

παρουσίασις  
βιβλίων

book  
reviews

ἐπὶ ὁμοίων ἔρευνῶν εἰς χώρας τοῦ ἐξωτερικοῦ.

Δεχομένη ἡ συγγραφεὺς τὸν κρατοῦντα ὁρισμὸν ὅτι ἡ Παιδεία ἀποτελεῖ τὸ ὄργανον, δι' οὗ μεταδίδεται εἰς τὰς νεότερας γενεάς ἡ πολιτιστικὴ κληρονομία, ἀγεται εἰς τὸν καθορισμὸν τῶν θεμάτων τῆς Κοινωνιολογίας τῆς Παιδείας, ἅτινα εἶναι: 1) αἱ ἰδεολογίαι περὶ Παιδείας, 2) ἡ δομὴ τῶν φορέων τῆς, δηλαδὴ τῶν σχολείων, 3) ἡ σχέση τοῦ συστήματος τῆς Παιδείας καὶ τῆς κοινωνικῆς ὁργάνωσης, 4) αἱ ἐπιδράσεις τοῦ γεωγραφικοῦ περιβάλλοντος καὶ 5) τὰ κοινωνικά χαρακτηριστικά καὶ ἡ στάσις τῶν παιδευόντων καὶ τῶν παιδευομένων. 'Επὶ πλεόν ὁμοι εἶναι ἀνάγκη νὰ διενεργηθοῦν ἔρευναι καὶ διὰ τούτων ἄλλους τομεῖς τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ κοινωνικοῦ βίου, ἥτοι τὴν οἰκογένειαν, θρησκείαν, ἐργασίαν, πολιτικὴν ὁργάνωσιν, δικαιοσύνην κλπ. Μόνον κατόπιν τοιούτων ἔρευνῶν καὶ συναγωγῆς ἀσφαλῶν συμπερασμάτων εἶναι δυνατόν νὰ ὀδηγηθῶμεν εἰς ὁρθὸν προγραμματισμὸν κοινωνικῆς πολιτικῆς.

Εἰς τὴν παρούσαν μελέτην ἐπεζητήθη νὰ παρουσιασθῶν στοιχεῖα, ἥτοι διαπιστώσεις καὶ εἰκασίαι ἐκ τῆς ἑρένης τῶν σχέσεων τῆς 'Ανωτάτης Παιδείας καὶ τῆς δομῆς τῆς 'Ελληνικῆς Κοινωνίας. Αὗται δύναται νὰ χρησιμεύσουν ὡς βάσεις διὰ τὴν ἀνάπτυξιν 'Ελληνικῆς Κοινωνιολογίας τῆς Παιδείας ὑπὸ ἐπιστημονικὴν ἔννοιαν—ὅχι ἔθνοκεντρικὴν. Εἰδικότερον, κατόπιν διεξαχθείσης δειγματοληπτικῆς ἑρένης κοινωνικῆς-στατιστικῆς φύσεως εἰς τὸ Πανεπιστήμιον 'Αθηνῶν διὰ τὸ ἔτος 1963-1964, ἡ συγγραφεὺς: α) παρουσιάζει τὰ πορίσματα διὰ τὸ σύστημα τῶν εὐκαιριῶν διὰ τὴν ἀνωτάτην ἐκπαίδευσιν, β) παρέχει πληροφориὰς διὰ τοὺς παράγοντας οἰτινες κωλύουσιν τὴν ἰσὴν ἀξιοποίησιν τῶν εὐκαιριῶν, γ) δίδει ἐνδείξεις ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ πόσον ἡ 'Ελληνικὴ Παιδεία συμβάλλει εἰς τὴν συντήρησιν καὶ ἀνανέωσιν τῶν ἡγετῶν καὶ δ) ἐμφανίζει τὴν ἐκτίμησιν τῶν προτιμήσεων τῆς σπουδῆς ὑπὸ τῆς 'Ελληνικῆς Κοινωνίας.

