

SOME IMPLICATIONS OF STUDENT ACTIVISM FOR SOUTHEAST ASIAN UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION*

Abraham I. Felipe

The last ten years have witnessed the appearance in southeast Asian universities and colleges of a generation of youth concerned and involved in university and community affairs. Their concern and involvement have been expressed in several ways and their impact felt in several countries. Many schools which never knew student activism before suddenly discovered themselves confronted by it. Meanwhile, the extent of student concern grows, and the students' tactics and methods to express their demands, to press the University to assume new responsibilities, are becoming both increasingly potent and disconcerting.

THE CHANGING FUNCTION OF EDUCATION AND ITS EFFECTS ON STUDENT ACTIVITIES

The appearance of student activism not only in southeast Asia but in other parts of the world is a consequence of multiple causes. Foremost among these is the change in the function of education for society.

Older Functions of Education

The traditional view. Education is perceived as a privilege with very strong socioeconomic

implications in the life of the student. This view has not materially changed in the last three or four generations. An expensive and therefore exclusive education was an adornment sought as a sign of membership in the upper socioeconomic classes. For the less fortunate classes, education was an instrument for upward mobility in East Asian society and an instrument of value in their scheme of family obligations. Thus, the students and their families were direct beneficiaries of the schools from which they received privileges, honor, status, and a promise of the good life. They were, therefore grateful to the schools for those benefits. The school and the family entered into a direct economic exchange—the former was to give the latter services which brought about status and economic opportunities, which the parents bought with matriculation fees.

Implications. This agreement between school and family, which still exists today in varying forms in our schools, has at least two implications. First, the school's ultimate obligation is to the family, represented by the parents—the party with which the agreement was made. Where the school is completely dependent on fees from students for its operations and even makes profits from them, as in many private schools in the Philippines, it is placed under greater moral obligation to fulfil its part of the exchange; otherwise it can be accused of renegeing on a contract. In this arrangement, a very legitimate basis for student protest is the school's failure to deliver the expected services to its students.

*Revised version of a paper read at the 1969 National Convention of the Philippine Sociological Society, December 6–7, 1969. At the time of the convention, Dr. Felipe was Dean of Students and Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines. At present (June 1971), he is still with the University, but no longer as dean of students. He is also a consultant to the Fund for Assistance to Private Education, Inc., Makati.

A second implication is the quality of the student population. When educational opportunities become readily available by the mere fact of paying matriculation fees, the socioeconomic qualities of the students become the criterion for admission rather than any intellectual quality. The student population thus becomes socioeconomically homogeneous but heterogeneous in terms of intellectual abilities and, therefore; in terms of other qualities correlated with intelligence. A student population created by a system of education which is based on a socioeconomic obligation to families tends to be less assertive and critical.

The Evolving Function of Education

In the last two decades, however, social forces hitherto ineffectual are compelling schools to assume a new function, a new obligation. The older socioeconomic obligation to the family is now being supplanted by a socioeconomic obligation to society at large. Two factors are imposing the new obligation on our educational institutions. These are the availability of previously untapped sources of funding for education and the change in the quality of students.

New sources of education funds started becoming available after universities demonstrated during the Second World War that the ivy-covered ivory towers contained knowledge that had eminently practical applications. As a result, many government and private agencies started to give schools funds for academic activities and projects. Scholarships were also made available, thereby making it possible for many students to get an education without spending their own money. These new funds have also encouraged the development of certain fields.

New funds and a new societal role. These new funds in our schools, which help maintain our facilities, projects, and student scholarships, should change the character of our universities. Donors of these funds do not give them without first stipulating the goals which they expect

their money to serve. Under ideal circumstances, money will be donated to a university for it to use in any way it pleases; but even in the most liberal form of donation, the university becomes accountable to the donor for how the money is spent. Under less desirable circumstances, donors take an active hand in designating the specific items for which the donation may be used. In most cases, however, the university's resources are diverted towards the donor's values, although usually those values are rationalized for the University's conscience in abstract terms such as "the good of society."

Thus, where formerly the universities served, by and large, the socioeconomic requirements of students and their families, the present universities, by virtue of their acceptance or active solicitation of support from external sources, now serve also the purposes of the donors. The university, on these terms, is immediately accountable to the donors. Since these donations are usually given under the stipulation that they be used to serve goals desirable for the whole society, then it is to the representatives of this society that the university is ultimately accountable.

