tivity, the origins of ideas and an appreciation of creative education in contexts with which I was not familiar. I had my views and beliefs challenged on numerous occasions and I felt inspired by new ideas I encountered.

There is a fundamental professional development challenge underlying many of the ideas in this volume; 'the demands [these readings] implicitly make of teachers – that they develop a knowledge of the lifeworlds of students, the modalities of contemporary arts practice, and of the value to pedagogy of ethnographic research methods' (Jones, 189). Not to mention the displacement of controlling with facilitative pedagogies that encourage learners to be independent thinking, autonomous and collaborative learners.

Given that this is a book about creativity and creative learning and many people are stimulated as much by visual representation as by text, perhaps more thought could have been given to engaging with the visual dimensions of literacy in the communication of ideas. Also, I felt that more attention could have been given to developments outside the school system which ultimately could feedback and forward into thinking and practice. Perhaps also the pedagogic focus on school education meant that other pedagogic and research contexts like work and other social environments for creative development, are not well represented. For example, there is no mention of Richard Greene's important work on multiple models of creativity and capability and their implication's for creative learning and education in school.

Like all good handbooks, a wealth of material is presented in a clear, concise and understandable way and this handbook will provide researchers with a reference starting point for understanding the research base for the field of creative learning and its application in education. This is a most valuable collection of writings on a subject that is crucial to the age we live in. Together, these articles make a useful and significant contribution to our understandings about where we have come from and show us the direction we are travelling.

Norman Jackson
*University of Surrey, UK*
*normanjjackson@btinternet.com*

**What are universities for?**, by Stefan Collini, London, Penguin, 2012, xiii + 216 pp., £9.99, ISBN 978-1-846-14482-0

This is a deeply disappointing book. Stefan Collini is probably the leading intellectual historian of modern Britain. His *Absent minds* is a masterpiece, a landmark work both substantively and methodologically (Collini 2006). His *Common reading* is a valuable companion, including one of the pieces anthologised again here (Collini 2008, 317–38). At its best his work is characterised by breadth of sympathy, meticulous attention to detail, an engaging style, and deep, original insights. These qualities are almost all absent from the work under review.

I think the problem is the following. Collini writes brilliantly about what he knows, and there are things about which he knows more than anyone else. These include the interior life and times of some our most intriguing intellectual figures over the past two centuries. Another is what it is like to be a scholar in the humanities in one of our ancient universities today, as well as some of those university departments elsewhere which have set their caps at imitating them. That is why the best chapter here is on the 'character of the humanities'

tivity, the origins of ideas and an appreciation of creative education in contexts with which I was not familiar. I had my views and beliefs challenged on numerous occasions and I felt inspired by new ideas I encountered.

There is a fundamental professional development challenge underlying many of the ideas in this volume; 'the demands [these readings] implicitly make of teachers – that they develop a knowledge of the lifeworlds of students, the modalities of contemporary arts practice, and of the value to pedagogy of ethnographic research methods' (Jones, 189). Not to mention the displacement of controlling with facilitative pedagogies that encourage learners to be independent thinking, autonomous and collaborative learners.

Given that this is a book about creativity and creative learning and many people are stimulated as much by visual representation as by text, perhaps more thought could have been given to engaging with the visual dimensions of literacy in the communication of ideas. Also, I felt that more attention could have been given to developments outside the school system which ultimately could feedback and forward into thinking and practice. Perhaps also the pedagogic focus on school education meant that other pedagogic and research contexts like work and other social environments for creative development, are not well represented. For example, there is no mention of Richard Greene's important work on multiple models of creativity and capability and their implication's for creative learning and education in school.

Like all good handbooks, a wealth of material is presented in a clear, concise and understandable way and this handbook will provide researchers with a reference starting point for understanding the research base for the field of creative learning and its application in education. This is a most valuable collection of writings on a subject that is crucial to the age we live in. Together, these articles make a useful and significant contribution to our understandings about where we have come from and show us the direction we are travelling.

Norman Jackson
*University of Surrey, UK*
*normanjjackson@btinternet.com*

**What are universities for?**, by Stefan Collini, London, Penguin, 2012, xiii + 216 pp., £9.99, ISBN 978-1-846-14482-0

This is a deeply disappointing book. Stefan Collini is probably the leading intellectual historian of modern Britain. His *Absent minds* is a masterpiece, a landmark work both substantively and methodologically (Collini 2006). His *Common reading* is a valuable companion, including one of the pieces anthologised again here (Collini 2008, 317–38). At its best his work is characterised by breadth of sympathy, meticulous attention to detail, an engaging style, and deep, original insights. These qualities are almost all absent from the work under review.

