



nb

if you are a student,
do you:
take introductory courses?
get married?
run for model parliament?
study????

introductory courses:

stale bread and dull circuses?

by david millett
lecturer in sociology

This article is the result of a recent discussion with one of my sociology 202 classes, regarding introductory courses required by various professional schools on campus.

Many students would never have taken such courses as sociology or psychology 202 if they were not required to do so by the curriculum of their professional schools. Some of these students have a real interest in one or another specialized field—the family, criminology, or minorities, for example—but are unaware that up to date no 202 prerequisite has existed for the appropriate courses. They could have enrolled in these specialties and pursued them to the point where some useful application of them could be made upon graduation.

Instead they have enrolled in introductory courses and are exposed to a hodge-podge of fields of sociology or psychology without learning much in any one of them. This type of superficial information will never be really useful, and, worse still, may be misused. They never asked for this scattered information, having been required to take it; and they are largely wasting their time and money acquiring it.

Some teachers of 202 courses accept this situation and make the best of it by emphasizing the novel or the shocking aspects of our society. They reason that since the students are confronted with the course and since it is desirable that professors and students have good relations, it is the duty of the professor to entertain them, to give them lots of laughs and surprises—bread and circuses.

In the hands of a highly-qualified and experienced professor such a course can provide both bread and circuses. A great deal is taught and it is presented in an arresting fashion. Some of those who teach introductory courses manage to do this, and all credit is due to them. In some universities it is customary for the department head to present the introductory course, to assure that this will happen.

Unfortunately, most teachers of introductory courses lack the experience which makes this possible, and the result is a combination of rather stale bread and rather dull circuses. If the bread were not required the circus might be better; if the circus were not required, the bread would be better.

Under present conditions the circus is required, because much of the class has no intention of going beyond the 202 level, hence do not see the course as a grounding for subsequent detailed study. Lacking the motivation which would be provided by such an orientation they require other more artificial motivations. More than this, they have either entered the course willingly, but with unrealistic expectations, or they have entered it under duress. In either case, the one thing they don't want is bread. They want something that can be immediately applied, or else they want a "fun" course, a soft spot in their timetable which will allow them to concentrate

on other, more "serious" studies. Given their position, these demands are, if not entirely excusable, at least understandable.

But to accede to these demands is to deprive the student intending to major in a social science of any really challenging intellectual struggle, in his first year. Instead of focussing on this type of student, as thinker to thinker, the professor must focus on the other students, as entertainer to audience. It is curious that while introducing streaming of courses into high-schools we have gradually removed it from the university introductory courses. Long-term and short-term students are mixed together, and in the end the course becomes either a pedantic extension of high-school or a glorified Ed Sullivan show.

When professional schools were first moved onto university campuses, it was with the idea that students who moved directly from high-school into applied fields would have at least some exposure to the 'still quiet air of delightful studies' which was supposed to characterize the university. Their students would be a minority in a world where the norm was either calm reflection or an intense fascination with some academic problem. Experience of this atmosphere through a few courses would broaden their world view beyond that of the strictly applied training they received in the

school of nursing, of education, or whatever.

Apparently the heads of today's professional schools were never really converted to this idea. If the few students to whom I have spoken are representative, then it is generally felt that heads of professional schools do not know and do not care what is taught in the required introductory courses which their students must attend. Even when the sociology department would permit the student to take a criminology or minorities course at the 300 level, something in which he is genuinely interested, his professional school requires him to take sociology 202. Not satisfied with this, the professional school keeps a constant check on his marks, so that the student becomes more interested in "beating" the course than in doing any serious reflective thinking. And with three or four applied courses per day it is not surprising that he fails to shift to a "reflective" attitude for the one course that requires it.

Forced into a course with false preconceptions, and with Big Brother looking over his shoulder to see that his marks keep up, it is a rare student who succeeds in putting his heart into his work. He wants marks, and he wants to get out. And I find it hard to blame him. He and his kind dominate the classroom numerically, and their will tends to prevail. Their is no place for the student with a passion for social science, and hence few oppor-

letter

ripe for a change

To The Editor:

I could not help but smile when the results of the model parliament elections were posted early Friday evening. For me, the final positions of the parties reveal the true sentiments of our campus in political affairs.

The Communist Party presents a platform coherent with the federal Communists. This is the supreme flaw for any campus party and one

which none of the others carelessly made. Thus the Communist Party, (if for no other reason) must finish last.

The Social Credit base their platform on honesty and responsibility. They must finish fifth.

