

THE COOLING-OUT FUNCTION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE

THE COOLING-OUT FUNCTION  
OF  
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

By  
WILLIAM LESLIE PRINCE, B.A.

A Thesis  
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies  
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements  
for the Degree  
Master of Arts

McMaster University

August 1978

MASTER OF ARTS (1978)  
(Sociology)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY  
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE:     The Cooling-Out Function of  
          Community College

AUTHOR:    William Leslie Prince, B.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR:   Professor Reginald A. Ripton

NUMBER OF PAGES:    vi , 139

### ABSTRACT

Community college in North America has as its primary function the preservation of the status quo and maintenance of class structure. The Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology is not a unique structure but closely resembles the whole North American system. It has an increasingly important transfer function although the function is not officially stressed as in the rest of Canada and the United States. However, community or junior college is a failure in North America as an academic institution, as only a small percentage actually transfer and receive a Bachelor of Arts degree although the majority aspire towards this goal. It is a failure as far as technical and vocational training goes as judged by its inability to interest students in the technical programs and its outright failure in Ontario, where technical education is supposedly paramount, to alleviate the acute skilled manpower shortage. Nevertheless, the institution is healthy and growing while other post-secondary schools are on the decline. Resources are flowing into this institution because it is accomplishing its primary task adequately. That task is to mollify or 'cool-out' the working class and preserve and protect the class structure of our society.

## AC KNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to my supervisor Reg Ripton for his considerate support and generous assistance on this project. Reg was instrumental, through his vast knowledge and talent as a sociologist in the field of education, in directing and guiding me through an area of study which previously had been sadly neglected in Canada. This paper would never have seen the light of day if it had not been for his helpful encouragement.

I am grateful also to the other members of my committee— Debbie Harrison and Graham Knight. Debbie had been most kind and amicable in lending full cooperation in her scrutiny of this thesis. Graham conveyed interest and encouragement through his willingness to aid even when it created some personal inconvenience and expense. Through Debbie I made contact with Professor R.M. Pike of Queens University and I wish to thank him for taking the time to write me an informed and detailed letter.

These acknowledgements would not be complete if I did not thank Bob Drass for his very beneficial and generous support he gave me when I started my graduate work at McMaster. Indeed, without the help and assistance of Bob and Reg I would never have considered graduate studies. For their help I thank them both.

## Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Introduction	
Stating the Problem	3
Outlining the Chapters	5
Chapter I: Ontario's Decision	7
A Fight for Control	9
Centralized Control Without Equivocation	16
The Transfer Function	19
The Teachers	25
The Official Purpose	27
Transfer Institutions?	30
Chapter II: The American Experience	41
Class Restrictions	42
Separating the Wheat from the Chaff	47
Cooling-out Explained	52
Skilled Manpower Shortage Persists	57
Cooling-out with Terminal Vocational Training	60
Students Are Given Guidance	64
"Sympathetic Elimination"	67
Chapter III: Protecting the Elite Nature of Higher Education	77
California Still the Innovator	80
Woes of the Community College Graduate	84
The American Dream Unfolding?	88
Canadian Development	90
Pipe Dream?	97
Cooling-out Requirement Less Urgent in Canada	100
The Importance of Guidance	106

Chapter IV: Neutral College, Ontario	114
Pursuing the Drop Out Rate	114
Visiting Neutral	117
Interpreting the Skilled Manpower Shortage	120
The Transfer Nature	126
Dismal Drop Out Rate	128
Conclusion	130
Appendix	133
Bibliography	135

## INTRODUCTION

The dominant ideology of North America is explicit in regards to higher education. It is the elixir of social inequality and the royal road of upward social mobility. The embodiment of Haratio Alger resides within the ivy covered walls of academia. As a rationalization and perpetuation of the class system this myth could be profoundly demonstrated as positive proof of its value. College and university graduates did indeed end up in the middle and upper classes of society. The working class youth having little access to higher education stayed in the working class. But, of course, the university graduates came from the middle and upper classes to begin with. Nevertheless, those with degrees were in higher classes, therefore, the plight of the working class could easily be explained and justified; they were not staying in school. In essence, in the philosophy of the American dream, they were simply exercising their democratic right to remain static in class relationships. In order to expound the apparent reality of this view it could be demonstrated that some working class did graduate from colleges and university and yes, they did exhibit upward mobility. These exceptions would be encouraged to demonstrate the meritocracy of the social system and the seemingly



availability of opportunity available. The non-ideological idealists seized on the idea of opportunity to higher education as an end to the inequities of the class system and poverty. The belief in social mobility through education became widespread through all classes of the society and hence the dilemma. What would happen if working class youth practically en masse decided to take advantage of this method? Social class based on the economic system obviously was not to disappear or be transformed by changes in the educational institution. Indeed the educational institution was to ensure the status quo. If massive numbers of working class went to universities and colleges you would simply have a working class with college and university degrees. The proportional divisions of class structure was not dependent on the educational institution. But the value of the education institution would in effect be destroyed as a perpetuator of apparent upward mobility. The working class graduates finding themselves holding relatively the same jobs they would have held, would have experienced the disillusionment of the myth of the dominant bourgeois ideology. Feeling trapped and seeing no way out of their subordinate class they would likely turn their anger against the dominant class bringing disaster to the status quo.

No one should underestimate the ability of the American system to be flexible enough to adopt, in order to remain essentially the same. History may see the answers as band-aid or stop-gap solutions at best but they appear to have bought time, perhaps several generations of time, for the corporate-state elite.

#### Stating the Problem

The educational establishment knew that they could not allow the working class to team to the universities. They also knew that the same calamity would occur if they denied them access. Here then was the problem. Working class youth had to have access to higher education but they had to be kept out of higher education — a seemingly unworkable contradiction, but not quite. They also had to be kept out of higher education without arousing their hostility against the class system. In other words their anger had to be turned against themselves. In essence they had to fail and feel that they were responsible for that failure. If the working class would passively accept their class position there would be no problem. They would be given technical and vocational education and remain in the working class. This is what the dominant elite desired and made plans and are still making them to carry this aim out, but as shall be demonstrated the working class had rejected it. They have been sold too well on the dominant or false ideology which does not correspond to their true

societal position. They want more of the 'goodies' of society, but the problem is that someone else already owns the 'goodies'. They will only increase their slice of the pie at the expense of those with the larger slices. The upper classes have everything to lose and nothing to gain. The only solution is an apparent confidence game where the subordinate class can not possibly win but still believe they can. As in any con game the victims or marks must not be allowed to openly display their anger and hostility towards those who run the game; they must be 'cooled-out'. In the educational establishment it was discovered that high schools being compulsory, could not accomplish this task. A barrier had to be erected between high school and university, where the working class desires for upward mobility could be thwarted and the resultant anger could be cooled-out. Thus was born the junior or community college.

This paper will give a general outline of the history and purpose of the community college system with its uneven growth in the United States of America, in this century and trace the system as it was transplanted to Canada and especially to Ontario in 1966. The social, historical and economic significance of this institution will become apparent as well as the necessity of this structure to the maintenance of the status quo and class system.

### Outlining the Chapters

Chapter I will strive to demonstrate the conditions existing in Ontario in the early and mid-sixties that led to the formation of the community college system. Struggles with the local school boards for control and the dichotomy between terminal and transfer education, with the federal government successfully making their option felt, will be demonstrated. An option, which will be shown in Chapter III, to be less permanent than first assumed. Chapter I will also outline the direction taken in other provinces as the matter of local versus centralized control did not conclude with the same result as in Ontario.