I think the problem is the following. Collini writes brilliantly about what he knows, and there are things about which he knows more than anyone else. These include the interior life and times of some our most intriguing intellectual figures over the past two centuries. Another is what it is like to be a scholar in the humanities in one of our ancient universities today, as well as some of those university departments elsewhere which have set their caps at imitating them. That is why the best chapter here is on the 'character of the humanities'

(61–85). Beyond his heartland Collini has been basically reluctant to punt and to guess – until recently. Contrary to a claim in the text (207), over half of this book is recycled from instant commentary on the vicissitudes of government policies and their implementation by the Funding Councils since 1989. It suffers from a lack of disciplined reflection on many of the points made in the heat of the moment.

In *What are universities for?* Collini makes mistakes, over-generalises from idiosyncratic cases, makes complex his own experience while simplifying that of others, and, above all fails to present to his reader not just the diversity but also the richness of contemporary university experience in the round. Some of the errors are significant (most of these are in chapter 2, and recycled from another article of almost a decade ago; see pages 20–38). The universities created in 1992 don't have charters (31), and being 'higher education corporations' has important implications for their governance and management. The UK system has much more than a 'slight' majority of female participants (the male:female ratio at undergraduate level is now about 40:60, although not at Oxford and Cambridge; 32). Far more influential as a result of the 1992 Further and Higher Education Act than the change in status of the polytechnics and Scottish central institutions (the latter don't feature anywhere in Collini's story) was the shift to 'territorial' funding councils (34). There has been much more 'reverse academic drift' since the 1980s by traditional universities moving across the ground formerly occupied by the public sector of higher education than simple 'academic drift' (or what he calls the 'flow of emulation'; 5) by the latter. Look at where all of the new business schools, faculties of nursing and departments of sports science have been formed (54). In fact, the Coalition government has not 'accepted the central proposals of the Browne Review' (196): Browne recommended uncapping fees, a levy on higher fees, and return to expansion. The current government has taken the opposite stance on each of these. Perhaps more seriously, Collini has very little to say about science, where the mode of production has managed to defeat some of his straw men, especially through 'unofficial' inter-institutional and international collaboration (see the Royal Society 2011).

Above all, Collini simply doesn't 'get' some of the main features of the democratisation of higher education – internationally – since the Second World War in North America and since the 1980s almost everywhere else. These include: universities returning to their roots of responsiveness to the communities that founded them; the discovery of scholarly excellence in surprising places; unanticipated achievement by non-standard students and life-long learners (no recognition here of the UK's pioneering Open University); the creation of genuinely international campuses; creative adaptations to the internet; and confirmation that it is possible to do more with less. He claims to be in favour of expansion, from which the university system should 'have nothing to fear' (105). However, everything away from the elite heartland is presumed by him to be a lump: technical training, market sensitive, and thereby philistine.

*What are universities for?* is an instant book. It is designed to catch a number of waves, including resentment at what successive governments have done to the notoriously (necessarily?) prickly world of academia, commercial interest in a topic of wide public discussion, and a personal desire to take a stand. Paradoxically, many of these features were also true of Newman's *The idea of the university* as it appeared in consolidated form in 1873, and there are aspects of Collini's position, reputation and intentions that are oddly similar to his exposition here of the master (39–60). In that case Collini urges, modern readers have failed to spot the irreducible confessional drive, or 'dogmatic intent' (44). In Collini's case, religious faith is substituted by an equally powerful sense of personal entitlement.

Perhaps fittingly, if this insight is at all accurate, the hagiographic tone has been picked up in a plethora of reviews, and it is interesting to think why (see the summary in Horder 2012). Some of the favourable responses have to do with nostalgics not really understanding

what Collini has to say. Much more is about joining a not well-formulated crusade. There are, however, a few dissenting voices among the hagiographers, not just journalists like Simon Jenkins (Jenkins 2012), but also some fellow academics (Conrad 2012; Seabright 2012). The sad conclusion is that the case for 'protected space' (56) to allow the university – in all of its contemporary forms – to extend 'human understanding through open-ended inquiry' (91) has to be made, but it has not been well-served here by what is, in its own terms, an 'unscholarly' work.

## References

Collini, S. 2006. *Absent minds: Intellectuals in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Collini, S. 2008. *Common reading: Critics, historians, publics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Conrad, P. 2012. A question that is surely academic. *The Observer*, February 19.
Horder, T. 2012. Who's to blame. *Oxford Magazine* 322 (Eighth Week, Hilary Term): 1–2.
Jenkins, S. 2012. These academic lickspittles need the guts to break free. *The Guardian*, March 16.
Royal Society (RS). 2011. *Knowledge, networks and nations: Global scientific collaboration in the twenty-first century*. Policy Document 03/11. London: The Royal Society.
Seabright, P. 2012. Being there? *Times Literary Supplement*, March 9, pp. 12–3.

David Watson
*Green Templeton College, Oxford, UK*
*david.watson@gtc.ox.ac.uk*