Difficulties with the new role. This assumption of the new accountability of the university necessarily imposes a new standard of judgment on its objectives, performance, and accomplishments; namely: Does the university really serve society? This new standard soon becomes a point of friction between students and administration. The students today lay claim to two rights: first, the right to speak in behalf of society and, second, the right of representation which can demand an accounting from the university for society.

The new role for society which the universities are assuming leads to a number of difficulties and account for many student-administration misunderstandings. The biggest difficulty is that the role requires a prior definition of the skills, knowledge, and attitudes which society needs. And who will say what society needs? There will always be many interest groups to

lay claim to this right-politicized citizens, the so-called Establishment, workers, the religious, and many others. A university administration will not be able to attend to all and still remain internally consistent. It has to address itself more to some interest groups, and less to others. Unfortunately, when it does this, it also takes the risk that its definition of societal needs might only be a political act, aimed to secure its resources, maintain its power to attract more funds and important political support, or to ward off student demonstrations, instead of learning what society truly needs.

Assuming that the university will be able to deal with the legitimate spokesmen for society, the second difficulty in its new role is that it requires a competence to serve society which is still wanting. In the cases of universities willing to assume the role of agents of social change, there are very serious social, technical, and conceptual obstacles to being effectual. We can begin with the volume and the discrete character of the present knowledge which can be used for this purpose. The volume of available information requires perceptive and discriminate sorting to ferret out those items which have immediate validity for social life and those which are of more remote consequence. The discreteness of this information, the absence of encompassing theories, makes impossible their systematic, comprehensive application for the benefit of man. If a university will serve society beyond giving manpower training, it must consciously devote time and resources to establish what knowledge is relevant.

There is also a social obstacle for the university to effectuate its functions for society. The mark of the academe, which distinguishes it from other institutions, is the love of knowledge for its own sake. This image of the university, although not yet fully imbedded in the traditions of southeast Asian schools, will resist attempts to make our universities assume social engineering functions. Because of these different difficulties in fulfilling their task for society, our universities will for a long time to come be

hard pressed before the student-spokesman for society.

The changing role of the University unwittingly creates another source of difficulty with students. The new role creates a situation which is very favorable, at least initially, to the assertiveness of youth. The articulation of the concern for society leads to the erosion of the authority of professors over students. By recognizing the legitimacy of the students' social and political concerns, the University also legitimizes new fields of academic activity and a new emphasis in learning in which knowledge is brought to bear on social problems. This is, however, a type of activity for which many academicians are untrained. Ignorance will be exposed, therefore, even among many who have good academic preparation. The exposure of this type of inadequacy will decrease the legitimacy of the authority of teachers over students, making the latter even more assertive. The alternative for these academicians is not attractive either—they may avoid attempting to connect their knowledge to real life needs, but this is exactly what students will charge as irrelevance.

THE CHANGE IN THE CHARACTER OF OUR STUDENTS AND ITS EFFECTS ON STUDENT ACTIVITIES

A second major condition contributing to the appearance of student activism is the change in the character of our students. The availability of scholarships made schools accessible to the poor and de-emphasized the importance of socioeconomic factors in college admission. A new criterion for selecting those whom we will teach, based on their ability, potential, and competence, has emerged. Schools are now demanding more intellectual qualifications from students than they did in the past.

The demand for greater intellectual qualifications has also been forced upon the schools by the sheer number of college applicants. The number of youth of college age has been pro-

gressively increasing. This forces the schools to select those who will be taught, and the dimensions of competence, potentials, and abilities become the natural criteria. Thus, making the schools accessible on the basis of intellectual qualifications progressively homogenizes the student population in terms of their general aptitudes, rather than their socioeconomic capacities.

Homogenization of Students and Its Effects

This progressive homogenization has a direct effect on student activism. Higher abilities are usually accompanied by more independence of judgment, individualism, a greater sense of personal competence and self-regard. The policy of selective admission and retention based on intellectual ability leads to a concentration in schools of individuals who tend to be critical of things—of institutions, traditions, policies.

They will resent being treated as immature or irresponsible, or having their school life rigidly managed, regulated, or preplanned. They are the very competitive and achievement-oriented type, interested in leaving their personal marks on University affairs, and insistent on their personal freedoms. They tend to apply the criteria of competence and novelty in judging the worth of others. They tend to tolerate the unusual in thought, the unconventional expression, the deviant, the radical, the eccentric. This is a change in the student profile that has been effected by the admission of individuals on the basis of their intellectual qualities.