Chapter II will concentrate on the evolution of the junior college system and, of course, the concurrent evolution of the cooling out process. Ostensibly called transfer colleges, it will be demonstrated that the schools are really terminal colleges for the great majority of students and the overwhelming majority of working class students.

Chapter III will deal with issues, many of them recent, which are affecting and changing the outward structure of the junior or community college system. As a cooling-out institution the success of the junior college will become apparent but the failure of the system of technical and vocational education will also surface. We will see transfer colleges, that transfer

very little and community colleges that amalgamate with technical institutes and destroy much of the value of the technical training while providing questionable academic instruction. But through all this, not in spite of but because of all this, the junior college will be seen as a success to its purpose of retaining class structure. However it is conversely a disaster to North American society as a whole. A study conducted at a Canadian community college for this paper will constitute Chapter IV. Background, attitudes, and desires of administrators, staff and faculty will be examined along certain relevant and appropriate areas. The thesis will conclude with a brief look towards the future of the community college as an institution in our society.

## CHAPTER I

### Ontario's Decision

A serious shortage of skilled manpower as well as unemployment among unskilled workers combined with the apprehension that the working class youth would overrun the universities with their sheer number and change the elitist nature of it, greatly enhanced the desirability of a junior college system in Ontario.

The Ontario Royal Commission, in 1950, recommended a system of junior colleges as the third level of a grade 6-4-3 plan. California tried this in 1937 and all but abandoned the idea by 1953. One of the main problems was the housing of those students in grade 11 and 12 who were still subject to compulsory education with those who went by choice and could not tolerate the restrictive atmosphere.<sup>1</sup>

In 1949 the first junior college opened in Alberta. It handled the usual apprenticeship training and terminal technical courses but its major role was similar to its American model's role. It acted as a clearing house or transfer agent for the University of Alberta and various provincial institutes of technology.<sup>2</sup> In British Columbia a debate throughout the late sixties raged over

the character of junior colleges, should it be a career technical institute or a university preparatory program. Vancouver City College was sending substantial numbers of students in its transfer program to the University of British Columbia, although these numbers only represented about 13% of those enrolled in the transfer program.<sup>3</sup> This percentage is very similar to the American experience, incidently. Chapter III will elaborate more fully on the Canadian development.

The 1950 Royal Commission in Ontario with its 6 years elementary, 4 year secondary and 3 years college originally envisioned sending masses of students to second year university admission. The third year of college would be quite flexible and perhaps even omitted in many areas such as areas served by universities. The third year of college was really seen as a grade 14. The colleges were to be vocational and technical in nature also, to meet the needs of industries. The colleges would be under the control of local school boards. Instead of the separate streaming of vocational and academic fields as was common in the high school system of that time, an idea was proposed that would allow the students to take a core of general education. They would then specialize through electives in their chosen area.<sup>4</sup>

This is not dissimilar to the curriculum layout at high schools in Ontario today.

A Fight for Control

Local pressures in Ontario were building through the sixties for the establishment of junior colleges in their respective areas. If allowed to continue to fruition a series of junior colleges with autonomy to each school board or regional authority would almost certainly have developed. A decentralized system with weak central control would be the final outcome. A new debate ensued; should junior colleges be controlled by the local school boards or by local council? There would be a series of junior colleges in Ontario to satisfy pressure from local government and industrial institutions, the question was who should control it, the local school board or the local municipality. The Ontario government was finally forced to act. Their desire for centralized control resting in Queens Park and not spread out throughout the province became apparent. They would open the junior or community colleges; they would set the curriculum and goals; they would decide which regions could have them and they would appoint the various Boards of Governors. They would control the college and initiate and supervise each and every step.



An Ontario government grade 13 study committee went beyond its purpose of studying grade 13 and recommended the establishment of community colleges.<sup>5</sup> The Committee of Presidents of Provincially Assisted Universities and Colleges of Ontario, in 1963, put out a timely supplementary report and gave the view of the state to the suggestion that was quickly gaining ground. The suggestion was to put grade 13 and a new grade 14 into a junior college under local school board control. It solidly opposed the idea. The first reason for opposition was the fact secondary schools were already short of staff because of the post-war baby boom. The idea is so preposterous that W. G. Fleming in his massive state sponsored history of Ontario education states:

It's not altogether easy to see the logic behind this argument, since it must have been clear that additional instructors were going to have to be obtained, no matter what the auspices under which the new facilities were to be provided and the presidents failed to indicate what categories of new instructors would be available under one scheme but not under another.<sup>6</sup>

This committee with all its public resources and public financing was not able to be specific in its arguments nor could they come up with a reason that at least

sounded plausible. They went on to state that it would be too expensive for the local boards. But, then one may ask why could not the province grant funds to the local board. The answer it would seem was that they would not fund what they did not directly control. Their third reason given for opposing local autonomy on this issue was that local boards were not competent. They would most likely botch up the job "because if it is done badly the secondary schools, the universities and the students will suffer". Staff, libraries and laboratories "of university calibre" would be needed and the school boards would be out of their depth, the committee asserted.<sup>7</sup> Obviously the government wanted to centralize control of the college system and did not want to state its reasons for doing so nor even its desire to accomplish this aim. However, the state would give the appearance of local control through a board of directors.

In 1965 this same committee came out with its supplementary report number two entitled The City College. They felt the school should not be too closely tied to current local conditions. They warned that since industries were becoming

increasingly mobile there were dangers in schools becoming too closely associated with the prevailing conditions of any local community. It would seem that they were fearful that a locally minded Board of Governors might ultimately be the same as local autonomy and they were warning that the needs and aspirations of school must be macro and take into account the whole province. Who would know the needs of the whole province better than the government which had led it for over two decades, presumably? The idea of granting degrees was dropped—"status not by any artificial build-up resounding title or "Associate" degree, but simply by doing a first-rate job."<sup>8</sup> One should not ask if these choices are mutually exclusive.

The school would be modeled on the existing Institutes of Technology a "cheerful no - nonsense businesslike training centre." said the report. This report unlike the first was making specific recommendation and giving plausible reasons for it. Who would argue with patterning the new system after the existing "cheerful" institution? This research committee came up with another idea why local educational boards should not have control. The area

served by each college would not correspond to the exact area of the local board. However, by this time the reasons for denying local autonomy were not that important, it was obvious to all including the local boards that the province was adamant in gaining control. However, this did not prevent the committee from taking another swipe at local autonomy, in recommending that the colleges be put under the matronly wing of the newly established Department of University Affairs. They called the Department of University Affairs an institution "unencumbered by the responsibilities and vested interests that cluster around the enormous operation of running the elementary and secondary schools."<sup>9</sup>

At this time as an afterthought the Minister of Education decided it would be diplomatic to approach the Ontario Teachers Federations for their suggestions. Although the minister counted the work of the Presidents Committee in terms of years he did not pay the same courtesy to the teachers. On December 14, 1964 he asked them to put in a report but make it fast because the deadline was January 15, 1965. Presumably the teachers could do the work on their Christmas break. However, the Ontario Secondary School Teachers

Federation responded with haste. They saw the need for semi-professional and vocational courses but also envisioned the transfer of students to universities as a prime role. Typically the high school teachers felt that the instruction of research-oriented university professors would be detrimental to the college. The college should take high school teachers and after upgrading with various appropriate courses allow them to teach at the colleges.<sup>10</sup> "Vested interests" obviously abounded.

On May 21, 1965, the Minister of Education, Bill Davis, introduced the bill to create the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology or CAAT's hoping to be ready for operation in some areas by September 1966. Everyone knew and agreed that it should contain vocational and technical training. By now people knew that the Ontario government intended to keep centralized control of the colleges. But what would be the policy on transfer students? Or would there be transfer students? Remembering that this transfer role had become paramount in the United States, Davis's formula was this. He stated to the legislature that qualified students would not be prevented from graduating from a community college to a university.