In the voting, the N.D.P. finish close enough to the Socreds to predict there may exist a parallel between these two campus philosophies. In fact this is true. To quote Mr. Barry Chivers, the N.D.P. fosters the fond aim of attaining "mutual trust amongst all peoples and a will to promote peace, prosperity and progress of all people." Because at least one-half of the Socred slogan is displayed, (there are overtones of responsibility), the N.D.P.'s fit is true to form.

The Conservative Party stood third in the polling. We can attribute this to votes from students still naively clinging to their Mother's apron, from students who didn't read the "Tory," and from girls who believe Bill Winship handsome.

Second are the Liberals. This is a result of their appeal through non-political means, for lack of political magnetism. For the party, the end they achieve is nearly successful although the means includes the sacrifice of their spirited leader.

The victor is the N.E.S.P. They win because of their obvious lack of political ends, because of their enthusiasm to prove model parliament is mock parliament and because the electorate, (i.e. those who cared to vote) generally share these view points.

As an independent, my position in the final tally is also very revealing. I poll more votes than the Communists because I'm not as serious, nor so radical as this group. Significantly my policy is based on honesty and responsibility in politics, like the Socreds. But for me this can realistically be translated into but one platform: a genuine void. So in hitting the campaign trail my supporters and I have a problem; the electorate demands a policy and we can't conceive a single point without abandoning our ideal of honesty and responsibility in politics. We poll less votes than the Social Credit. In light of the overall results my supporters and I are pleased. The times are ripe for a change.

Bob Armit
independent

the halfman

gets married

student marriages increasing

reprinted from the mcgill daily

In the past, and sometimes even today, people have had the annoying tendency to consider the student as an incomplete human being who is at a transitory stage in his life where he must still be guided. In a word, people outside the university often consider the student as a half-man. Then this half-man gets married. Not always, to be sure, but to an increasing extent.

Two Quebec journals—Le Quartier and Le Carabin—recently published enquiries into the problems of student couples.

The enquiry of Le Quartier Latin is the most profound and by the same token the most interesting. The investigators first of all made a study of marriage among youth in general on the American continent. The majority of young women who will get married will be 18 years old this year. Their husbands will be 21 or 22. This phenomenon of rejuvenation began during the second world war. In the 1940s-1950s, the number of married students in American universities doubled. Moreover, sociologists have established that the increase of marriages is clearly greater among the more educated milieu than among those who have less training.

This increase at the end of the war was related to the return of men in uniform to their homes. At the present time, the marriage curve is again rising—after having come to a halt—while the ages of husband and wife are dropping continually. On the other hand, in this type of highly industrialized and technically very developed society, studies last longer and longer, that is to say people are now devoting a good many years of their lives to study.

It is therefore normal that in such a situation student marriage should increase. This is what is happening at present when 25 per cent of the students terminating their studies are married.

A number of problems face students desiring to get married. Is the marriage acceptable to the family? Will the couple find the necessary funds to get started? And how will the marriage influence the economic and social activities of the married student?

The opposition of the parents is not centered on the choice of a mate, but it is generally caused by fears arising over the material problems facing the future couple, especially if the parents are unable to help their children financially.

On the whole, however, this opposition is finally overcome and the family tries to help out as much as possible.

Among most couples only the husband studies and the wife works to support the household. Most young women, however, do not intend to work more than a few years in order to be able to raise their children. Only a few hope to take up their studies again when their husbands have terminated theirs.

The husband works part time in winter and full time in summer. Part-time work is generally very badly paid but the husband tries to do such work in order not to feel entirely supported throughout the entire year. Sometimes the student, in order to avoid this feeling or to improve his living conditions, stops his studies and only appears at exams. Another solution (but we hope it is one of despair!) consists of entering the army which pays the costs of studies, offers a salary of \$350 per month and requires that the student works three years for it after finishing his studies.

In case both husband and wife are students, an often complicated system is worked out by which each works in turn so as to contribute to the family budget.

The average annual budget of a

student couple at the University of Montreal varies from 3,000 to 6,000 dollars. These variations among couples are due to the lesser or greater amounts of money invested in clothing, leisure, cars, etc.

The enquirers asked if financial difficulties were not a cause of failure of marriages and if a couple with a low income did not have less chance of a successful marriage. Opinions were divided in this respect. Certain couples thought that this could play an important role in quarrel and divorces, creating a state of perpetual tension between the husband and wife. They added, moreover, that the government must be asked to stop considering the married student as dependent on his parents, financially, in order to obtain scholarships.

Does marriage help or hinder studies? According to the results of the inquiry by Le Quartier Latin it seems that on the whole marriage is propitious for studies. The first reason, and a rather humorous one, is that students do not like to wash dishes. When their wives ask them to do so, they discover by chance that they have a lesson to review, a test to prepare for, etc., which obviously is not lost time.