of het schema waarmee al deze studies gebeuren, voldoende is om het huidige levenspatroon in zijn geheel vast te leggen.

In dit licht wint het boek van de beide Keurs wel aan belangrijkheid, en is het inderdaad een bijdrage tot "comparative ecology, anthropology and sociology", zoals Prof. Bouman in zijn Foreword schreef. Was het echter niet de taak van de inleider geweest het boek tegen de gehele, juist genoemde, achtergrond te plaatsen?

GEWETENSPROBLEMEN VAN DE TOEGEPASTE PSYCHOLOGIE

DOOR B. J. KOUWER

Inaug. Rede Groningen 1955 (Wolters, Groningen 1955)

Zelfs wie oppervlakkig de recente ontwikkeling van de toegepaste psychologie in Nederland volgt, wordt telkens weer getroffen door een toon van onzekerheid en zelfcritiek. Stelde Van Dooren's Openbare Les van 1950 de psychotechniek op principiële en ethische gronden in gebreke, oefende Ouweleen bij zijn ambtsaanvaarding in 1953 scherpe critiek op de onderschikking van de bedrijfpsychologie aan de organisatieleer, Kouwer graaf nog dieper, waar hij de overspannen verwachtingen van de psychologie bij het publiek en de soms even overspannen pretenties van de psychologen zelf als gevaren voor wetenschap en maatschappij nadrukkelijk signaleert.

Het is ondoenlijk het interessante betoog in kort bestek weer te geven. Volstaan wij met te constateren, dat kwesties als het dilemma tussen wetenschappelijke competentie en maatschappelijke verwachtingen, de therapeutische taak, de ethische achtergrond, de maatschappelijke verantwoordelijkheid en de sociale status van de psycholoog, — dat dit alles ook de sociale onderzoeker onmiddellijk aanspreekt. In menig opzicht verkeert de toegepaste sociologie immers in een soortgelijke situatie als de psychotechniek, slechts met dit verschil, dat hetgeen in psychologische kring thans achteraf wordt betreurd, in de toegepaste sociologie nog slechts dreigend opdoemt, zij het dat de dreiging onontkoombaar en snel nadert. Des te vruchtbaarder is het, van de beschouwingen van Kouwer kennis te nemen.

Venster op het buitenland

ENGLAND

From its inception the International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction 1) has given a very prominent place to a section of volumes entitled 'Sociology of Education' and to this day the longest single list of works appears under this heading. This is perhaps understandable when it is realized that the library was founded by Karl Mannheim whose emphasis on the importance of the educational process is well known. Mannheim was, indeed, the first Professor of the Sociology of Education in England, the chair having been founded for him by the University of London in 1946.
It would be a mistake, however, to infer from this that the sociology of education has a prominent place in English University education. When Mannheim died in 1947 his chair remained vacant until 1949 when it was filled by Professor Lester Smith who retired in 1952. Since then there has been no Professor of the Sociology of Education in this country, and in fact a course of lectures on the subject has been substituted for the post. Indeed, at the present time there is only one teaching post in the whole of Britain which is officially recognized as a lectureship in the sociology of education, and that is at the Institute of Education in London. Although every University in England has an Institute of Education attached to it, none of them except London, has a trained sociologist on the staff. The gap is filled in a more or less casual fashion by lecturers and professors trained in other disciplines who give occasional lectures and courses on what they believe to be the sociological approach to the problems of education.

Under these circumstances it is hardly surprising that there have been few systematic developments in this field in England until very recently, when under the influence of Professor Glass at the London School of Economics a number of projects were launched mainly to examine the relationship between the education system and the class structure of Britain. Professor Glass is himself a pioneer in this respect since he published a joint paper with J. L. Gray on "Opportunity and the Older Universities" in 1938, which investigated parental capacity to pay and other aspects of their social circumstances which were associated with the existing disparity in the allocation of scholarship award to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. 2)

In an earlier number of Sociologische Gids 3) a brief description was given of studies carried out by the London School of Economics Social Research Unit, which considered educational opportunity as one of the main aspects of social mobility in Britain. Briefly it may be said that in spite of considerable modifications in the state educational system from the beginning of the twentieth century and in spite of the extensive development of a state provided secondary school system, there was not "an unqualified improvement in the relative educational prospects of children drawn from families in the lower status categories of the population." 4) No serious attempt was made to account for this, other than in terms of the stability of the social status system, 5) and no attempt was made in Social Mobility in Britain to analyse the interrelationship between educational institutions and other institutions in the same society.

In terms of the secondary school system, this weakness has to a large extent now been overcome in a study which deals with the developments in English secondary education since the turn of the century and with the kinds of occupations entered by the pupils from the different types of state schools. 6) Throughout the emphasis is laid upon the schools "not as the purveyor of a certain type of education but as the avenue to a certain level on the social and occupational scale". 7) In one sense the whole study may be seen as an attempt to assess the theory put forward by an eminent British educationalist that the educational system conditions the development of society, 8) and concludes on the contrary that "develop-
ment within secondary education has had to wait upon changes in the social structure." It shows, for example, that as certain technical and manual occupations have gained in social prestige and economic reward at the expense of professional and clerical occupations since 1939, so a growing proportion of grammar school leavers have demonstrated a greater interest in industrial occupations and less in clerical and administrative posts. This has maintained the traditional role of the grammar schools as the main avenue to the more responsible and higher paid employments, and consequently rendered inoperative the aim of educationalists to create a system of secondary education in which there will be parity of esteem between the three existing types of school. Looked at in this light much of the history of British secondary education becomes understandable, especially those aspects of it which are concerned with the failure of policy makers to implement many educational programmes. As Dr. Banks has put it, "purely educational reforms have foundered wherever they have set themselves against the selective function of the schools." Moreover since the schools have become more and more the main avenue for social mobility, it was inevitable that those parents most concerned with achieving social status and economic security for their children should have sought to place them in the grammar schools; and as the Social Research Unit had already shown that this was a feature of middle class rather than working class parenthood, it becomes understandable why children from larger families and lower occupational levels fail to benefit as much as they should from a system of education which is free and open to all.