The homogenization of our students is abetted by some school policies on student welfare and general affairs. Common facilities such as dormitories, student unions, a "free" student paper, provide students with the occasions to share with one another their common concerns and aspirations, opinions about the government, the University, the peasants, Vietnam. Space where students can live away from home, such as school dormitories, reduce the conservatizing influence of the home and increase the im-

portance for the individual of the peer and the immediate social community.

A sense of group identity thus develops. Willy-nilly, other sources contribute to enhance it. Almost naturally, University administration and faculty treat students as a corporate entity—they are categorized as "students," and policies, rules, and special treatments are applied to them as a group, while the same are not applied to other groups in the University. Media people have focused on their dramatic encounters with others and treated them as if they were undifferentiated and undifferentiable. At the same time, communication facilities enable them to establish networks and maintain relationships within and between schools. The end result is a population operating in relatively well-defined territorial boundaries, increasingly intelligent, with a greater sense of competence and developing a group identity. A kinetic force for political pressure and group influence has been generated.

The Character of Present-day Knowledge and Its Effects

There is another aspect of our present students which breeds student activism. This is the aspect that is shaped up by the very character of the present knowledge we transmit in our schools and to which we referred earlier. Present day knowledge is voluminous, yet it is discrete and tentative. We now face a geometrically increasing body of information, each category becoming more precise and specialized. Social and technical tools, increasingly more sophisticated and suited to our problems, are multiplying. On top of these, our knowledge is also constantly being updated. What was true yesterday does not necessarily hold true today. This character of knowledge makes it humanly impossible for anyone to stay abreast of the developments in several fields.

The volume, discreteness, and tentativeness of present-day knowledge have bred discontent among students in at least two ways. First, they

have affected the students' social relationship with the faculty members. The faculty find it more difficult to exercise a legitimized authority over students because the intellectual competence required to do this has become increasingly difficult to maintain. This is precisely due to the fact that what is necessary to know is so much and yet so variable. Age, which was an advantage in the academe before, because it meant more time to have mastered a constant corpus of material and therefore to show competence in it, is becoming a liability—what one previously learned may interfere with what he must presently know. If for nothing more than the fact that the student population is being renewed annually, it becomes difficult for the teacher to keep up with what his students know. Sooner or later, his knowledge becomes obsolete, and he becomes an "old fogey".

The second way by which the character of present-day knowledge helps breed student discontent is that it develops a style of living which facilitates encounters with adults. This is the style of living characterized by more concern for the present, and by less awe for the past, and the traditions and the advice of elders. This is a style of living required when the modes of adjustment suited to the past are easily antiquated, and the modes of adjustment suited to the future can hardly be predicted because of the very rapid changes underway. This style produces a discontinuity in the values of the older generations and the students, including a discontinuity in the values which can be applied to resolve differences between them.

The volume, discreteness, and tentativeness of present-day knowledge have also required a new style of acquiring knowledge, which further facilitates encounters with adults. The older emphasis on comprehension and memorizing in the acquisition of knowledge cannot serve well when the information to be studied is so complex and voluminous. Of more importance are an emphasis on criticism, developing standards of acceptability and trustworthiness of information, and imagination. Skepticism, a tolerance for tentative judgments and skills in evaluating evi-

dence are of greater value. And in acknowledging the value of these, we are simultaneously encouraging a more critical approach to life, thereby facilitating encounters with others.

That is more or less the profile of the students our schools tend to develop. This profile is not peculiarly southeast Asian, for the circumstances shaping it are characteristic of our times. But our societies and our schools are more traditional than their Western counterparts, for which reason the rapid changes in the quality and styles of our students may soon be an overwhelming trauma for us.

School Environment is Not Adapted to Student Characteristics

These modern students—increasingly well-informed, with more self-competence and self-esteem, skeptical, non-traditional, concerned about and oriented to their present, cut off from the past and unable to link to the future—these students are forced by circumstance to spend some years of their lives in our schools, with their fixed policies and regulations which, in almost all probability, were laid down in response to earlier circumstances. In no time at all, they realize that the environment is not hospitable to their pursuits. They encounter aged and aging structures which no longer respond to their needs and their style of life. They find new truly intellectual challenges available. Although competition is increasing, only a handful of possibilities for excellence and recognition exists—the traditional standards of excellence in the classroom and the few focal points of campus student power. They become concerned with the circumstances of their nations, as they are taught and encouraged to be; yet, when they want to participate in these vital problems, when they react against terrorism, election frauds, graft, corruption, social injustice, they find no mechanism provided by the University to let them show their concern; on the other hand, they can express their values through mechanisms they themselves have had to evolve, usually at the spur of circumstance and moment.

