scholars, the present trend toward more relaxed standards and multi-purpose functions would be constrained. Not only would a teaching doctorate suit the milieu of the established graduate schools, it would also match more closely the resources of developing institutions. Of course, with Ph.D.'s populating the larger and more prestigious universities, an elitist distinction might well emerge between the Ph.D. on the one hand and the teaching doctorate on the other. If the Ph.D. were to become known as the superior doctorate, I can only argue that such a situation, though regrettable, is preferable to what we now face.

Another objection cannot be ignored. Some scientists and social scientists will argue that if a teaching doctorate is legitimate, why not new research doctorates for those who will work in industrial labs or government agencies? The Doctor of Department has already been proposed. I believe one can defend a teaching doctorate without embracing a variety of sub-Ph.D. research doctorates. In a common teaching degree we are concerned with the process by which the academic establishment replenishes itself and most effectively sustains one of its unanimously accepted purposes: the dissemination of learning. In a variety of departmental research doctorates we are concerned with the mechanism by which graduate schools can satisfy job specifications defined by diverse employers with widely varying wants. Admittedly we now attempt this to some extent by training people differently and attaching to them the common Ph.D. label. Yet there is a serious question as to whether the graduate school should be looking inward (critically and constructively) at and its own essentials or, as it has done in the recent past, looking outward for student-placement and research objectives dictated by other institutions. I shall have more to say about this a bit later.

II.

Assuming a teaching doctorate could find acceptance, the problems of the Ph.D. programs would not miraculously disappear. Rehabilitation of the Teaching Assistantship remains as a middle aged problem. Clear separation of the teaching function and student recruitment, improved instruction of undergraduates by Assistants, and enrichment of the teaching apprentice experience

are needed most in the sciences. In the absence of adequate screening, faculty supervision, and prestige, it is no wonder that the T.A. has slipped into the unfortunate state of second class citizenship in the academic community, and it is no wonder that more and more graduate deans lose sleep over impending negotiations with the union to determine working conditions by means of collective bargaining.

Of more recent origin are complaints about the Research Assistantship. One now hears that the R. A. is a corridor of ever-narrowing specialization in graduate study. Example: Henry Hopeful enters graduate school as a T. A.; advances to an R. A. in his second year while he takes only those courses necessary to pass prelims in certain fields; advances further in the narrowing experience of a Research Assistant without time to take courses that might expand rather than intensify his knowledge because he must meet his commitments to his research adviser; and finally emerges on the job market as a specialist in his dissertation. Henry Hopeful alleges that industry finds him to narrow for the range of problems on which he would be expected to do research, and colleges find him ill prepared to teach general undergraduate courses. If one is to take the complaint seriously, thenthe boast of minimal formal course work in science is but a cloak for the practice of awarding the Ph.D. degree in a sub-specialization of the department. Why did Dr. Hopeful not speak out earlier or take it upon himself to enlarge his knowledge? Because, he says, he was under the financial thumb as well as the

intellectual influence of his research adviser. At issue here is something more far reaching: the conception of graduate education as program versus graduate education as a master-apprentice relationship -- "the" graduate student versus "my" graduate student -- or, if you will, the faculty member as counselor and guide versus the faculty member as entrepreneur.

Now, what negative things can I find to say about the humanities and social studies? Lately, we have all become conscious of the excessive time consumed in the completion of doctoral requirements. Financial support adequate to permit qualified students to remain on campus for 4 or 5 years of full-time work is a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for degree completion within a reasonable time. Curricular changes are needed as well. I assume the purposes of doctoral education include development of the individual to fulfill his own potential for creativity to the greatest extent possible, stimulation of learning and communication, self-direction and appreciation for quality of work, and attainment of a level of professional competence upon which a student can build in his postdoctoral years. The prevailing sequence of step-wise obstacles to be overcome acts instead as a hindrance to the scholarly development of many bright students.

Lectures and seminars are important to new graduate students as a means of providing a solid self-disciplinary base. But since no amount of formal course instruction will provide more than a small fraction of the basic knowledge a scholar will need to draw upon in his lifetime of activity, we should abandon

the pretense that a sizeable array of courses will provide "distribution" and a "balanced background" -- or somehow assure high-quality research. More important is free-inquiry. Students should be turned loose or, more exactly, turned toward the library. Certainly, consultation with the faculty is necessary; but fundamentally the student is responsible for his own progress and is accountable for the outcome reflected in some form of general or preliminary examination and the doctoral dissertation, which has been begun prior to the prelims and is viewed not as a comprehensive tome but as a crisp and relatively short piece of work equal in quality to a respectable journal article.