Πρὸ τῆς διατυπώσεως τῶν πορισμάτων τῆς ἑρένης διὰ τὴν 'Ελληνικὴν 'Ανωτάτην Παιδείαν, ἡ συγγραφεὺς δίδει δειγμάτων τοῦ τρόπου καθ' ὃν γίνεται ἡ διερεύνησις τῆς κοινωνικῆς πραγματικότητος καὶ τῶν ἀντικειμένων τῆς Κοινωνιολογίας τῆς Παιδείας εἰς τὰς τεχνολογικῶς ἀνεπτυγμένας χώρας τοῦ ἐξωτερικοῦ, ἀφοῦ ἡ ἐκεῖ ἔρευνα ἀποτελεῖ, ὡς εἶναι φυσικόν, τὸ ὑπόδειγμα ἐργασίας καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς. 'Εκ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆσεως ταύτης, ἐκ τῆς ὁποίας προκύπτει ὅτι ὡς πρὸς τὸ ἰδεώδες ἐπικρατεῖ ἐκεῖ ἡ ἄποψις τοῦ T.H. Marshall, καθ' ἣν «τὸ πρόβλημα συνίσταται εἰς τὸ πῶς θὰ παρασχεθῶν αἱ ἰσαὶ εὐκαιρίαι χωρὶς νὰ καταργηθῇ ἡ οἰκονομικὴ καὶ κοινωνικὴ ἀνισότης», ἡ συγγραφεὺς, συνθέτουσα τὰ ἐπὶ μέρους πορίσματα, συνάγει τὰς ἑξῆς τρεῖς διαπιστώσεις: 1) ὅτι ὅλα τὰ ἄτομα ἴσων πνευματικῶν ἱκανότητων δὲν ὑφίστανται ἰσὴν

μεταχείρισιν, 2) ὅτι εἰς τὰ ἄτομα ἴσων πνευματικῶν ἱκανότητων δὲν προσφέρονται ἴσαι εὐκαιρίαι νὰ ἀποκτήσουν μόρφωσιν ἀνωτέρου ἐπιπέδου καὶ 3) ὅτι ἡ σχολικὴ ἀπόδοσις καὶ ἡ πρόσδοσις δὲν ἐξαρτῶνται κυρίως ἐκ τῆς ἐμφύτου εὐφυΐας τοῦ μαθητοῦ. Ταῦτα εἰς τὸ ἐξωτερικόν. Ὁ τρόπος τῆς διεξαγωγῆς τῆς ἑρένης ταύτης διασφαρίζεται καὶ διὰ παραθέσεως διαγράμματος ἐνδεικνύοντος σημαντικῶς τὰς σχέσεις τῶν παραγόντων καὶ τῶν στοιχείων τῆς ἑρένης.

'Ακολούθως ἐκτίθεται ἡ μέθοδος τῆς ἐν 'Ελλάδι διεξαχθείσης ἑρένης, ὁ τρόπος καθ' ὃν ἡ συγγραφεὺς καθώρισε τὰς κοινωνικὰς τάξεις συμφώνως πρὸς τὸ ἐπάγγελμα τῶν γονέων καὶ τὰς συμπεράσματα. Ταῦτα, ἐμφανιζόμενα καὶ εἰς εἰδικὸν πίνακα, ἀναφέρονται εἰς τὰς πιθανότητας εἰσαγωγῆς τῶν 'Ελληνοπαίδων εἰς ἀνωτάτας σχολὰς ἀναλόγως τῆς «κοινωνικῆς τάξεως» εἰς ἣν ἀνήκουν. Ἡ ἔρευνα ἐγένετο διὰ τὸ ἔτος 1963-1964 καὶ διὰ τὸ Πανεπιστήμιον 'Αθηνῶν, λογιζόμενα δὲ ὡς ἀνήκοντα εἰς τὴν ἀνωτέραν κοινωνικὴν τάξιν τὰ τέκνα γονέων ἀσκούντων ἐλευθέρια ἐπαγγέλματα ἢ ἐπαγγέλματα Διοικησεως καὶ Διευθύνσεως, εἰς τὴν μεσαίαν τὰ τέκνα γονέων ἀσκούντων ἐπαγγέλματα ἀπασχολήσεως γραφείου, τὰ τέκνα ἐμπόρων καὶ πωλητῶν καὶ εἰς τὴν κατωτέραν τὰ τέκνα γεωργῶν, ἐργατῶν, τεχνιτῶν.

