# UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS IN GREAT BRITAIN, 1952--53 

TTHE "Returns from Universities and University Colleges in receipt of Treasury Grant for the Academic Year 1952-53"*, issued by the University Grants Committee, shows a further decline of 1,984 in the number of full-time students- to 81,474 , compared with 83,458 in 1951-52 and 85,314 in 1950-51. In the English universities, full-time men students decreased by 1,231 , but women students increased by 282 ; for Wales the corresponding figures were 259 and 17, while for Scotland there were 694 fewer men and 99 fewer women. Overseas students from within the British Commonwealth increased by 318 to 4,239 full-time and 1,842 parttime students, and students from foreign countries by 190 to 3,229 full-time and 1,302 part-time students. While there was no significant change in the percentage distribution of full-time students among the faculties, there was no evidence of any increase where it appears to be required in the national interest. Arts students decreased by 1,020 to 34,916 , but those in pure science decreased by 52 to 17,001 and those in technology by 222 to 9,993 . Students of medicine decreased by 399 to 13,511, of dentistry by 174 to 2,715 , of agriculture by 139 to 2,279 , and those of veterinary science increased by 22 to 1,059 . Full-time advanced students of pure science, however, increased by 187 to 3,045 , and those of technology by 52 to 1,157 and of agriculture by 7 to 28l; students of medicine and dentistry decreased by 44 to 963 , of veterinary science by 3 to 7 , and of arts by 10 to 3,304 , while those working for a teacher's diploma decreased by 76 to 2,900 . Of the full-time students, 64,753 were reading for a first degree, 5,064 for a first diploma and 11,657 were engaged in research or other advanced work, the corresponding figures for 1951-52 being $66,409,5,505$ and 11,544, respectively.
The proportion of assisted students was slightly smaller ( 70.4 per cent compared with 72.4 per cent during 1951-52) ; for England as a whole, it decreased only from 73.8 to 72.9 per cent, but in Wales it decreased from $88 \cdot 3$ to $81 \cdot 1$ per cent, and in Scotland from $61 \cdot 6$ to $55 \cdot 7$ per cent. The dependence on Parliamentary grants, however, continued to increase and is now $69 \cdot 6$ per cent of recurrent income, only 12.7 per cent coming from fees, 4.4 per cent from endowments, $3 \cdot 6$ per cent from local-authority grants and $1 \cdot 6$ per cent from donations and subscriptions. Two years ago (1950-51) the corresponding figures were $16 \cdot 6,5 \cdot 2,4 \cdot 1$ and 1.9 per cent, respectively, with 64.9 per cent from Parliamentary grants. The ratio of staff to students continued to improve, the full-time teaching staff being now 9,098 , compared with 8,952 during 1951-52 and 8,603 during 1950-51. The increase was chiefly in readers, assistant professors and independent lecturers (38), senior lecturers (71) and lecturers (364), with a further decrease of 255 in assistant lecturers and demonstrators to 1,282.

Of the full-time students, 62,635 were in England, 4,621 in Wales and 14,218 in Scotland. Of these, 14,717 were at Oxford and Cambridge, 18,199 at London and 29,719 at other English universities and university colleges. There were slight decreases at
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all universities and university colleges, except Bristol $(+9)$, Reading $(+60)$, Exeter $(+35)$ and North Staffordshire University College ( +117 ), but only at Cambridge (-152), Oxford (-119) and Liverpool (-182) was the decrease more than one hundred. The proportion of full-time students residing in colleges and halls of residence increased to 27.3 per cent; of these 22,269 students, 7,977 were at Oxford and Cambridge, 11,367 at other English institutions and only 1,188 in Wales and 1,737 in Scotland. The proportion of men in residence was 22.9 per cent and of women 41.3 per cent, while 32,559 students ( 40 per cent) were in lodgings and 26,646 ( $32 \cdot 7$ per cent) at home, compared with $39 \cdot 6$ per cent and 34.5 per cent during the previous year. Of the 21,355 students admitted for the first time during 1952-53 (a decrease of 1,059 on 1951-52), 19,683 were reading for a first degree, and 1,672 for a first diploma; and of those reading for a first degree, 1,612 were under eighteen years of age, and 10,679 were nineteen or more. Of the full-time students, 35,057 out of 48,044 men and 10,607 out of 14,591 women in England were receiving assistance in the way of scholarships, exhibitions or other awards from public or private funds; for Wales the corresponding figures are 2,588 out of $3,287 \mathrm{men}$ and 1,161 out of 1,334 women; and for Scotland 5,942 out of 10,455 men and 1,980 out of 3,763 women. Of 61,786 full-time men students, $36 \cdot 3$ per cent were in arts, 21.9 per cent in pure science, 17.2 per cent in medicine and 15.9 per cent in technology; for the 19,688 women students the corresponding figures are $63 \cdot 4,17 \cdot 5,14 \cdot 7$ and 0.9 per cent, respectively. Medicine and dentistry claimed $49 \cdot 1$ per cent of the part-time advanced students, arts $33 \cdot 8$, technology $9 \cdot 0$, and pure science $7 \cdot 5$ per cent, compared with $51 \cdot 1$, $33 \cdot 0,8 \cdot 0$ and $8 \cdot 7$ per cent, respectively, during 1951-52.