Not infrequently, subjects are taught as if their contents were eternally true; and the students can sense something is wrong with the subject. The rules and regulations on conduct and discipline often show our schools acting in behalf of authoritarian parents, rigidly managing and regulating student affairs. In short, our schools have been slow in responding to the homogenization of the intellect and the character of the students; they have been slow in revitalizing their structures so that they can engage the students' self-regard, utilize their intelligence, test their values by which they judge others and their conceptions of reality and society. The only mechanisms for group expression of which the students can avail themselves are those which they have themselves developed, which, by their very nature, have to be outside the control of the University administration.

IMPLICATIONS FOR UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

In responding to student activism, the university administration must take the lead. It must realize that the phenomenon implies that the students have needs which are not being met. It must determine what these needs are and then make provisions to meet them. If those needs will enhance the intellectual life of the University, or are rationalized in terms of its goals, then the administration is obliged to meet them. If it merely acknowledges the legitimacy of those needs but does nothing about them, then its image of being morally fit to carry out its jobs will be corroded. The administration must take the initiative in dealing with student activism, for otherwise it will lose an opportunity to harness a force in the University to non-academic entities, whose style might neither be politically manageable nor academically substantive.

It will be unwise, and also unfair, to assume that student activism in this part of the world is only imitative and superficial. It will be unwise

because it will be an affront to the students' conscious regard of themselves. It will be unwise and unfair, for this will lead us to take their legitimate complaints lightly.

Style of Administration

In dealing with student activism, the University's response must have a style and carry a certain content. The administrative style of a university must consider the quality of its students.

On the other hand, the content of what will be administered should consider the conscious goals of the student movement. Both the style and the content of University administration are necessary. Emphasis on style alone will be empty; emphasis on content alone could be offensive.

Pertinent dimensions. Two dimensions of administrative style are important. First is the conscious-unconscious dimension. The University must respond conscious of the situation, deliberate in its search for new types of relationship with the students and the faculty. It must not adjust to student demands unconsciously. This is to say, when it should yield administrative territories to students or adapt programs initiated by them, it should not, at the same time, hold on to the belief that the traditional character of the University is not being thus affected. It must accept reality, particularly the reality that the student movement is altering the character of the University, instead of denying this fact and continuing to act out the myth that the University has remained unchanged. It must be conscious of its goals and methods, and of the consequences of the latter, so that it can cope with the requirements of the student movement in the most intelligent way.

The second dimension is the experimental-passive dimension. The University must be curious of procedures which will work. It must creatively explore new forms, evaluating the results in the process. In this, it must be systematic as opposed to being haphazard; it must

proceed from a plan instead of experimenting without any design. It must constantly try out new methods, even when there are others which are already satisfactory, in the hope that better ones may be discovered. And it must experiment for those techniques, methods, and forms which will work in our times and our particular circumstances. Being experimental is not the same as being innovative. The latter already implies a commitment to the method being adopted. The former, however, implies only a willingness to explore, a quality which is demanded in the case of student activism, because we are ignorant of what a proper and intelligent response may be.

Aims of the style. The style to be adopted by the University administration must try to eliminate obstacles to its smooth relations with students. More specifically, that style must try to achieve the following:

First, it should try to reduce areas wherein students would impute motives to the administration. Students will tend less to impute motives if they are informed regarding the motives and intentions by which we rationalize our actions and decisions. They must be assured that concern for student welfare is a regular consideration in administrative decisions. This assurance they can get if their interaction with the administration, the negotiations over issues and the conciliation of differences are routinized. We must experiment for ways to minimize the tendency of both students and the administration to avoid each other. The administration must not be too remote and austere. Remoteness might enhance one's status, but this just may provoke many students to challenge the administrator.

If a system fails, it should be possible to right it at once; or, at the very least, the students must see that the failure is not necessarily due to bad faith. They must be made to appreciate that some problems are just simply difficult, even if this must require their trying their hands in solving them.