Κατὰ τὴν παρεχόμενην ἀνάλυσιν τῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων περισσοτέρως πιθανότηας ἐπιτυχίας ἔχουν τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἀνωτέρας τάξεως μὲ ποσοστὸν 2/3, ὀλιγοτέρας τῆς μεσαίας μὲ 1/4, καὶ ἐλαχίστας τῆς κατωτέρας μὲ 1/12. Περαιτέρω ἡ συγγραφεὺς διαπιστῶναι μακρὰν σειρὰν ἀνισοτήτων εἰς τὰς πιθανότητας ἐπιτυχίας: 1) μεταξὺ τῶν κοινωνικῶν τάξεων, 2) μεταξὺ τῶν ἐπαγγελματικῶν ὁμάδων ἐντός ἐκάστης κοινωνικῆς τάξεως, 3) μεταξὺ τῶν φύλων καὶ ἀναλόγως καὶ ἀνεξαρτήτως τῆς κοινωνικῆς τάξεως, 4) μεταξὺ τῶν ἀρρένων, 5) μεταξὺ τῶν θηλέων. Πρὸς ἐρμηνείαν τῶν διαπιστώσεων δίδονται ἐκτιμήσεις περὶ τῶν τάσεων καὶ προτιμήσεων, αἰτίνας κρατοῦν ἐν τῇ 'Ελληνικῇ Κοινωνίᾳ.

'Εν τῇ ἐκτετάτῳ τὸ θέμα τῆς ἀνισότητος τῶν εὐκαιριῶν συγκριτικῶς ἐν 'Ελλάδι καὶ ἐν Γαλλίᾳ, παρατιθεμένου καὶ σχετικοῦ πίνακος, ἐξ οὗ προκύπτει ὅτι αἱ ἐν Γαλλίᾳ πιθανότερες εἶναι δυσμενέστεραι τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν.

Ταῦτα τὰ συμπεράσματα τοῦ βιβλίου. Εἰς τὰ καθ' ἑκάστον κεφάλαιον ἀναγράφεται ἡ σχετικὴ βιβλιογραφία καὶ εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ βιβλίου παρατίθεται εὔρεθριον τῶν κυριωτέρων θεμάτων, ἅτινα ἐθίγησαν εἰς τὸ βιβλίον.

Ἡ ἐργασία τῆς κυρίας Δημάκης εἶναι ἡ πρώτη συστηματικὴ διὰ τὴν θεμελιώσιν τῆς Κοινωνιολογίας τῆς Παιδείας ἐν 'Ελλάδι. Ἀπὴν ἐστηρίχθη εἰς τὰς μεθόδους ἀναλόγων ἔρευνῶν, αἰτίνας καθιερώθησαν εἰς τὰς τεχνολογικῶς ἀνεπτυγμένας χώρας τῆς Δύσεως καὶ θεμελιώνει τρόπον

'Ιωάννας Λαμπιρῆ-Δημάκη, *Πρὸς μίαν Κοινωνιολογίαν τῆς Παιδείας*, I, 'Ανωτάτη Παιδεία: Εὐκαιρίαι καὶ 'Εμπόδια, 'Εκδόσις 'Εθνικοῦ Κέντρου Κοινωνικῶν 'Ερευνῶν, 'Αθήναι 1974, σελ. 153.

