Book Reviews

Trevor Colbourn, Editor

Rudolph H. Weingartner, *Fitting Form to Function: A Primer on the Organization of Academic Institutions*. (Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1996.) 136 pp. $29.95.

Professor Emeritus Rudolph H. Weingartner has assembled an interesting, insightful, and informative summary of truisms and reflections on the workings of the academy based on his years of service as a faculty member, department chairperson, dean, and provost. This collection discusses the advantages and disadvantages of various organizational structures, and gives plausible reasons for his assertions regarding their effectiveness. The work breaks no new ground about the administration of colleges and universities, but it was not intended to do so, and Weingartner mercifully avoids summarizing the results of studies or doing statistical analyses to advance his views. Instead, he draws on his experience in academic administration and on his conviction that the faculty must be central to the governance as he develops his primer.

Despite his years of service as an administrator, Weingartner seems to relegate administrators to a decidedly secondary role in the primary functions of teaching and research in colleges and universities. His view of the presidency certainly reflects the importance of providing institutional leadership, but the emphasis is on what he calls pastoral duties—internal and external. The president's substantial duties in fund raising, interacting with governing boards and legislatures in public institutions, and securing operational resources are recognized, but stresses the president's role in assuring collaborative efforts with the faculty to set the policy parameters appropriate for the university. He takes a dim view of the concept of an executive vice president and feels that such a position, while intended to relieve pressures on the president, can undermine his or her leadership and collaborative functions. He questions the need for vice presidents of student affairs and development, preferring instead to view them as staff functions in the president's or provost's offices. Although a vice president for business in the organizational structure seems to be an accepted entity, Weingartner believes that the person in this position is likely to be more concerned with efficiency of operations than with service to faculty and students. This assertion would not be hard to substantiate in most institutions of higher education today.

Many of his points on the organization of higher education and about fitting form to function are made through the 27 truisms he has devised and refers to as maxims. While one does not always grasp the full importance of these on first reading, later in-depth discussions and continual references to them soon give readers an understanding of how true they are. They also add interest to the book and sometimes reflect Weingartner's sense of humor on how things work in the academy. Maxim 3, for example, states that "Academic administrators do not *manage* units composed of faculty or students, however much they may at times dream of doing so."

He places an unusual burden on the office of the provost, concluding that just about every campus administrative function not directly involved in teaching and research—but supporting these activities—should report to the provost. The implication is that these administrative functions will not operate in the best interests of the faculty and students unless they are under the watchful eye of the provost. Again, this view would not be hard to substantiate in most educational institutions and, if it were, the administrators in question would be unlikely to retain their positions.

His treatment of the role of the faculty senate and how it can function effectively in an institution is treated particularly well and should be read by all faculty and administrators with an interest in this traditional form of university governance. Discussions of the dean's office and the department chair are also excellent and deal with matters of hiring, tenure, judicial processes, and the development of multisdisciplinary programs. Cogent arguments are made for the extreme importance of hiring and tenure decisions in creating and maintaining the long-term health and vitality of the academic enterprise.

Weingartner's overriding premise is that the way academic institutions are organized plays a crucial role in whether they can achieve their goals, and he makes this point with admirable clarity. The book is a must-read for administrators and faculty in new and developing institutions and in those in which changes in organization are being considered.

—John R. Bolte

Daniel Seligman, *A Question of Intelligence: The I.Q. Debate in America* (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1992). 239 pp. $16.95.

A Question of Intelligence is a well-written interpretive overview of theoretical, research, and opinion literature, in which Seligman translates the literature of a very complex and politically explosive issue into objective language.

The author makes a strong case for the utility of I.Q. scores, and does so along the way by citing much of the research reporting positive correlations between I.Q. scores and success as defined by academic achievement, position, and economic indicators. He also provides interesting insights into the debate on the relative contributions of genetic and environmental factors in determining both an individual's intelligence and group differences, including differences in I.Q. scores among religious, racial, and ethnic groups.

The personal interpretive orientation of the book is contained in a short paragraph of Seligman's preface, in which he wrote, "The connection between I.Q. and achievement has one positive implication: It tells us that people at the top in American life are probably there because they are more intelligent than others—which is doubtless the way most of us think it should be."

However, his discussion suffers from his tendency to equate I.Q. scores with intelligence. Although he does sometimes note the distinction between the two, his work most often demonstrates his assumption that I.Q. scores and intelligence are one thing. Moreover, he consistently writes about intelligence as if it were a physical property rather than a construct created by humans to ease discussions of patterns of phenomena observed over time. Intelligence, like such concepts as aca-

demic achievement, personality, and attitude, does not have physical reality—it would not fall on the floor if a surgeon were careless during an operation.