Indeed graduates from technical institutes had already been transferring to universities.<sup>11</sup> Then in a typical political manner he said he would set up a committee to look into this issue.

Basically although Davis did not state it, this situation developed. To get into university required grade 13. To get into a community college, incidently unlike many Ryerson College courses, requires grade 12, often a terminal grade 12 at that; as opposed to the regular grade 12 which leads to grade 13. A graduate of a community college would be considered for university admission, although not necessarily advanced standing. Therefore, his two years at CAAT would be equal to grade 13 although the university at their discretion may give him certain credits for work done at college. Certainly this is not the good deal that is given by junior colleges in the United States whereby a student may be given up to two years credit in university for the two years in junior college. However, all this was done in the context of the times and it must be remembered what a chore grade 13 was in the mid-sixties with province wide final examinations. Indeed, it was the policy of many high schools to recommend that the average student take two years

to do grade 13. For example, standards were set so high in most high schools that Central Secondary School in Hamilton, the largest high school not just in Canada but in the whole British Commonwealth did not have one Ontario Scholar (75% - average) in its 1964 grade 13 graduating class.

Centralized Control Without Equivocation

The birth of the CAAT system was Bill 153, an act to amend the Department of Education Act.<sup>12</sup> The Conservative majority government had no problem in passing the Act to law in June 1965. In the Act the minister was given power to "establish name, maintain, conduct and govern". No control could be less equivocal. The governing bodies would include an Ontario Council of Regents for Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology with members appointed by the minister. They would assist in overall supervision. Each college was to have a Board of Governors with authority under the Corporations Act. Various advisory committees would assist the governors. The minister was given full power to decide on the composition of the Board of Governor as well as already stated, on the make-up of the Council of Regents. The minister was empowered by the Act to decide if

chairmen or officers should be appointed or elected and the means of that process. He could decide "the type, content and duration of programs of instruction to be offered". Requirements for admission and qualifications and conditions of service of teaching members were all at the minister's discretion, as well as tuition fees of students. In short the Act gave the minister power over the formation of the institution which was absolute and unchallenged. Centralized control had won; local autonomy had lost. It was that simple. Queens Park was bigger than City Hall.

On October 7, 1965, Regulations to the Department of Education Act stated that there would be a Council of Regents with fifteen members with three year staggered terms, appointed or reappointed each and every year, a Chairman and Vice-chairman elected annually and Board of Governors with twelve members for each school. In order to mollify local pressure, Davis made a concession of sorts. If a college was with a single municipality or part of a municipality the local council would appoint four members. The regents would appoint the other eight. The director of any college would be an ex officio member of the board. The board could elect



a chairman and vice-chairman. The terms of appointment of the governors would come due every four years. Recommendation on curriculum as well as construction and other important aspects of the institution were made by the Board of Governors to the Council of Regents, who could recommend the proposal to the minister. For example, section four of the act lays down the rules concerning construction. The Board of Governors would submit a plan to the Council of Regents who could change it and then send it for ministerial approval. Finally the Board of Governors could hire an architect who would give sketches and estimates. The minister would have to approve these initial plans before the final plan could be worked out. Of course, he had to approve the final plan also. All construction contract biddings would also have to be agreed to by the minister. The same format would be followed through with new educational programs, administrations, finances, hiring and any other important matters.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, it can clearly be seen that the Board of Governors in no way meant local autonomy. They did not threaten in any manner centralized control as was an initial fear of the Presidents Committee.

The Transfer Function

Davis would not allow the colleges to duplicate the transfer functions of the United States system. Transfers from CAAT's to university would be handled on an individual basis, without overt encouragement. Any university level courses given in college would be arranged and controlled by the university.

The underlying fear felt by the universities and expressed by the government was this. Norman Sisco, of the Department of Education an important developer of the Ontario college concept repeated an American educators prediction at a national seminar for Community College in 1966.

I will tell you what will happen. In five years the staff will come to a meeting and they will pass a resolution that from here on they must be referred to as the faculty. A year after that they will all want to wear gowns. Two years after that they will be talking about increasing their image in the eyes of the public by raising their entrance requirements. Then in ten years you will have a fourth rate liberal arts college.<sup>14</sup>

This was no idle speculation. At the very same seminar, Lethbridge Junior College aspired to university status. The faculty wanted ranks leading to professorship. The snag was that the vocational instructors also wanted the same. Fleming points out "the academic group expressed dismay at the idea of

having ... a professor of plumbing." Ontario hoped to avoid Alberta's errors.

In 1967 the Committee of Presidents of Universities in Ontario were asked to take up the question of transfer students. Opposition parties in the legislature seemed to be demanding the American type of transfer college system. In 1968 the presidents went as far as they would or could go. They would consider for admission to the second or sophomore year of university, students who achieved high standing in an appropriate three year program at community college. The entrance requirement would be left to the discretion of the universities. "High standing" in a two year program was still required for university entrance.<sup>15</sup> This kept the number of students eligible to transfer relatively low if "high standing" was literally interpreted. However universities had it at their discretion to adjust standards. If universities faced with declining enrolments see the students from community colleges as a desirable source and are willing to admit those with lower standing from CAAT's then a major shift towards the American system of junior college could quickly become evident. Large numbers

of students may go to community college with the expressed interest of transferring to university. This paper will explore developments in that circumstance.

A report entitled Towards Two Thousand: Post-Secondary Education for Post-Industrial Ontario was released in 1970 by the Subcommittee on Research and Planning of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario. The plan among other things called for improved coordination between the universities and other post-secondary institutions. Policy development for the CAATs was handled by the Council of Regents in the Department of Education while universities were supervised by the Committee on University Affairs and the Department of University Affairs. The latter also handled the Ontario College of Art while the former took care of Ryerson Polytechnical Institute. On October 1, 1971 all post-secondary education except agricultural colleges and diploma schools of nursing were amalgamated under the new Department of Colleges and Universities. A joint committee composed of members of the Council of Regents and the Committee on University Affairs was also established.

Nineteen sixty-six saw the establishment of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, an

institution engaged in research and development of education in Ontario. In September 1970 an educational television channel was initiated in Toronto for the purpose of advancing the direction of the educational institutions of the province.

The post-war economic expansion had been going on at a good clip for over two decades and the Ontario Economic Council in 1966 stated that there were skilled labour shortages, inspite of massive immigration in almost every area of the province and in almost every occupational category. It was felt that the CAAT system once established would quickly satisfy this need. Therefore somewhat of a sense of urgency pervaded the atmosphere as the Council of Regents appointed separate boards of governors, in order to get the CAAT enterprise underway. Amid cries of political patronage and influence peddling regarding sites and construction contracts, the colossus of the CAAT edifice was erected. Newspaper accounts suggest that land speculators and contractors knew that the long reigning Conservative Party in Ontario looked after its benefactors.<sup>16</sup>

Thus the impetus for the colleges can be demonstrated by the fact that the government was forced to act in order to keep centralized control or else the

individual school boards were ready to commence on their own. Industry wanted more skilled workers, land speculators and developers wanted the lucrative building contracts and land site sales, also the educational establishment did not want the children of the more affluent working class filling the universities. Another reason becomes apparent, also. Canada had a recession in the early sixties and young people were hit particularly hard. However, as economic times improved somewhat it developed that large numbers of young people were still unemployed or perhaps unemployable, as industry increasingly showed less interest in developing and training their own skilled work force. Now with the CAAT system tens of thousands of potentially unemployed youth would be immediately taken off the labour force for two to three years. Ontario already had a provincial election in 1963 and would now have a much improved labour statistic for the new election expected in 1967. I would refer to this as a holding tank concept of educational usage.