In short, it can be argued that the sciences are on one horn of a dilemma and the humanities on the other -- one requiring minimal structured course work but little flexibility because grant and contract conditions focus time and energy into unnecessarily narrow channels, the other requiring too much structured course work and little flexibility because of preconceived notions that all students should run the same course. Obviously, I am saying that the optimum lies somewhere between the two extremes.

While the curricula of some humanities departments have been revised in the interests of greater flexibility, others preserve the best 19th century standards and practices. Unexamined degree requirements tend to become outmoded. To the extent that they are obsolete, rigid adherence to such requirements simply because they are sanctioned by time contributes to the view that prevailing doctoral education is irrelevant to the aspirations and concerns

of the emerging generation of scholars that some day will replace us. In presenting this argument, I fully realize that the question of relevancy is much more than a matter of curriculum or degree requirements. The call for relevancy is more a matter of process or style than the structure of program. Unlike some of my colleagues, I am not haunted by a spectre of graduate education degenerating into a political stanse, superficial speculation, or sensitivity training. Indeed, if advanced study does so degenerate, I suspect it will be an attitude of fear and resistance to "relevancy" that will contribute most to its demise. The younger generation has <u>not</u> gone mad; only a few individuals are carrying forward a long tradition of madness not unknown to any society. And these are made more visible by the course of events in our world of today.

Relevance is relatedness to experience. Even Knowledge for its own sake, to be appreciated, must have a foundation in experience. If we have in fact lost much of this relevance in education and thus abidcated educational leadership -- as the teachers of Greek and Latin did in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries -- then we have lost it for the same reasons. Our style, in teaching and scholarship, fails to link the constancy of the human condition to the immediacy of social change. As Daniel Bell puts it, "The question is not 'who is this new man, the American?' but 'who is the generic man that stalks the world today?'".[4] In the classroom and in the journals we, as teachers

---

[4]Daniel Bell, <u>The Reforming of General Education</u> (New York: Anchor Books, 1968) p. 151.

and scholars, project instead an image of ourselves as Victorian man pacing nervously around the concerns of what may well be the Age of Aquarius.

Scientific and technological advances have created what is now called the Post-Industrial or Technological Society. In the process, new power structures have emerged and knowledge has been divorced from values. On the educational scene, while undergraduate education no longer prepares men for an understanding of themselves and the vastly complex and rapidly changing social organization, graduate education has despaired of the task of joining literary and sociological imagination in favor of specialization disguised as professionalism. Relevance today is not achieved by a sprinkling of topical courses and research institutes on Viet Nam, nuclear control, urban crises, race, or poverty. Neither is relevance attained by a few generalizations on whatever issue happens to be bothering people at the moment. Relevance is a truly intellectual understanding of secular man and technological society in all its aspects: occupational structure, power distribution, art forms, language, the function and value of the individual, to mention only a few.

One can hardly blame troubled students because they are inarticulate in defining the roots of their discontent or because they grasp at educational forms that are intellectually indefensible. That is, one can hardly blame them when the faculties and administrators are not even sensitive to the pace of change.

After all, they are the students and we are the teachers. Yet they are forced to take the initiative, misguided though it is in some instances, because we do not make enough effort to provide a sense of direction by which they might begin to understand themselves and their environment. The great and very difficult challenge to the humanities and social studies -- indeed to the sciences as well -- in the decades ahead is a forging of humanistic concepts meaningful to secular, urban, behavioral man; a total rethinking of the social order; the re-welding of knowledge to values; and the possibility of shared intellectual experiences.

III

Allow me to pursue my fantasy. Assuming that the graduate schools were to have exemplary programs of teacher preparation and that Ph.D. programs are swept clean of the cobwebs of irrelevancy without leaving behind nothing but guilt feelings, one might turn to the relations between the university and society -- in particular between graduate schools on the one hand and government, alumni, and the public on the other.

Most often this relationship is conceived of in terms of money. True, we need resources to do our job well. True also, that unlike industry we must beg for these resources. However, our case for expanded support leaves much to be desired. A review of reports from committees, task forces, and representative associations conveys the impression of some statistical extrapolations and a massive outstretched hand backed by a cry for more. More

for international studies, more for research, more for community colleges, more for graduate schools, more for well-established institutions and more for new ones.