Αἱ Κοινωνικαὶ 'Επιστῆμαι δὲν ἔχουν γενικῶς τὸν μακρὸν βίον τῶν ἄλλων 'Επιστημῶν, ἡ δὲ Κοινωνιολογία τῆς Παιδείας ἀνήκει εἰς τὰς ἐσχάτως ἀναπτυχθείσας ἐρένας. Εἰς τὸν τόπον μας τὸ πεδίον τῆς ἑρένης ταύτης εἶναι εἰσέτι παρθέον. Ὅπως ὁρθὸς παρατηρεῖ ἡ συγγραφεὺς, ἡ 'Ελληνικὴ Κοινωνία διατελεῖ εἰσέτι εἰς κατὰστασιν ρευστότητος, δι' ὃν λόγον καὶ δὲν ἔχει εἰσέτι ἀναπτυχθῇ ἡ κοινωνικὴ ἔρευνα εἰς τὸν τόπον μας. Εἶναι ὁμοιως καιρὸς νὰ ἀναπτυχθοῦν αἱ ἔρευναι τῶν ἐπὶ μέρους κλάδων τῆς Κοινωνιολογίας καὶ ἐδῶ, δι' ἑρευνῶν ἐργασθέντων ἥδη

ἐρευνῶν τῶν τοιοῦτων θεμάτων εἰς τὸν τόπον μας. Τὰ συμπεράσματα καὶ αἱ ἐρμηνεῖαι τῆς παρουσίας ἐρευνῶν παρέχουν ἑξαφως εἰς ἑλεγχον, παρατήρησεις καὶ κρίσεις καὶ πάντως ἀποτελοῦν εὐπρόσδεκτον ἀφετηρίαν διὰ τὰς ἐρεῖνας τῆς Κοινωνιολογίας τῆς Παιδείας μας.

Διὰ τὰς μελλοντικὰς ἐρεῖνας τοῦ εἶδους τοῦτου θὰ ἐπεθώμουν νὰ ἐπιστήσω τὴν προσοχὴν τῶν ἐρευνῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδιουτυπίας τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Κοινωνίας, ἡ ὁποία, ὡς ὀρθῶς παρετήρησεν ἡ κυρία Δημάκη, εἶναι εἰσέτι ἀσχημάτιστος, δι' ὃ καὶ διαφέρει κατὰ τὴν ὕψην πρὸς τὰς τῶν παλαιῶν Δυτικῶν Κρατῶν. Ἐπομένως καὶ αἱ μέτρα, αἱ ταξινομήσεις, αἱ ἐκτιμήσεις καὶ αἱ μέθοδοι τῶν ξένων πρέπει νὰ χρησιμοποιεῖνται παρ' ἡμῶν μετὰ πολλῆς περιστομένης. Ἄς ἐνθυμηθῶμεν ἀπλῶς ὅτι πρὸ δύο γενεῶν ἀκόμη ἡ πρωτεύουσα μας δὲν εἶχε περισσότερους τῶν 150.000 κατοίκων, ὅτι ὁ πληθυσμὸς μας ἦτο κατὰ 70 τοὶς ἑκατὸν ἀγροτικοῦ, ὅτι τὸ 80 τοὶς ἑκατὸν τοῦ σημερινοῦ ἀστικοῦ πληθυσμοῦ μας εἶναι νεοπαγεῖς καὶ ὅτι τὸ 30 τοὶς ἑκατὸν αὐτοῦ ἀνήκει εἰς οἰκογενεῖας ὧν τὸ ἥμισυ τῶν μελῶν τῶν διαμένει εἰς τὴν ἐπαρχίαν καθὼς καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ ἰδιότυπα κοινωνικὰ φαινόμενα, ἐκ τῶν ὁποίων καθίσταται πρόδηλον ὅτι αἱ ταξινομήσεις, ὡς λ.χ. ἡ κατάταξις εἰς κοινωνικὰς τάξεις, εἶναι κάπως ἐπισφαλές.

ΠΑΝ. Κ. ΓΕΩΡΓΟΥΝΤΖΟΣ

*The Applicability of Organizational Sociology*, by Chris Argyris, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1972, pp. 138, \$ 8.95.

There is first an analysis of the theories of Peter Blau, James Thompson, Charles Perrow, John Goldthorpe and David Lockwood. After criticizing them, Argyris presents his comments and suggestions of a desirable organizational research methodology. Blau, Thompson, and Perrow are criticized because they studied a part of an organization while Goldthorpe and Lockwood «omitted the psychological dimensions from their theory» (p. 53). Blau concentrated on formal organization, and especially on top management and therefore his data were biased toward top management view. Though verbally professed to seek an integration of the formal and natural system, Thompson favored the closed system and that was more to the management's liking. Perrow especially stressed the significance of technology. However, since the relationship between technology and structure is not studied by means of other variables such as administrative controls

or leadership styles, etc., their influence is unknown. Generally, Blau, Perrow and Thompson tended to stress a normative position, favoring the present orthodoxy in studies of organization.