Rush was the byword, with the hope of a 1966 opening. Using portable classrooms, if necessary, grabbing course outlines from Ryerson and other institutes of technology, acquiring temporary old buildings, the frantic dash was on. The first three colleges to commence opened without calendars, without even registration forms.<sup>17</sup>

But they opened.

Ontario continued with its goal of centralizing education in the province. In 1968 the forty-four school boards that controlled the Ontario Manpower Retraining program found they were no longer deemed competent. The programs were given to the colleges to administer. The government had direct centralized control over the colleges. The local boards of education objected, they had administered the program successfully with no cost to the local taxpayer.<sup>18</sup> Incidentally, we are discussing a large number of people under the retraining program. In many colleges the number of adult retrainees exceeded the current college enrolments. However, as happened several years earlier the complaints of the local boards fell on deaf ears. The big blue machine rolled on.

The Board of Governors who were appointed to their terms were the watchdogs of each college. Directly responsible to the Council of Regents who were under the Minister for Colleges and Universities, their function was more or less to see that government policies were actually carried out and the colleges were being run smoothly towards previously laid out goals.

College calendars were full of rules for student conduct and dress in the late sixties. Durham College

in 1969 and 1970 warned students that potential employers visited the campus regularly. The calendar said that "a majority of students demanded" that male students dress in a shirt and tie with dress pants. Mohawk, in 1970, allowed men to wear a turtle neck and sweater in lieu of a tie and sports coat. Obviously these rules were later found to be unenforceable and dropped.

#### The Teachers

The faculty would come from various sources. Business and industry could provide experienced individuals and many were willing to come. However, many sadly lacked any teaching ability. Many high school teachers wanted to teach at the colleges, also. Enrolment being voluntary at college and students being older meant that the physically exhausting problem of discipline of the high schools was avoided. Universities also provided some of the faculty although those running the colleges did not want to move towards the university concept and were to often suspicious of the consequences of open inquiry associated with university teaching. One does not need too much imagination to look at the background of the Board of Governors of Mohawk College in 1968, for instance, (see appendix) and envisage the kind of reception a Marxist



orientated teacher would have found at this school. Certainly, this was typical of other CAAT's also. This is not too suggest that the college had the rigid curriculum control of a high school but definitely the boundaries were far better defined than was the case at the universities. Indeed the situation was the same in the United States. Corcoran points out that the "conservative campus flavor" of the community college drew financial support away from the private schools and forced a large number of small private residential colleges to close. The diversity and choice of higher education was actually diminished by the junior college with its heavily state subsidized low tuition.<sup>19</sup>

However, it was soon discovered that the colleges had more than enough applications for their teaching positions. In time the applications for any single position would become a deluge. Obviously there was some prestige centered around this new institution. There was also fast becoming an over supply of secondary school teachers and university instructors. The Council of Regents who never tire of issuing edicts defined the qualifications for a teacher or "master" in 1968. An assistant master had to be a qualified craftsman with grade 12 or equivalent and six years of experience or a graduate of a three year college course with four

years practical experience or a university graduate with three years acceptable experience. An associate master had to have more related and approved course or a P. Eng. or C.A. degree. A master had to be a graduate of a university honours course with two years experience or be a qualified craftsmen with six years experience and a university degree or a college and university graduate with four years experience or P. Eng. or C.A. with three years experience and a university degree. In 1969, they made a category lower than assistant master, an affiliate master. This category pretty well included anyone who the college needed and felt could do the job in a specific commercial or technical field. A teacher of adult education with three years experience was now recognized. This was important because the colleges had taken over the Ontario retraining program and now had to create a category for many of the longtime adult retraining teachers.

#### The Official Purpose

John P. Robarts, Premier of Ontario claimed:

CAAT's are a response to the technological age in which we live. They are entirely new institutions designed expressly to accommodate the conditions existing in Ontario, to meet the needs of the people in Ontario and to provide educational opportunities to those who will return to education in the retraining process. They are not alternatives to university nor are they an inferior level of education.<sup>20</sup>

Still protesting, still on the defensive, the government proclaimed that they were not setting up junior college transfer schools. The fact that they went to such lengths continuously to explain that the community college was not a transfer medium perhaps belies the covert fear that they may evolve into one.

The Minister of Education, Davis, said:

The colleges in fact do not want to be judged with reference to existing institutions. They are trying...to pioneer new educational techniques...upon the principle that everyone possesses latent skills and abilities.<sup>21</sup>

The Premier, Robarts, talked in more abstract terms:

The objective of CAAT is to weld their programs to reality and enable the colleges to provide a meaningful program of education. CAAT's are designed to mould themselves to the requirement of the community, including those of the business and industrial community.<sup>22</sup>

Following up on the Premier's statement and reiterating a major point made earlier; one of the stated objectives and reasons for being, of the CAAT system was to help provide the skilled manpower in a rapidly expanding industrial economy. What has been the upshot of all this? A dozen years later with more than a million 'officially' out of work and the economy expanding at a snails pace as compared to the post-war boom, we would have expected the problem of

skilled manpower shortages to at last be solved. With the expenditure of literally hundreds of millions of dollars on actually hundreds of thousands of students since 1968 and the slow down of industrial expansion over the last several years, as well as the immigration of approximately two hundred thousand people a year into Canada, many of them highly skilled, one could at least assume that technological deficiencies in the labour force would be remedied. Or could one? J. L. Meschino, chairman of the Machinery and Equipment Manufacturers Association of Canada said recently that industry is desperately in need of skilled tradesmen.<sup>23</sup> Ross Strickland the president of the Canadian Tooling Manufacturers Associated lamented; "No matter who you talk to... the number one problem is the availability of skilled workers."<sup>24</sup> The problem exists in the United States also. This apparently is one of the reasons for the mandatory retirement age in that country being raised by Congress to seventy from sixty-five. If they are not fulfilling their industrial and technical function are they fulfilling an academic function? Are they fulfilling a function which officials were relatively reluctant to admit; indeed, often even

quick to deny. Are Ontario's community colleges becoming junior transfer colleges where students, who hope to some day go to university, go to upgrade themselves for advanced admission? It is a process which is very rapidly becoming much easier as universities drop their entrance standards to CAAT students as will be documented in this paper.

#### Transfer Institutions?

In Ontario the twenty-two community colleges have an essentially open door type of admission according to the official guide to education, Horizons, put out by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and distributed to the Ontario high schools. Students are told that there are transfer possibilities for CAAT graduates, possibly to the second year level. Students are however advised that CAAT's are not intended to be "feeder institutions" to the universities. After that bit of penance to the official line students are then told of the opportunities to transfer to such desired courses as engineering at the second year level.

An excellent example of the transfer nature that has developed in the CAAT's can be demonstrated at Centennial College which has over three thousand full time students. In their academic division

Centennial offers General Arts and Science programs for one, two and three year terms. They make the point that a student will hopefully develop an interest in a certain field and eventually transfer. They specifically do not say where the student is to transfer too, but since the subjects are academic there is really only one academic institution that a student could go to after graduating from this program. This coyness is necessary because the school wants to attract transfer students to increase their enrolment, but they want to satisfy government desires to keep programs terminal. Centennial calendar states that over fifty percent of graduates from the academic division proceed to other post-secondary institutions. They further state that the Committee of University Presidents have stated that those who complete eight single semester academic courses are eligible for university. Since each semester contains five courses, a one year course would contain ten courses, therefore a student could take the marks from his eight best courses and be admitted to university. This could be the reason that the college has a one year academic program as well as a two and a three year program.