Second, the style must impress on the students the University's determination to apply

its rules in order to achieve its goals. This present aim particularly applies to cases of discipline involving the violations of a university's rules on conduct and on order. Conduct which violates the rights of other students to their studies, such as coercing them to participate in a boycott, should be regulated. A prior requirement to regulation, however, is the students' acceptance of the goals served by those rules.

Third, the students must derive a sense of achievement from their interaction with the administration. This is required to insure the continuity of the relationship between them. Worthwhile ideas of students must be given a chance to be implemented. What the administration must avoid is isolating the students or isolating itself from the students, because mutual trust facilitates negotiations and isolation is an obstacle to the development of trust.

Content of the Administration

Changes in the style of administration seem required because the problems raised by student activism are partly problems in human relations. Hence it is in order that we be concerned with how to deal with the students. However, an over-emphasis on administrative style might only lead to trivia and human relations minutiae. In the long run this type of response will be empty, for the brunt of the student demands is less on how the administration should treat students but more on the substance, the functions, and responsibilities of the University.

Activism and the curriculum

The thrust of our students' activism is for the University to link them to the conditions of society. The demand, therefore, is for the universities to institute curricular changes in which the content of teaching will engage social problems. Our universities, varying as they do in the degree to which they are attached to the classical character of the University, with its devotion to pure knowledge, will differ in the willingness and readiness to adopt such a socio-technocratic

character. In need of settlement first, however, are some issues.

Student lobbies and curriculum changes. The first difficulty is in determining who among the students will represent society when a university's curriculum is in the process of being changed. Many will claim this right, but the problem is that none has been legitimized by society to be its spokesman.

A university, examining its curriculum to make it truly responsive to society, therefore, faces the problem of the correct and proper student representation. Students who take the initiative to demand changes are really lobbyists for certain interest groups. The university, however, is obliged to consider the values of those who do not have lobbyists; otherwise the curricular changes may become nothing more than a political move.

To guard against the possibility that an essentially academic matter, such as making curricular changes, will be transformed into something political, changing curricula should be left in the hands of the instructional staff of each academic department, to people sensitive to the links between their respective disciplines and the outside world, rather than allowing it to be the prerogative of higher-level administrators.

The new role of the University vs. academic traditions. The commitment of a university to engage society's needs, and the necessary changes in curricular content required by this commitment, raise a more basic issue. This is the issue related to the highly valued academic tradition of the universities, because this commitment, basically one to social technology, is as yet untested in the academic setting. A university which makes this commitment will have to decide on the form by which it will be expressed.

One form of expressing it is for the University to take positions, as an institution, on vital social issues. Many student groups, as a matter of fact, demand this of universities. This is, however, a role which is not in keeping with the university tradition of standing aloof from social controversies.

As an alternative, the commitment of the university to society might be limited to the acquisition of knowledge pertaining to those vital issues. The decision as to how to resolve those issues will be left to other institutions, such as the church, civic organizations, or the government. This commitment, requiring a technical role, although the arena might be political, is more in keeping with the traditions of universities.

However, a university which participates only in the acquisition of knowledge and information on vital issues and takes no position with respect to them, will be creating a climate which is, psychologically speaking, not consonant with human nature. For man tends to act according to what he knows. An emphasis on thought and knowledge alone, without equivalent forms to express one's thoughts in action, will leave dissatisfied the many students who would develop an awareness of our social problems. As a matter of fact, the students' resort to boycotts, demonstrations, sit-ins and other tactics, is due to the simultaneous occurrence of two facts, namely, an awareness of problems among students, on the one hand, and, on the other, the absence of university-provided means which they can use to give expression to this awareness. So long as their concerns cannot be expressed within the programs of the universities, the students will have no recourse but to use their present techniques of protest and even direct them at the University.

A new academic program. From a psychological point of view, therefore, a university willing to be an agent of social change must also make provisions for the students to apply their knowledge to the social, political, and economic realities of their nation. Otherwise, the character of the university will not be in harmony with the basic nature of man. On the other hand, however, the university must still act in the traditions of the academe, that is, it must emphasize the acquisition of knowledge.

To do this, new curricular programs may have to be instituted. In fact some universities have previously devised programs to take care of sim-

ilarly special circumstances. For example, the Honors Program, in which the students are required to present, among other things, an independent study, was devised to answer the needs of some academically talented students. Then there is the Foreign Studies Program of some Western schools, also devised to meet the particular needs of some students. Similarly, we can probably devise a new academic program which gives students an opportunity for social involvement. This program might take the form of including a year of apprenticeship in a project outside the university, dealing with vital social matters. The intent of this program, however, will not be to give the students a whole year off for action. This program will still impress the academic approach, even on this apprenticeship. This might not be easy to accomplish, but probably one way to do this is to require of the students to reflect and write later on their experiences, using as framework their academic disciplines.

