Het ziet er dus hard naar uit dat opnieuw de grenzen der wetenschappen vloeiend worden. Een van de eerste eisen welke deze ontwikkeling stelt, is wel een grondige herbezinning op de faculteitsindelingen aan onze universiteiten. Wordt het niet hoog tijd dat alle menswetenschappen onder één dak worden gebracht? Moeten de programma's niet zo worden gecoördineerd dat op doctoraal niveau gezamenlijke wetenschapsbeoefening rond geselecteerde problemen practisch doorgevoerd kan worden?

Merkwaardig is, dat op het ogenblik een uitgeverij als de Free Press op deze ontwikkeling vooruit loopt door met excellente boeken zodanig de oude burchten te bestoken dat hun verdediging tenslotte vallen moet en dan nieuwe wegen vrijkomen.

**Venster op het buitenland**

**EN GELA N D**

In an earlier number of *Sociologische Gids* 1) the first full-scale report of the Social Research Unit of the London School of Economics was described. This was concerned with the general problem of social selection and differentiation in Britain 2). From the outset, however, the Unit realised that such a study must be followed by more specific enquiries concentrating on particular groups or occupations, particularly those whose place „in the power structure of the community, or in the process of social mobility, could be regarded as „critical“ 3). Studies of two such groups have now appeared, one on the Higher Civil Servants in Britain, the other on the elementary school teachers. Both contain much historical material, both attempt to describe the social background of the members of the profession, and both are concerned to ascertain changes in the status of the job.

Professor Kelsall has stated his problem in unmistakably sociological terms. „From which social strata is the Higher Administrative Class now being drawn, and what changes have taken place in this respect over the last eighty years or so?..... How far have the developments that have taken place been the result of policy changes either in the recruitment of direct entrants, or in the promotion of those originally entering the lower classes of the Service? To what extent have the fathers of senior officials themselves been members of this or closely allied occupations? What has been the relationship between the social origin, education and upbringing of higher civil servants on the one hand, and their career-success on the other? Has there been any marked change in the status of their profession?” 4).

It is indeed a pity that having stated the questions so clearly, Professor Kelsall should not have answered them equally as clearly. However, the answers are contained in the book, even if the reader has to seek patiently for them, and they follow the pattern sociologists have come to expect of any social class system. By origin Higher Civil Servants come from the top strata of the community. Class I of the Registrar-General’s social class classification, „which only accounts for 3.4 % of the adult male population of working age, has hitherto included a third of the fathers in the group, and 80 % or so in the 1939 and 1929 groups. The underrepresentation of
classes 3, 4 and 5 is correspondingly marked”). These figures are not unlike those published in a similar study made in America).

Secondly, there is a marked difference in terms of social origin between those who are promoted into the Higher Civil Service from ranks lower in the Administration and those who enter it directly by open competition.

Thirdly, there has been some change in the social origins of both these types of entrant over time. Some of this is no doubt due to deliberate changes in recruitment policy but more important seem to be those changes in the educational and social systems of Great Britain which have resulted in a growing proportion of lower class children being put forward as candidates for the Service. Fourthly, career-success appears to be highly related to degree of success in the written entrance examination but much less so to results in the oral interview, while the latter is more closely related to class of origin. Finally, status as measured by income and other financial “incentives”, such as non-contributory pensions, has declined as compared with that of other occupations.

This, then, is the general pattern of recruitment to a profession of some importance in the power structure of the community and it adds to what we already know of the degree of class rigidity involved in recruitment to other professions. We turn now to consider the case of a rather different occupation, that of the Local Authority teacher. Above, I referred to this group as the elementary school teachers, and it is perhaps important to explain this term. Briefly, it may be said that in the nineteenth century the term elementary education was used to refer to education provided, largely out of public money, for the children of the poor, while the term secondary education was reserved “to describe that type of education which catered for a rather higher social class than was normally to be found in the ordinary elementary school of the country.” After 1902, and more especially after 1944, much of secondary education became absorbed into the national system; and at the present time most schoolteachers, but by no means all, are employees of Local Authorities. Thus in terms of origin, both of their pupils and of themselves, these schoolteachers have affiliations with a lower social class than is the case with the teachers in the schools independent of public funds. The profession indeed is recruited “mainly from the children of the skilled manual and the routine non-manual workers”. But they form a “critical” group insofar as in the nineteenth century and today mobility up the social scale proceeds most rapidly via this profession.

Dr. Tropp’s study, however, does not add so neatly to Professor Kelsall’s as we might wish. Whereas the latter has concentrated largely on statistical data about recruitment, the former has documented at length the historical details on the growth of professional unionism among the teachers, with considerable emphasis on its ideological basis. This is all very valuable but tends to obscure the sociological sophistication under a mass of historical fact. Indeed it is necessary to turn elsewhere for a clear statement of the problem in order to make the most of the book. „My major interest in undertaking the research,” the author has written, „was not in writing a narrative history of the teaching profession and the associations that the teachers had created, but in analysing the growth of one of the largest
segments of the „new middle class”. In making the study he became more and more aware of the importance of the professional association as a factor in the consolidation of the teachers’ position 14). Thus the focus of attention has been turned from the concept of class or status as measured by the kinds of prestige ranking used for studying Social Mobility in Britain to the concept of class or economic position involving the exercise of power and decision making in the community 15). In that sense Dr. Tropp’s work is a good example of continuity in social research, which began with the Social Research Unit’s survey of the social origins, education and occupational achievements of a random sample of 10,000 adults in Britain in 1946 and has now resulted in a detailed historical account of the forces sustaining the rise in importance of a single occupational group.

But what general conclusions emerge? So far, no one has made these very clear. Professor Kelsall’s study seems to suggest that the relative decline in the status of the Higher Civil Service is due to the failure of this profession to organise itself into an effective Association 16). Dr. Tropp’s study on the other hand, suggests that the growing prestige of the teachers is to their success in organisation 17). But he would go further than this. „In general, we can say that the improved status of the teacher from 1800 onwards can be attributed to the dual influence of an increase in the publicly acknowledged importance of education, and the influence of the organised teaching profession” 18). Does this mean that there has been public acknowledgment of the declining importance of the Higher Civil Service? Certainly Professor Kelsall has documented a list of indictments regarding the main virtues and failings that such high functionaries exhibit; but is this the same thing as saying that the function they perform is valued less highly than it was in the past? We still await a more adequate theoretical treatment than we have as yet of the relationship between the function of an occupation and its status in the community; but in the meantime it can be said that these two works provide some interesting material on the sociological aspects of the supply and demand factors in occupational recruitment.

J. A. BANKS
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