Education critic Peter Druker maintains: "The skills that vocational education teaches are obsolete..."

The way to teach a skill today is by putting it on a knowledge foundation and teaching it through a systematic course of studies, that is through a program."<sup>25</sup> It would appear that Druker is against the type of defined training that would constitute, say, the teachings given to an apprentice in a trade. Such training is too specialized. Industry would seem to feel the same about apprenticeship training, for Mr. Druker points out that industries are increasingly reluctant to undertake apprenticeship training. They want the state to take over the skill teaching function. Industrial corporations are reluctant to shoulder the expense of training and retraining and would like the taxpayer to bear this burden. But educational ideologists believe that narrow disciplines are obsolete and demand more of an academic core curriculum in their technical institutions. An expanding academic core makes the CAAT's more like a junior university and makes transfer from college to university all the more logical and inevitable. Ontario may have created a system of junior transfer colleges while all the time denying that they had an intention of doing so. It does seem a strange contradiction that as industry moves

towards greater division of labour and more specialization, the educational system moves in the other direction to what Druker calls the "new renaissanceman -- or an improved breed of C. P. Snow's, New Man."<sup>26</sup> Perhaps one could view the problem as a dialectic between the mechanistic corporate man who would fit in with the machine and the technological system and the humanistic man who would be capable of socially surviving in a post-industrial society.

The year CAAT's were born there was a fifty-seven thousand full time university grade enrolment in Ontario. Predications made in 1966 at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education projected a steady upward curve in university enrolment with over two hundred and eleven thousand by 1981 and 1977 would have well over one hundred and sixty thousand students.<sup>27</sup> How well did they predict? The latest available statistics show that by 1975 there were one hundred and forty-four thousand full time university students. However, reports suggest enrolments have peaked and have begun to drop, although actual figures are not yet publicly available. They could not have forseen the deteriorating economic conditions of the seventies. They could not know that university enrolment would drop in the late



seventies. This drop in enrolment meant a cut in funds to each school. The greater the drop, the greater the per-student grant cut. This would necessitate a cut in staff, in services and in programs. Universities needed students. Originally, universities distrusted the academic ambitions of many community colleges and hardly saw any use for them as a transfer agent. They would only take the cream of the college graduates and even then only begrudgingly give them credits for work completed at college. The original ties with the universities meant that the senior institutions would act as watch dogs to ensure that the community college did not become the feared 'second rate liberal arts college' and thereby drain funds from the university establishment. However, today the university needs the college or to put it more succinctly the university needs warm bodies, for grants, and the colleges have plenty of warm bodies.

Transfer functions are quickly becoming liberalized and institutionalized. Instead of the usual individual considerations and "may be admitted" phrases we read "will be admitted" and increasingly see the end of "considering each case individually." We see "high

standards" required for transfer become "A or high B" or just "B or sixty-six percent" or even "third class standing". We see prestigious schools like Western University having some of the lowest standards for CAAT admission. We see second year entrance not just for three year A -grade graduates but for B-grade graduates also. We see credit given not just for courses related or similar to university courses but for work done at community college not related to the course desired at university. We see standards quickly changing so that two year calendars at schools like McMaster which cover 1976-1978 and were composed in 1976 having significantly higher standards than the 1977-1978 calendars which reflect 1977 thinking. Whatever the number of transfer students today it can be safely said that this number will increase. As students in CAAT and high school discover the expanding transfer function of CAAT's we can expect more of them will desire this option as recent evidence would suggest. (see appendix).

The question of whether the purpose of junior college is predominantly that of a transfer agent or a terminal school in its own right is obviously not a

popular one. Even in the United States where the transfer nature has been accepted and encouraged for many years we read in Leland L. Medsker's 1960 study on the subject that his was the first comprehensive study since 1940 to determine how many students entering junior colleges later transferred to four year college.

In June 1974 a Graduate Committee of the Department of Education at Wayne State University conducted a study of the Ontario community college system. The Wayne State Committee obviously misunderstood the hierarchical structure of the CAAT system. They claimed that each college was set up to function separately and thus have ended up competing rather than co-operating with each other. As has been clearly demonstrated the power of decision rests exclusively with the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and is coordinated for colleges by the Board of Regents for all of Ontario. This is what distinguishes Ontario Community Colleges from almost all other community college systems in North America; that is, centralized control. The Wayne State report however insisted, obviously without documentation, that the Ontario Community Colleges "have grown like separate islands."<sup>28</sup> Nothing could be further from the truth.

Although most studies of the CAAT system tend to ignore the class basis of the community college set up, this is often done to avoid political censure rather than just plain ignorance of the situation. For example, the Wayne State Committee study tended to ignore reference to any class basis throughout their study of the Ontario system. However, when they discussed future recommendations for College Alumni Associations they demonstrated that they were actually very aware of social class although they were still careful to qualify their recommendations in this rather conservative study. Their report stated:

It has been said that community colleges are promoters of social stratification, that is, they appeal only to a certain segment of the population. If this is true then their Alumni Associations could hardly be expected to grow to vast proportions largely because many graduates might earn marginal incomes all their working lives after graduation, thereby making it impossible for them to consider contributions; either of their time or finances on a regular basis. The above mentioned facts could also apply to a proposed Alumni Development Fund.<sup>29</sup>

Interestingly, the Wayne State report concluded that "continued active research and communication is needed if the community college is to be an instrument for social change."<sup>30</sup> This paper contends that community colleges were never intended to facilitate

social change but were instead instituted to ensure continued social stratification.

Next, let us look at the American experience and see if it is or can become a role model for the Canadian experience. As far as can be ascertained no study of the transfer nature of Ontario's community college system has ever been conducted. Actually the very nature of the transfer role has usually been denied. The idea being that students in Ontario who desire to go to university upgrade themselves through correspondence courses and night school or stay in high school and finish grade thirteen. It is officially an unusual notion to purposely go to community college for the reason of transferring eventually to university. Colleges and universities are claimed to be discreet entities dealing with a different clientele. The falseness of these hypotheses will be demonstrated in this thesis.

#### FOOTNOTES

- 1 W. G. Fleming, Post-secondary and Adult Education, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971, 494.
- 2 Ibid., 495.
- 3 Ibid., 497.
- 4 Ibid., 498.
- 5 Ontario Department of Education, Report of the Grade 13 study committee 1964.
- 6 Fleming. 500.
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 Ibid., 502.
- 9 Ibid., 505.
- 10 Ibid., 506.
- 11 Ibid., 508.
- 12 Ontario Statutes 13-14 Elizabeth II 1965-66 An Act to amend the Department of Education Act.
- 13 Fleming, 513.
- 14 Ibid., 516.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Ibid., 521.
- 17 Toronto Globe and Mail in Fleming 522.
- 18 Fleming, 524.
- 19 Thomas B. Corcoran, Community Colleges: The Coming Slums of Higher Education, in Change Vol. 4 Number 7, 32.
- 20 Edward B. Harvey and Joseph L. Lennard, Key Issues in Higher Education, O.I.S.E. 1973, 15.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Ibid.
- 23 Toronto Globe and Mail, March 17, 1978.
- 24 Hamilton Spectator, April 5, 1978.