The recurrent income of the universities and university colleges of Great Britain increased by $£ 3,950,084$ to $£ 29,698,083$, of which $£ 20,682,415$ was from Parliamentary grants, $£ 3,764,749$ from fees, £1,311,884 from endowments, $£ 1,065,913$ from grants from local authorities and $£ 483,416$ from donations and subscriptions. Of the total income from public funds of $£ 21,748,328$, and $£ 7,949,755$ from other sources, the University of London received $£ 6,660,992$ from public and $£ 2,330,982$ from other sources; the University of Cambridge similarly received $£ 1,358,177$ and $£ 1,278,658$; for Oxford, the corresponding figures are $£ 1,220,380$ and $£ 733,576$; Manchester, $£ 1,068,409$ and $£ 265,774$; Leeds, $£ 891,496$ and £259,220; Durham, $£ 961,460$ and $£ 342,640$; Birmingham, $£ 856,834$ and $£ 252,077$; Liverpool, £866,006 and £236,745; Bristol, £777,240 and $£ 316,801$; Sheffield, £544,693 and $£ 165,201$; Reading, £513,506 and $£ 61,316$; and Nottingham, $£ 478,565$ and $£ 106,604$. No other English university or university college had an income exceeding half a million pounds; but for the four universities in Scotland the corresponding figures were: Aberdeen £494,000 and $£ 136,754$; Edinburgh, $£ 1,039,430$ and $£ 346,812$; Glasgow, $£ 1,021,000$ and $£ 349,223$; and St. Andrews, including Dundee University College, $£ 529,000$ and $£ 109,658$. The University of Wales,
including the Welsh National School of Medicine, received $£ 1,096,545$ from public funds and $£ 309,189$ from other sources.

Of the total expenditure of $£ 28,700,434$, an increase of $£ 2,568,312$ or $9 \cdot 8$ per cent on 1951-52, administration accounted for $7 \cdot 7$ per cent, departmentel maintenance 68.9 per cent, maintenance of premises 12.5 per cent, and miscellaneous expenditure 9.7 per cent. Capital expenditure met from income amounted to $£ 334,516$, and allocations to reserve to $£ 334,015$; for 1951-52 these figures were $£ 258,963$ and $£ 222,536$, respectively. Departmental maintenance, which includes salaries of teaching staff, payments for superannuation, the running costs of laboratories, lecture rooms, libraries and museums, and the supply of materials, apparatus, books, specimens, etc., increased by $£ 1,665,428$ to $£ 19,761,880$, and expenditure on the maintenance of buildings increased by $26 \cdot 4$ per cent. Salaries and superannuation amounted to $£ 13,169,879$ compared with $£ 12,542,994$ during 1951-52, the increase being 5 per cent for the teaching staff and 18.5 per cent for technicians and leboratory assistants.
Library expenditure, excluding general maintenance of library buildings, etc., rates, heat, light, repairs, etc., amounted to $£ 1,118,428$, or 3.9 per cent of the total expenditure, compared with 3.8 per cent during 1951-52 and $3 \cdot 7$ per cent during 1950-51. Of this total, $£ 557,656$ was for salaries and wages, $£ 135,907$ on periodicals and $£ 90,072$ on bindings. Of the $£ 276,852$ expended on books, $£ 174,548$ was in the schools and colleges of the University of London, including $£ 9,800$ at the Central Library, $£ 7,222$ at University College, $£ 6,883$ at the London School of Economics and $£ 5,846$ at the School of Oriental and African Studies. The University of Oxford spent £39,404 on books, Cambridge £16,014, Manchester £12,955, Liverpool $£ 10,016$, and Durham $£ 10,265$. The University of Bristol spent $£ 9,739$ on books, and the University of Southampton's expenditure of $£ 9,152$ is noteworthy in view of its smaller number of students; but although expenditure on books and periodicals continued to increase slightly, the upward trend was scarcely in proportion to the mounting costs of both books and periodicals. Only the Universities of London ( $£ 38,582$ ), Cambridge ( $£ 10,247$ ) and Oxford ( $£ 11,417$ ) spent more than $£ 10,000$ on periodicals, and only Birmingham ( $£ 5,770$ ), Leeds ( $£ 5,055$ ) and Manchester ( $£ 5,460$ ) more than $£ 5,000$. The University of Wales spent $£ 11,869$ on books and $£ 7,987$ on periodicals ; in Scotland, Edinburgh spent $£ 13,625$ on books and $£ 6,071$ on periodicals; Glasgow, $£ 13,421$ and $£ 7,711$; Aberdeen, £6,619 and £3,733; and St. Andrews, £8,113 and $£ 4,350$.