Is it at all realistic to expect a national scheme of educational development and a set of rational priorities? What are the criteria for determining the allocation of finite national resources among alternative uses that include natural conservation, urban renewal, highways, and defense as well as education? What about the allocation between elementary and secondary education on the one hand and higher education on the other? and the allocation among different programs and institutions within higher education? An attempt to answer these questions must acknowledge that the system of education is itself a central cause of the difficulty. Having prided ourselves on diversity, we now find that this very diversity and multiplicity makes nearly impossible a consensus on priorities. By free wheeling competition modeled on the market place, we invite the principle of offense to none and a share for all. Perhaps asking for something better is asking for too much. We have been able to live with the situation, and it's conceivable (though not certain) that we can continue to live with it. I would only note that the research experts, having devised powerful analytical tools, have not applied these tools to the problem of the allocation of public funds among alternative social enterprises. Thus, we do not have the foundation needed to build priorities.

Aside from money, and probably of deeper concern, is the lack of communication between universities and the public. The man in the street simply does not know what we are all about. This is especially true of graduate education and what appears to the layman as esoteric research. That universities exist to transmit a fixed and unchanging body of knowledge for the single purpose of preparing young people to practice an occupation is not an uncommon view. Witness the advocates of suppressive legislation who have gond through a college education and come out uncontaminated by any respect for free inquiry. Witness those who judge research solely in terms of better seed corn or miracle drugs. In presenting budgets that will appeal to these interests (because that is the realistic thing to do) we have not only convinced the suppliers of funds that we are legitimate, we have also, to a large extent, sold ourselves on tangible, immediately applicable results as the measure of legitimacy.

It does no good to curse the so-called anti-intellectuals. The fact of the matter is that the universities have been indifferent about explaining why new truth has value or why the university must be autonomous if its purpose in society is to be fulfilled. Universities must make a concerted effort to gain greater appreciation and understanding for two simple reasons: (1) those who pay the bills have a right to know us better; (2) only we can be trusted to communicate our purposes with minimum distortion because we have the greatest stake in pure knowledge.

IV

I have covered my three topics. Still, unless I have already turned you off -- because what I say is irrelevant to your experience -- I am tempted to mention a fourth. Little that I have said is new. On teacher preparation, e.g., over 60 years have elapsed since the first criticisms were aimed at the Ph.D. for its failure to prepare college teachers. The President's Commission on Higher Education in 1947, the Conference on the Preparation of College Teachers in 1949, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School in 1956, the Association of Graduate Schools in 1957, and several publications from 1960 to date have all pointed up the problem. Yet we continue to grind ever so slowly toward the inevitable, while social needs grow more pressing.

Reforms in the T.A., and in Ph.D. programs generally, have been emphasized for at least a decade. Yet we continue to grind ever so slowly with some reforms in a handful of institutions while the doctoral scene nationally remains about the same. What I have to say that may be new is a barefaced public admission of this fact.

Our councils of deans, our professional associations, and our separate institutions are inherently conservative. I have heard it argued that this inherent conservatism is inherently healthy. For conservatism acts as a shield against untested ideas and as

a buffer against the cyclical swings of fashion, preventing the fashionable from converting stable progress into chaos. No doubt there is truth in the argument, as there is some truth in almost any argument. Nevertheless, there is historical evidence that our conservatism often impedes worthy innovation. Conservatism in the universities has been an impediment to progress at those points in history when the larger society has been undergoing fundamental changes.

If, then, Western culture is changing from an Industrial Society to an X Society, and if the pace of change is accelerating at a rate unknown to previous cultures, our institutions are likely to be rusty vehicles for confronting, understanding, and controlling change. We like to rap but we seem unable to act!

I am quite aware of the dangers that this type of "hysterical" or "alarmist" elocution may present to honest innovation. Some things are better kept within a small fraternity and not broadcasted publicly, for they give consolation (indeed weaponry) to the short sighted and thick headed enemies of contemporary education. However, I, for one, prefer to run this risk as long as it appears that the outside enemy is less destructive than the inside enemy in the long run.

The newspapers reflect our dilemma. Backlash in the left-hand column and in the right-hand column proposals that such outside agencies as HEW impose educational change upon the universities. The crucial question is whether we can demonstrate that we can

handle our own affairs -- and at the same time successfully defend the value of truth untrammeled -- or whether some organ of the larger society will solicit change by tempting our need for dollars, perhaps without adequate understanding of or full respect for the unique functions of the educational institutions. The answer depends upon the universities' initiative and will to recapture educational leadership.