From the theoretical point of view, what is most exciting about the publication of these studies is the fact that for the first time in the history of British sociology we are beginning to see an accumulation of data which really extends our knowledge and understanding of contemporary social structure and institutions, while at the same time does not ignore the importance of historical fact. *Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education* is an attempt to trace the interplay of two variables over a period of 50 years or so. Much the same kind of attempt is made in the work of Dr. Asher Tropp, another of the younger sociologists influenced by Professor Glass. In his case the emphasis is not on school pupils but on teachers, and on the factors affecting their status in society over the past 150 years. It represents therefore not merely a contribution to the sociology of education but to the sociology of professionalism in general and to that extent is also cumulative with the work of Kelsall on the higher civil service, and the much older work of Carr-Saunders and Wilson on the professions. Since this will form the topic of a future contribution to *Sociologische Gids*, this side of Tropp's work may be ignored for the moment, although it should be emphasized that the organization of teachers into a profession is one of the six factors which he claims have affected the status of the teacher, if we consider it from the standpoint of the Davis and Moore theory of stratification. The other five factors are (a) the amount of money their employers are prepared to spend on salary, pensions, and conditions of work; (b) qualifications demanded by their employers; (c) the amount of paid recruits
are offered to obtain these qualifications; (d) the number of candidates sufficiently qualified and willing to enter the profession, and (e) stereotyping of past prestige. What we now need is some clearer thinking on the relation between these factors and the importance of the 'demand' side as expressed not by the direct employers of school teachers but by the aims and aspirations of parents who desire secondary grammar education for their children. Dr. Tropp's work so far has been confined to the 'elementary' level — that is, to teachers in primary schools and in those post-primary schools and classes which were not regarded as of secondary status before the 1944 Education Act. The gap would be filled if we knew more than we do about the relative prestige of secondary grammar school teachers as compared with other secondary teachers in the post-1944 world; and it would be invaluable if Dr. Baron who has traced the development of professionalism among secondary school teachers up to 1914 could be persuaded to extend his work to the present day. 14)

In conclusion reference should be made to another book published in the International Library of Sociology with the sub-title "An Introduction to the Sociology of Education". 15) This is a very readable book and is much to be preferred in terms of size and content to most American textbooks on the subject. Its chief weakness, however, lies in the lack of sophistication it shows in its approach to sociological questions of a more theoretical kind. Thus, in a chapter on the social determinants of education in England there appear such statements as "with regard to social status there has been a tendency to break down class distinctions, which is a tendency towards the greater integration of society"; and Ottaway seems to believe that because an institution is called by the same name at different points of time its functions are precisely the same on both occasions. For this reason he fails to appreciate that one of the main reasons why the grammar schools maintained their social prestige was because they changed the content of their courses to meet the changing requirements of the middle and upper levels of the occupational system, and therefore that to talk of their prestige as responsible for "many obstacles to change" is to lay an emphasis on the aims of social reformers who are not too concerned with the sociological realities of the situation they wish to alter, rather than to introduce the reader to the sociology of education. Ottaway's book is, indeed, a good example of what happens to an educationalist who has become aware that "educational change tends to follow other social changes, rather than initiate them", 16) but who has not been trained to look at the problem from a sociological point of view. The mere use by him of the term "sociology of education" is no guarantee that he understands the concept, as Mrs. Floud implies; 17) although it is to be hoped that the writings of the younger generation of British sociologists in this field will have an impact on the thinking of practitioners and teachers of educational philosophy.

J. A. BANKS
1) A series of books published by Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., and edited at the present time by Professor W. J. H. Sprott. It is true to say that the most important sociological works produced in England at the present time are published in this library.


5) see, for example, Professor Glass’s "Introduction" to *Social Mobility in Britain*, p. 21 and F. M. Martin "An Inquiry into Parents’ Preferences in Secondary Education" (in the same volume). Martin’s study shows that concern with secondary education increases as we move up the occupational hierarchy.


7) *ibid.* p. 239.

8) H. C. Dent: *A New Order in English Education*, 1942, p. 15.

9) *op. cit.* p. 248.


11) This will be one of the main themes of a forthcoming book by Floud, Martin and Halsey referred to in Veinster op het buitenland, april 1954. (see note 3 above).


16) *ibid.* p. 12.

17) J. Floud: "La Sociologia de la Educacion en Inglaterra" in *Revista Mexicana de Sociologia*, Vol. 16 No. 3 september-december 1954, p. 429. In Mrs. Floud’s view, the concept of the sociology of education has "acquired a wide recognition among English educationalists" and she cites Ottaway’s book as "perhaps" an example of this.