25 Harvey and Lennard, 16.

26 Ibid.

27 Presidents' Research Committee, from the Sixties to the Seventies Ontario 1967, 74.

28 Graduate Committee, Department of Education, Wayne State University 1974, 4.

29 Ibid., 86.

30 Ibid., 145.

## CHAPTER II

### The American Experience

Some of the junior colleges in the United States are really technical institutes with terminal programs; however, most are junior colleges that have as their main stated existence the desire to prepare students to transfer to a four year college with advanced standing. A minority of students actually transfer although a majority expressed the desire to do so. Education in the United States is under state control therefore there are over fifty different educational systems counting Washington D.C. However, there is mass federal funding and although the various systems may have developed at different rates, a similarity of substance and purpose is apparent in the educational field.

But the sad facts remain that far less than one half of students in community or two year colleges ever graduate.<sup>1</sup> Less than twelve percent of community college students complete senior college and less than five percent graduate from professional or graduate school or ever make more than twenty thousand dollars a year. (mid-1970's)<sup>2</sup>. Steven



Zwerling makes the point that the majority of community college students are victims of a social and educational process that limits the career options and social mobility of its students and it "tells him that he was always second best and the chances are he will never be anything more".<sup>3</sup>

#### Class Restrictions

The prevarication of the American dream only belies the truth. The majority of community college students were born into the working class and it is there that they will stay. That is a fact of our socio-economic system. The disillusionment comes from the dominant ideology that tells them college is a ladder of upward mobility. The student in western society is led to believe that he must be upwardly mobile, that he must do better than his father. He is given an unrealistic set of expectations. He could live comfortably at a working class level and be content feeling he did as well as his parents. Indeed, people in many parts of the world today, and even here, at one time, felt this was a successful existence. But the student has been fed a wrong bill of goods, a false ideology and the tragedy is that he internalizes and believes it. Now when the community college graduate

finds himself at the same level in society in which he was born he blames himself. He feels he personally has failed. As Zwerling says he feels that he is "second best". Second best to whom? Second best to the middle-class university graduate who stays in the middle class. Second best to the 'self-made' millionaire who inherited his fortune and upper-class position. Instead of looking realistically at the situation the community college graduate will look, actually he will be encouraged to look, at the relative handful who went through community college, senior college and professional school. Instead of seeing them as the exception he will see them as the norm and feel himself the exception. He will all too often feel he has personally failed. In this manner his anger will safely be directed towards himself and not towards an unjust society that had the deck stacked against him from the moment he was conceived. Ironically, the majority will say that he was given the opportunity to carry the ball and he fumbled.

Edmund J. Gleazer has said the junior college system is the "only education institution which can truly be stamped, made in the United States of America."<sup>4</sup>

Starting in 1892 at the two year university college section of the University of Chicago it had grown to over eight hundred by the late 1960's when they were opening at the incredible rate of about one in a week. However, one point remains apparent as Gail M. Inlow has stated "junior colleges perform their academic functions better than they do their terminal educational functions".<sup>5</sup> The main reason Inlow gives is that "the former is endowed with greater prestige than the latter."<sup>6</sup> If this is true it is a pity since the overwhelming majority of junior college students will never transfer to any senior college.

Zwerling maintains that the community college is "in fact a social defense mechanism that resists basic changes in the social structure".<sup>7</sup> The more ambitious of the working class go here with aspirations only to be routinely and systematically "cooled-out". It maintains the status quo of modern industrial bourgeois society. Students rapidly learn the truth as disillusionment sets in. In a community college in New York some student has written above the toilet paper dispenser-"Pull for your diploma".<sup>8</sup> Hardly morale building.

Studies on the distribution of wealth and income by Jenck (1972), Kolko (1962) and studies on social mobility by Lipset and Bendix (1959) and Blau and Duncan (1967) all come to the same conclusion.<sup>9</sup>

The idea of significant social mobility, the idea of a basic redistribution of wealth and hence power, in this century, is a fantasy. Indeed the gap between rich and poor has grown, the community college phenomenon, notwithstanding. Indeed, as Zwerling and others postulate, this situation is maintained because of community colleges and other institutions which act as pillars to support the status quo. The drop out rate at community college is staggering. Seventy-five percent will never finish. Rather than being tragic, Zwerling refers to this as "one of the two year colleges' primary social functions."<sup>10</sup>

Two and a half million Americans were enrolled in over eleven hundred junior colleges by 1975. But a half million increase was expected by the federal Office of Education for 1976 and the Carnegie Commission on higher Education expects about two hundred and fifty new colleges by 1980 with up to four and one half million enrolled.<sup>11</sup> Although university and senior college

growth seems to have at least levelled and even shows recent signs of dropping enrolment, community college enrolment still continues to flourish. Not at the rate of the late sixties of course, but certainly they are still a growth industry. Half of all American youth eighteen to twenty-one are in some type of post-secondary institution.<sup>12</sup> To give an indication of the importance of the transfer function it should be noted that, although, as previously stated, about twenty percent of junior college or community college students actually transfer this represents twenty-nine percent of all 1968 undergraduates, and the trend is definitely upwards with about forty percent expected by 1980.<sup>13</sup> The long range goal of the Carnegie Commission is to have forty to forty-five percent of all undergraduate students throughout the United States enrolled in community college.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, it readily becomes apparent that the sifting or transferring job accomplished by colleges is massive in scope and paramount in importance to the entire senior educational structure remembering that far more students are "cooled out" than ever transfer.

Junior colleges were born out of the wish to

separate the junior and sophomore year from university. The desire being the separating of the wheat from the chaff. Only the elite from these first two years would be allowed to go on to university. However, it would hardly do to have the majority of students fail. The working class would balk at a system which so overtly defined their role in hierarchical society. William Harper, president of the University of Chicago, which housed the first junior college at the turn of the century, had the solution. He designed a separate degree for those who accomplished the two years of college but who obviously were not wanted in university. This he said would encourage them to "give up college work at the end of the sophomore year" and save them from "the disgrace which may attend an unfinished course."<sup>15</sup> In essence from a practical viewpoint they were being given a consolation prize for failing.

#### Separating the Wheat from the Chaff

Universities did not want to run junior colleges though. They desired to pattern themselves after the great European universities, especially in Germany. German universities used a pre-university preparatory school or gymnasium to make sure that only the elite had access to higher education. The American university

establishment wanted the American high school to expand and become more directly involved in this function. In other words they wanted the high school institution to run junior colleges. It was the same University of Chicago president, William Harper, who convinced the area high schools to take on this function. In 1902 in Joliet, Illinois the local high school board established the first independent public junior college. The next one would not open until 1910 in Fresno California.<sup>16</sup> But from then on the concept mushroomed.

It is interesting to note that Ontario went half way towards this concept. It created grade thirteen but did not separate it from the high school. Presumably it was felt that the cooling-out function could be accomplished successfully in just one year, at much less expense. The prime motive behind all this was the desire for the ideal university, the 'community of scholars' which was felt to exist in Europe in a relative handful of select locations.

Elitism created the junior or community college. The university would eventually take care of the elite; the junior college would handle the rest. Ironically,

what on the surface appears to be an institution dedicated to upgrading the relatively unfortunate class in society actually is created for the bourgeois class in order to ensure their continued position of predominance within the society. Appearances certainly are deceiving, the universities would remain more or less exclusive if this new institution succeeded.

Vocations or 'semi-professional' technical education fulfilled the school system's function very well. The technical education would be terminal and students who took it would not have to be cooled-out. In the process they may well pick up skills that would normally have to be taught on the job at industry's expense. The problem discovered was that relatively few students wanted terminal technical courses. They believed the dominant ideology of the country. They did not want to make a decision that would have ensured them a subordinate position in employment as an assistant, if they had the choice. The sad truth being that they would work in subordinate positions for the most part whether they wanted to or not. However, the college appeared to be offering them a choice and they accepted it. The majority of students at junior colleges are transfer students.