Though Argyris does not use the term, it appears to me that Goldthorpe and Lockwood are closer to Durkheimian epistemology. Argyris insightfully points out that workers provide the instrumental explanation to the question «why they work» and yet, as he suggests, the British workers also desired a meaningful and not only an instrumental job.

In the presentation of suggestions contained in the last two chapters, Argyris first refers in varying degrees to other students of organization, he appears quite well read though, I am sorry to observe, he considers only authors who published in English or whose works were translated into English. Argyris epistemological position is a greater emphasis on individual differences and on a greater number of possible variations. As used by him, the term «organic» expresses his framework. What is certainly sympathetic in his conclusion is his emphasis on a possible change and restructuring of organization. From reading his pages, one can feel that he himself is engaged in observations or experiments which should provide a greater opportunity for spontaneity in organizational behavior. Argyris explicitly subscribes to an integration of psychological and sociological data. Generally, he feels that data from any discipline should be available if it helps our explanation. This reviewer could not help but remember Durkheim and his programmatic declaration of the autonomy of sociology. Certainly, Argyris has introduced or seeks to introduce a contrary epistemological position. Especially as analyzed on pp. 109-110, an individual and an organization can be related in contradictory or in coordinated demands. Argyris is, of course, eager to promote the latter relationship. A desired change can be observed or measured in five dimensions: deviance from existing norms; degree of unfreezing of the old that is required; new system required to be self-corrective; degree to which others are required; and degree of personal and system discomfort. Though my failure of a further explanation of these five dimensions leave the reader somewhat at a discomfort, I would like to point out that the dimensions deal with demands on persons as well as on a social system. In this respect Argyris follows his interest that deals with psychological-sociological data. However, could not a change be analyzed within another conceptual framework? Certainly, Argyris would agree. Suppose if an organization would be changed from a charismatic to a bureaucratic leader? Could we consider conflict or ambivalence or compli-

mentarity of norms? Generally, my criticism of Argyris' elaboration is that, if I take for example Durkheim's different categories of suicide, they emerge with a disregard of certain psychological variables. By that we do not say that the disregarded variables are irrelevant but that a theory disregards them if it has other certain theoretical explanations. In other words, I would argue that under certain conditions a combination of psychological and sociological data, as far as we can differentiate them, is legitimate while under other conditions that may be less so.

To finish my review I would like to point out the great degree of clarity in which the book is written. He asks his questions in a rather spontaneous way though, I suspect, that behind most questions has accumulated an extensive amount of thinking and reading. As stated earlier, Argyris expresses an energetic optimism that we shall be able to improve our organizations. It is a good book. However, one more point; it would help to compare Blau, Thompson, Perrow, Goldthorpe and Lockwood in more categories than those chosen; or to point out more explicitly in which categories they can be compared or not, probably one could have two separate books: one to deal with certain selected theories, and another with Argyris own elaboration.

JIRI KOLAJA  
West Virginia University

Elie Dimitras, *Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Κοινωνιολογίαν τῆς Ἀναπτύξεως (Eisagogi eis tin Koinonologian tis Anaptyxeos)* (Introduction to the Sociology of Development), Athens, Greece: National Centre of Social Research (EKKE), 1973, second edition, pp. 137, \$ 4.00.

This book is one of a number of excellent studies recently published by the National Centre of Social Research in Athens, Greece. The volume at hand is the second installment (the first was originally published in 1971) on the growing literature concerning the sociology of development in Greece. This reviewer is familiar with other pertinent works particularly those written by such Greek social scientists as Tsaoussis, Xirotis, Patras, Tsakonas, Lambiri-Dimaki, Athanasios Kanelloupolous, and Daskalakis.

Professor Dimitras who is also the general director of the National Centre of Social Research in Greece (known better by its Greek acronym EKKE), in a