

## AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

*Science* serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

### Editorial Board

1978: RICHARD E. BALZHISER, JAMES F. CROW, HANS LANDSBERG, EDWARD NEY, FRANK W. PUTNAM, MAXINE SINGER, PAUL E. WAGGONER, F. KARL WILLENBROCK

1979: E. PETER GEIDUSCHEK, WARD GOODENOUGH, N. BRUCE HANNAY, MARTIN J. KLEIN, FRANKLIN A. LONG, NEAL E. MILLER, JEFFREY J. WINE

### Publisher

WILLIAM D. CAREY

### Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

### Editorial Staff

*Managing Editor* ROBERT V. ORMES  
*Business Manager* HANS NUSSBAUM

*Assistant Managing Editor* JOHN E. RINGLE  
*Production Editor* ELLEN E. MURPHY

*News and Comment:* BARBARA J. CULLITON, *Editor*; LUTHER J. CARTER, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, R. JEFFREY SMITH, NICHOLAS WADE, JOHN WALSH. *Editorial Assistant*, SCHERRAINE MACK

*Research News:* ALLEN L. HAMMOND, *Editor*; RICHARD A. KERR, GINA BARI KOLATA, JEAN L. MARX, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, WILLIAM D. METZ, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON. *Editorial Assistant*, FANNIE GROOM

*Associate Editors:* ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DORFMAN, SYLVIA EBERHART, JUDITH GOTTLIEB

*Assistant Editors:* CAITILIN GORDON, RUTH KULSTAD, LOIS SCHMITT, DIANE TURKIN

*Book Reviews:* KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, *Editor*; LINDA HEISERMAN, JANET KEGG

*Letters:* CHRISTINE KARLIK

*Copy Editors:* ISABELLA BOULDIN, OLIVER HEATWOLE

*Production:* NANCY HARTNAGEL, JOHN BAKER; YA LI SWIGART, ELEANOR WARNER; JEAN ROCKWOOD, LEAH RYAN, SHARON RYAN

*Covers, Reprints, and Permissions:* GRAYCE FINGER, *Editor*; CORRINE HARRIS, MARGARET LLOYD

*Guide to Scientific Instruments:* RICHARD SOMMER

*Assistant to the Editors:* RICHARD SEMIKLOSE

*Membership Recruitment:* GWENDOLYN HUDDLE

*Member and Subscription Records:* ANN RAGLAND

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Area code 202. General Editorial Office, 467-4350; Book Reviews, 467-4367; Guide to Scientific Instruments, 467-4480; News and Comment, 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions, 467-4483; Research News, 467-4321; Cable: Advancisci, Washington. For "Instructions for Contributors," write the editorial office or see page xv, *Science*, 30 September 1977.

BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: Area Code 202. Business Office, 467-4411; Circulation, 467-4417.

### Advertising Representatives

*Director:* EARL J. SCHERAGO

*Production Manager:* MARGARET STERLING

*Advertising Sales Manager:* RICHARD L. CHARLES

*Marketing Manager:* HERBERT L. BURKLUND

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Steve Hamburger, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-DE-7-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); DORSET, VT. 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581)

ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Tenth floor, 1515 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-730-1050.

## Back to Structure

There can be little doubt that the movement to return to a more structured curriculum on the campus is gaining momentum. Far less clear is the overall implication of the recent return to more required courses, more requirements per course, greater reliance on grades, and so on. Does it simply reflect a return of the pendulum, which swung far into left field during the rebellious 1960's and early 1970's? Or will the main result be an even greater confusion of purposes, a mix of anarchy here and requirements there, with standards differing widely from department to department, tightened up one year, loosened again the next? Or will a new synthesis arise out of the thesis of rigid codes and antithesis of unbounded liberties, a new approach to higher education, clear in its purpose but not without opportunity for change, neither lax nor formless?

That the trend is away from anarchy is evident from top to bottom. In terms rarely used in nearly two decades, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Ernest L. Boyer, has strongly challenged educational practices that were until recently viewed by many as either "liberating" or "necessary" so as not to alienate the student body. Boyer bemoans the fact that "on the vast majority of campuses, required courses have been dropped, and the ones which remain reveal a staggering incoherence of purpose." He is equally critical of the intellectually undemanding way in which requirements for courses in humanities might be met by "twelve nights of Marx Brothers and the aesthetics of 'Casablanca'" and "a natural science requirement . . . by doing work for a season in the Galapagos." For undergraduates, Boyer defines as essential a required course in Western civilization, a course in communications ("to master the written and spoken word"), and courses aimed at developing the capacity to understand and criticize.

The students are not far behind. Although the majority (50 percent) of a national sample of undergraduates would have abolished grades in 1969, by 1975 this position was favored by only about one out of three undergraduates (32 percent). Only 19 percent of the 1977-1978 freshmen endorse this position.

Many universities are "restructuring." A 2-year study of the undergraduate curriculum at Harvard seeks to "balance" the "legitimate claims of individual interest and aspiration" with the need to ensure that those who graduate will be properly educated. It seeks to move away from random selection of courses by students, and instead to specify course load requirements and course combinations that make sense. The Amherst faculty rejected a proposal to endorse the system of electives that arose in the 1960's. Expressing dissatisfaction with the absence of a "shared educational purpose," it voted 78 to 25 to form a core curriculum. Stanford is reported to have established a new Western culture requirement. City University of New York has replaced open admission with minimum requirements in reading, writing, and mathematics. Similarly, California State University and Colleges voted in March 1977 to require all students to take an English placement exam. The University of Wisconsin reportedly began testing juniors for writing proficiency in fall 1976.

While the retreat from curriculum anarchy is clearly under way, it is much less obvious where it will end up. Colleges are not highly planned entities with powerful "steering mechanisms," able to set and stick to a consistent new course against all opposing currents. The tendency is to compromise, to gradually blend the new (or renewed) orientations into yesteryear's fashions. Adoption of rigid, mostly required rather than elective, lockstep curricula is most unlikely. The main alternatives are having a patchwork of requirements here and sizable pockets of disorganization there, or making a systematic effort to define where structure is needed and where free choice and opportunity to define new directions are called for.—AMITAI ETZIONI, *Professor of Sociology, Columbia University, and Director, Center for Policy Research, Inc., New York 10027*