The bulk of vocational and technical education is taken part-time at night school usually as a requirement of employment or a guarantee of steady employment by the employer. When given even the illusion of choice is it reasonable to expect that most people would chose to do what economic conditions in reality force them to do? Vocational training can be called "semi-professional training" but eventually people realize the final job will often still be a grind.

If anyone would doubt the truth that junior colleges served to keep the working class from university or senior college than let us look at these facts. In 1870 eight out of ten high school graduates entered college and six went on to receive degrees.<sup>17</sup> There were more than twice the number of college graduates with degrees as those with high school diplomas only.<sup>18</sup> With the working class being sent to high school in greatly increasing numbers it had to be made plain that a high school diploma was not a ticket to university for the masses. Industrial training in the high schools that could not lead to college was a partial answer but obviously more was needed. Huge numbers of students had to be cooled-out. Certainly the educational

establishment could easily prevent them from going to college but this might eventually shatter the myth of equal opportunity. Massive numbers of hostile workers who feel they are being held back would hardly lead to a strengthening of the status quo. They might demand certain 'rights' and this could lead to a forced redistribution of wealth. However, institutions could be created to add mystification to the situation and the class structure could be maintained for several more generations, at least. If the individual could feel he personally had the opportunity to 'succeed' then he personally would be the one to blame if he failed. In order to accomplish this a relative few had to succeed; there had to be some upward mobility between classes. Now his anger at remaining static in social class would be directed inwards, in most cases. Some upward mobility towards the top had to be maintained in order to avoid sudden downward mobility from the top. Rather than having the analogy of what is commonly referred to as a stream flowing towards the university we have a manmade canal with a great series of confusing locks. Those who control the locks can decide on the quantity of cargo arriving. Some will be let in but the

majority will find that they do not have the toll and will have to be re-routed never to arrive at their destination.

One of the earlier 'locks' was the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. American educational reformers had called for comprehensive high schools where students could take different options but would graduate with relatively the same value of diploma. This Smith-Hughes Act stipulated that if federal funds went to a high school then vocational students had to be separated from academic students.<sup>19</sup> Vocational education would be mainly terminal, of course. This was considered an ideal solution to the teaming hordes of European immigrant children reaching America at this time. The bureaucratic structure and indoctrination of the school system could instill social control in the children without the danger that they would demand their place in the power structure of American capitalist society.

#### Cooling-out Explained

It was the failure of the high school system to adequately fulfil its screening task and act as a cooling-out agent that created the necessity of the massive junior college institution. Burton Clark in his landmark, 1960 study of the junior college system

in California applied Goffman's 'cooling-out' term to the community college system. Clark explained the actual mechanics of the process as carried out at San Jose Junior College.

Students who the college feel lack ability are often asked to enrol in remedial work. They are also given a pleasant interview with a counselor. "Orientation to College" is a course they will be asked to take in which, Clark says, it is "a place to talk tough." Peer pressure can be used in this class setting. The college gives out a great many low marks and a much sterner interview with the guidance counselor armed with a student's poor marks will make all but the most adamant students quite compliant. The fifth and final step would be to put the student on probation if he will not agree to switch his course from transfer to terminal technical education or just dejectedly quit which is usually the case.<sup>20</sup>

Clark says "In short the public junior college tends to be a classification and distribution center from which large numbers of student leave education after a relatively short stay".<sup>21</sup> Calling the standards "non-existent" he pointed out that although any high school

graduate can go to community college only eleven percent of all high school graduates qualify for state university, which is not as exclusive as Stanford University, nor has standards as low as the four year state college where forty-four percent met the requirements.<sup>22</sup> However, whereas only six percent of the students' parents at Stanford came from blue collar homes, San Jose Junior College had sixty-two percent from blue collar homes.<sup>23</sup> Clark calls its make up "virtually identical with the city-wide occupation structure" and refers to it as a "working class college."<sup>24</sup>

Although, most students at junior college prefer academic subjects the government has tried its best to reverse this desire. Recent legislation, such as the Higher Education Act of 1972, allocated eight hundred and fifty million for post-secondary occupational education and only two hundred and seventy-five million for academic community college programs.<sup>25</sup> It shows what is officially thought in Washington of the transfer function of the schools. The funding requires a separation of academic and vocational programs. This means separate administrations and separate facilities.

Certainly this does not add to the "community" of the Community College. The problem simply stated is this. Poor economic conditions mean massive unemployment, especially for youth. Therefore, the desire is to take eighteen and nineteen year olds away from the labour force. However, to put them in senior colleges or universities would destroy the elite nature of these institutions. Class structure would be threatened. Therefore, students must be denied access to important higher educational institutions without arousing hostility, as has been stated. However, not only should the student be cooled out but he (or she of course) must be kept off the labour force. The junior college growth attests to its effectiveness in these functions. Literally billions have been spent on junior colleges. We would assume that they are at least partially fulfilling these functions.

The educational establishment was concerned that enrolment at university was increasing too rapidly and the junior colleges were not effective in controlling it. Too many people were bypassing the junior college altogether. Many times the goal has been stated by educational leaders that the junior college should be the enrolment leaders. They would sort and stream

people for senior college or university. Indeed, all is not unhappiness in the educational bureaucracy over the recent levelling and even dropping enrolment at university as compared to the steady growth of community college in Ontario, one may be sure. This can be safely said even though the transfer function of Ontario's community colleges is not well publicized and to many may not seem important. Remember, in the United States only twenty percent, or so, of students transfer and the senior colleges they transfer to are very often inferior to Canadian universities in quality. There an extremely small minority of American junior college students transfer to an institution comparable in quality to Ontario's universities. But this is not the real purpose of the junior colleges. It is not necessary to spend billions on junior colleges, in the hope that a small number will transfer to university. Universities, as an institution, do not need students that badly and can recruit their own students and screen and sort in any number of ways. No, it is the cooling-out functions that is paramount. It is the diversion of a class without the resultant

anger and bitterness towards the unequal economic system that is important. Social control by preventing angry revolt is the function. Denying higher education to the working class in order to allow the middle and upper classes to profit is the aim. To do this without arousing the hostility of the working class is the goal.

Skilled Manpower Shortage Persists

To say that relatively few community colleges in Ontario transfer, therefore, they are not transfer colleges is a misleading statement. The function of transfer college is to let just a relative few get through and transfer. Transfer college exists mainly to cool out a class. Community colleges in Ontario also perform this function quite well, as it will be shown. As for the importance of their technical functions, it has already been stated that they operate quite poorly at this task. Canada has a skilled manpower shortage and must still hope for adequate immigration in technical skills from England, West Germany and other European countries to fill these functions. Unfortunately, the immigrants are no longer coming in the necessary numbers. The CAAT system has failed to take up the slack. In one of the most important and basic technical skills in industry, tool and die making, Canada has had a severe



shortage for well over twenty years. Industry is unwilling to train apprentices and immigration can not fill the quota. This trade is so crucial in manufacturing that this has led to a large loss of jobs in many industries.<sup>26</sup> How can this be after a dozen years of community colleges in Ontario, not to mention the numbers of junior or community colleges outside this province? Canada suffers from a crucial shortage of skilled labour as will later be documented in this paper. Contracts are lost, trade is lost, along with thousands of jobs of all sorts, because of this deficiency. Where are the community colleges with their technical training? If technical training was really one of their primary functions could they really have failed as badly. No, vocational training is seen as just another terminal program, for the most part, amongst the educational bureaucracy. Reiterating, the important function of the community college is to cool-out students. This role they do effectively and competently. After all this is their reason for being.