I.Q. scores are no more than indicators of intelligence. Each test developer decides what traits he believes are included as part of the meaning of intelligence, and many types of performances are included because no one type is both necessary and sufficient.

Seligman also fails to describe the strategies used in selecting specific items to be included in I.Q. tests. It helps to know that a large number of items are considered and pretested before inclusion in a much smaller set that are selected to ensure that scores on the test will produce a bell-shaped or "normal" distribution in a large representative sample of the human population. The normal distribution is desirable because it seems reasonable that a conceptual trait such as intelligence should be distributed in the form of the normal bell-shaped distribution. No one knows that such an assumption is true, but because many human physical traits have been shown to be distributed in such a manner, one can assume that psychological and social traits are as well.

Seligman makes a major point of the positive correlations between I.Q. scores and academic achievement scores, but he fails to explain that the two types of tests were intentionally created to measure similar traits. (If there were low correlations, test developers would have a major problem.) Thus, nationally norm-referenced achievement tests can be thought of as alternative forms of some I.Q. stests.

The reader should also be reminded that the traits assumed to be indicators of intelligence were selected by persons who wished to predict success in environments that place high positive value on a selected subset of human performances. One can only imagine what might be reported in the I.Q. group-differences literature if the original social structures had placed more value on other traits such as running speed, hand-eye coordination, empathy for others, or a cooperative lifestyle.

—Robert R. Lange

Howard R. Bowen, in collaboration with Peter Clecak, Jacqueline Powers Doud, and Gordon K. Douglass, *Investment in Learning: The Individual and Social Value of American Higher Education* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997). 507 pp. $22.95.

Originally published twenty years ago by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education and based on a report for the Sloan Foundation, this volume reexamines the original findings concerning the value of higher education to society and individuals. Four major areas are addressed: (1) The Setting deals with efficiency, accountability, and the goals of higher education; (2) Consequences for Individuals addresses cognitive learning, emotional and moral development, practical competence for citizenship and economic productivity; practical competence for family life, consumer behavior, leisure, and health; the "whole person"; and similarities and differences among institutions; (3) Consequences for Society concerns societal outcomes from education, research, and public service, progress toward human equality, economic returns on investments in higher education, and views of

social critics; and (4) Conclusions presents an overview, with attention to the cost and worth of higher education and the future of higher education.

The first section examines efficiency in normal settings that are generally accepted for measuring outcomes as compared to costs. Difficulties in specifically defining desirable outcomes, much less in measuring complex institutional and human behavior, set very serious limitations on any such effort. The authors do about as good a job as can be done with an undefinable and debatable set of factors. Examination of the goals of higher education both extends the apologia to bean counters and lists generally accepted human and societal goals. At this point, it seems appropriate to note that this volume does not deal effectively with the impacts on society's and individuals' problems—due to the rapid growth of communication technology and delivery via computers, the Internet—of absorbing and properly using available input, output, and life in front of a monitor.

The next section presents a complete and thoughtful guide to examining group and individual growth potential in higher education settings, as well as underlining social participation and economic and political dimensions. Attempts to measure similarities and differences between universities seem to founder on the rocks of not having a clear set of weighted goals, not being able to differentiate outcomes due to lack of ability to describe what students bring to higher education, and a marked lack of willingness to carefully and thoughtfully at least *try* to measure the impacts of family, economics, and even genetics (the bell-shaped curve exists, even if we do not like it) as factors influencing access to selective institutions and outcomes for those who attend different categories of institutions.

The third section attempts, with considerable success, a tour de force presentation of the views of critics and defenders vis-à-vis the value of higher education to society in terms of both concrete and personal goals. Given the level of debate over factors ranging from definition to value in such areas as equality, weighing teaching, research, and public service, and a reprise of economic factors involving public education, this section does a most creditable job of dealing with the widely varied and often fuzzy areas with which higher education is involved. The area of service, which includes contributions to the efficiency and quality of work within institutions of higher education, is not addressed. Internal service is a major area of responsibility, especially in large and/or complex institutions, and deserves attention.

The last section serves dual purposes: an overview of matters treated and a venue for emphasis on issues that have been consistent, ongoing, or more prevalent since initial publication of this work. The influence of technology, for good or ill, is recognized.

In summary, this book was a valuable tool twenty years ago and retains its value today. Persons involved or interested in higher education would do well to read and own it for review, reference, and as a loaner for critics, converts, interested colleagues, and others. The authors have done an exceptional job of selecting core issues, providing appropriate hard data, and presenting a variety of approaches to issues that are difficult to define and often impossible for those who require closure or solution formulas. The bottom line, an area treated at length here, is that those with serious interests in higher education should keep this edition and its predecessor in mind and in their libraries.

—David E. Hernandez