The new responsibilities of the university

As a university takes on a more conscious role for society, it faces a twin change in the responsibilities it should exercise. First, it will have to scrutinize its old responsibilities, keep those which are consistent with the newly added role and abandon those which are not; and second, it will have to surrender some of its old powers to other members of the university constituency, such as the students. It will have to re-evaluate its functions; otherwise it might be saddled with functions irrelevant to its objectives and which might just create a conflict of roles. It will have to surrender some of its powers to students, if it wants to develop in them true responsibility.

The older socioeconomic function of the university required it to perform certain other duties to enhance the students' chances of later social and economic success. These duties, assumed on behalf of the parents, included the duty to instill certain values, such as respect for elders other

people of authority, and the duty to protect them from sexual experiences. It performed the role of a moral surrogate for the parents in many different ways, since morality was of great importance to one's social position. Thus, there were rules on curfew, religious behavior, types of movies to be shown on campus, manner of dressing, and general good conduct. Many of these rules still remain as parts of the machinery of university administrations even as the more family-oriented functions of education are being supplanted by the university's newer functions for society.

Universities should immediately and self-consciously scrutinize the responsibilities they have been exercising relative to students, and prepare to abandon those which are not necessary to their fundamental objectives, once these are challenged by students. This view requires them to first list their objectives, preferably in a hierarchy, and then see to it that their rules on conduct and discipline are rationalized only in terms of these objectives. If the objectives of the school are acceptable, then these rules will not be opposed.

In this connection, we take note of the fact that many of the recent student protests are actually a reaction against the University's assuming certain responsibilities regarding the conduct of students. Sometimes the students oppose these rules because these rules make assumptions about the character of the students which are contrary to the students own self-view. In other words, these rules violate an elementary principle of human psychology, namely, that people want to be treated as they present themselves to others. There have also been many times when rules were opposed because they could not be rationalized at all in terms of the explicit and declared purposes of the university, or the laws of the land. These are the rules to which we should be sensitive and which we should be happy to abandon.

At the same time that the university is re-evaluating what functions it would like to retain, there are other functions which may not be

crucial for the administration and, on this basis, might be made responsibilities of students. Examples of these are matters pertaining to the determination of the activities of student organizations, and the provision of certain non-curricular services for students, such as cafeteria services. There are even other functions, very central to the objectives of the university, such as participation in its deliberative or policy-making bodies, which the administration might nevertheless extend to students.

In connection with developing student responsibilities, however, we should always bear in mind that this, first of all, requires the university to surrender some of its powers to the students and student organizations. The university must not reverse decisions made by student organizations, no matter how ignorant and uninformed they seem to be. True responsibility will come when they shall have to answer for the consequences of their decisions, when the ultimate decision is their prerogative. In contrast, they will not be able to answer for these consequences, to be truly responsible in other words, if administrators overrule their decisions time and time again.

Need for research on students and student life

The administration of universities today requires activities which were not necessary before. Formerly, universities could be administered almost without regard to the reactions of the students to their university experiences. This is

no longer possible, since these reactions often convey strong and weak points of an administration. To ignore the student reactions would imply that they are completely meaningless, and this attitude will eventually mean a loss for the university. Like any other rational organization, the university must have access to facts and information, systematically and properly collected, to use as bases for its decisions. Especially in cases when an organization is instituting innovations, which is the case when a university assumes new functions and sets up new programs, properly collected data are very important.

With this as an assumption, universities should have their machineries to study students and student life. Many topics can be studied to inform the administration just how the school environment affects the students, as individuals and as social organisms. These include finding out how the university experience engages the requirements of the real world; the nature of our student populations; their subcultures, values, backgrounds and aspirations; and how each interacts with specific aspects of the school environment (intellectual, social, physical, and political). We must study the qualities of those students who can best profit from the university. Finally, we should collate and integrate information from different schools so that we can discern the patterns of needs evolving in our societies as a result of the responses of our different universities. A university which has to remain systematic in its search and rational in its choice of the styles and content of its administration will find a research center a useful aid.