## SCIENCE IN THE EXTRA-MURAL WORK OF UNIVERSITIES

ASURVEY of some aspect of adult education from the pen of the doyen of heads of university extra-mural departments* is bound to attract attention and interest, and it is to be hoped that this essay will be carefully studied in responsible quarters. It will repay careful study, for there is much wisdom and good sense in its pages; but at the same time
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there is little to inspire, and the tone is cautious, almost apologetic. Thus, on p. 9 are set out the figures for courses in the sciences in relation to the total number of courses arranged by the universities and the Workers' Educational Association during the session 1952-53. Science provides 10 per cent of the total, and, while acknowledging that this represents "a considerable advance" on the 4 per cent of an earlier survey in 1925-26, Prof. Peers describes it as "remarkably low". In fact, however, an examination of the figures for all subjects scarcely confirms this judgment. In a total number of courses of 3,755 the physical and biological sciences, with 378 , are exceeded by language and literature (623), the arts (599), history (597) and social studies (459). But the sciences in turn exceed international affairs (289), psychology (231), philosophy (186), religion (180) and government (128) : biology alone provides more courses than philosophy, religion or government, and the physical sciences, with 167 courses, fall little short of religion. Given the inherent difficulties, which Prof. Peers does not fail to bring out, the position is less unsatisfactory than he suggests. Something must be allowed for variations in length of courses; but it remains remarkable that, in times like the present, international affairs should be less well represented. The student quoted by Prof. Peers who preferred "not to know the details" of the atom bomb that might blow her to pieces would seem to be as critical of international affairs as a subject of study. Here, perhaps, Prof. Peers's judgment is understandably coloured by the fact that his Department has a greater number of courses in international affairs than any other in the kingdom.

Nevertheless, Prof. Peers's approach is a sound one: "The real case for science as part of the general education of the adult citizen is exactly the same as the case for history, literature and the social sciences . . . without a knowledge of science he cannot live the best and most satisfying life of which he is capable: a whole range of experience, esthetic as well as practical, is closed to him". This is well said, and the point is developed in some valuable paragraphs (pp. 6-7). It is doubtful, however, whether this view is sufficiently widely held in adult education circles. Prof. Peers quotes a science tutor's opinion as to the disadvantages caused by the unfamiliarity of organizers and administrators with science, only to brush it aside. He does not, however, seem to make sufficient allowance for the existence of latent demand. His argument that "it is not the business of Extra-mural Departments to use methods of persuasion to induce adult groups to choose one subject rather than another" begs the question, and reflects the conditions of an earlier period when 'demand' could be more easily recognized and satisfied. The task of the present in adult education, despite the great increase in the number of courses, is not to meet a recognizable and clamant demand, but to investigate society in order to ascertain where and how the universities, and other providers, can both stimulate and satisfy needs and interests. Prof. Peers offers some observations, based on the experience of several universities, on this aspect of the problem; but the investigation needs to be carried further and to be illustrated with actual syllabuses. His conclusion that little can be done "until science is given its proper place in the general curriculum of the schools" is open to question. Despite the arguments he offers, it is doubtful whether recollection of studies at school often encourages adult students