A skilled manpower shortage existed when community colleges were established, yet it was a

community college system that was considered with applied arts, business, health and academic programs. The province could have forgotten about the junior college concept and left the academic subjects to the university. They could have massively expanded pure institutes of technology. But they did not. It is true that they used the technical institute as their model but Ontario's skilled manpower shortage points out their failure in this regard. They created a very different type of institution from a trade school. The men running the college structure in Ontario are not that incompetent. If they wanted to fill the skilled technical vacancies of Canada with a huge number of trade schools they would not have failed so miserably. The present type of community college did not evolve by accident, rather it was planned and conceived. Perhaps those in power hoped that it would fulfil its technical function a little better but they could have corrected that problem. They got what they wanted. A place to hold the young unemployed. A place for people to learn recreational hobbies. A place for students with grade twelve to upgrade themselves to university. A place where some terminal vocational training will take place

at subordinate levels (although obviously not enough), and most importantly a place to cool out the potential radicals of the working class. If this was not the real purpose then why would the province spend hundreds of millions and altogether billions on a system of community colleges which handles a retraining program for unemployed which was already handled successfully by school boards, which handles apprenticeship training which was already handled in several vocational schools; which handles technical training but no better than previous institutes such as the Hamilton Institute of Technology; which handles academic subjects but at a much poorer level than the universities. In other words what else was the justification of spending billions if the driving but covert reason was not to cool-out and cool down an entire class of people who had expectations which could never possibly be met without restructuring the entire socio-economic system?

#### Cooling-out with Terminal Vocational Training

The Master Plan for higher education in California (1960-1977) does not pull punches when it comes to its function. The American college, perhaps being more senior, seems to have a more open knowledge of its purpose. The plan discusses using "coercion" to divert

students from senior college to junior college even if its "difficult and dangerous." Do it and do it quickly to avoid "an atmosphere of clamor and controversy."<sup>27</sup> The fact that community colleges in Ontario attempted at their inception to play down any transfer role is not really surprising. In 1948 New York State created a system of community colleges and they too tried to downgrade the transfer role.<sup>28</sup> Community colleges do not want to transfer many students. This is not their function. They would prefer that students take terminal courses. It is the students themselves who shun the technical courses and opt for academic transfer courses. The school continually tries to arrest this development. Indeed the 1972 Regents Plan for New York calls for a system that has all the advantages of terminal education. It leaves the colleges and universities alone; it does twice as good a job as will become apparent for holding youth from the labour market and it cools out students without their realizing it. It is the "upper-division technical centers or four-year two year college."<sup>29</sup> Ingeniously, it would take students who could successfully transfer and give them two more years of junior college level

work. Richard Rinehart claims that actually more than half the colleges and universities in America are considering the institution of such programs.<sup>30</sup>

As has often been mentioned vocational terminal education is a "far more efficient system" of cooling out the working class. Rather than take up to two years to convince most students that they are not university material, this vocational training allows the student to voluntarily choose terminal education. He has accepted an occupation at his class level and is no longer a threat to the dominant class. Indeed he can be an asset as he will learn a skill that will make him more valuable to his future employer. Students when given the choice steadily reject this route although the United States federal government certainly encourages this route. The federal government in Canada also made money available to vocational education only, when the CAAT system was being developed in Ontario. Having centralized control, the Ontario government took tenacious steps to ensure that the Ontario community college system would be vocational and terminal without a transfer function. They were not entirely successful with this task and the recent lowering of university standards for CAAT graduates suggests an increasing

transfer function for the future. Of course the current propaganda blitz on the relative worthlessness of the Bachelor of Arts as opposed to the emerging value and importance of community college educational training, without collaborating documentation to back up the claims, suggest other methods to ensure that higher education stays elitist. If people can believe in the words of our Prime Minister that "the country does not owe you a job"; if they can be taught to be grateful for any type of employment then the working class, far from being militant over their denied access to upward mobility, can just be happy and satisfied to be working. Of course this is a short range hope at best. Accepting one's position in the working class and giving up the dream of upward mobility does not by any means suggest an acceptance of the status quo. If people realized that they were not going to somehow achieve the upper classes it would concurrently occur to them that it was not in their interest to have upper classes.

The per capita distribution of Bachelor of Arts degrees in the United States is much more prolific as compared to Canada but the value of a B.A. would not appear to be on the decline. Research by David K. Witmer suggests

that even taking into account the non-earning years spent in school and using constant dollars a B.A. had a steady advantage of approximately fifteen percent a year in monetary terms for lifetime earnings. The low point for the monetary value of the B.A. was actually reached in 1949 when it registered an 11.4 percent advantage. Nineteen seventy-six was 15.5 percent.<sup>31</sup>

At present what we have is the dominant class in society encouraging vocational or technical education and the working class students opting for transfer programs and the dream of higher class attainment. Karabel also reflects this point of view "vocational training in the community college has been sponsored by a national educational planning elite whose social composition outlook and policy proposals are reflective of the interests of the more privileged strata of our society."<sup>32</sup>

#### Students Are Given Guidance

Cooling out or encouraging transfer students to change to terminal education is even officially recognized as a mainstay of the junior college system. Robert Finch former head of Health, Education and Welfare, said, "though it is not listed as an objective in the college catalogue, changing transfer students to

terminal students is one of the unique and most important tasks of the junior college."<sup>33</sup> Re-adjusting the disillusioned student to the reality of his social class is the cooling-out process.

Of course, so important a function in a bureaucracy must have its own office. Some part of the institution must be made responsible to see that this necessity to the purpose of the whole is carried out. In junior college the guidance department coordinates and generally transmits this role. A series of aptitude and I.Q. tests will be used to indicate a problem. Remedial courses and extra work may be prescribed. Then of course poor grades will be the irrefutable proof that the student does not have academic ability in sufficient quantity to ensure success in college or university. At a New York community college more than half of the first semester freshmen had less than a 1.25 or D+ average.<sup>34</sup> They need a 2.00 to graduate. Poor marks, therefore are not hard to obtain. Students don't have to be kicked out of these colleges, they get ground down and leave in disgust and dejection. They know they had their chance and they blew it. If they do not know this a guidance counselor will



lugubriously tell them. Tenacious failures may have to be put on probation but usually they can be convinced that if they do not want to drop out they can switch to relatively easier terminal programs. Every step of the way down the ladder there is someone available from the guidance department willingly to help the student. Certainly the institution seems to lean over backwards to counsel him. When he fails they do not ask him to quit, but helpfully suggest courses that constitute a re-evaluation of his place in society. He must feel that the institution did all it could to make his way smoother. Consequently any poor results must be due to the student's individual failure. If the school did not fail then who is left but the individual? If years later there are gripes about life's opportunities or lack thereof a rereading of marks would quickly cool down most students, again. The majority of freshmen never finish junior college or else the failure rate would be simply atrocious, especially if they insisted in staying in transfer programs. The fact that most drop out means that the cooling out program has been successful. It has saved money by working in less than two years. Also it would be

extremely difficult for students to feel that society has failed them when they were given the apparent opportunity for upward mobility and did not even complete their course.

"Sympathetic Elimination"

The con man cools out his victim in order to prevent him from going to the police; it could be correctly said that our society cools out the working class youth in order to prevent them from taking to the streets, such as happened in Paris in 1968. The expenditure of any amount of money in order to pacify the working class is, of course, ultimately worth it to the corporate state elite of our society. They truly have everything to lose - like wealth, status and power. Any analysis that does not take in this basic truth will be inadequate. Alexis Lange one of the founding fathers of the community college movement plainly saw the junior college as turning away from university and providing terminal vocation education to the "cannots will-not's and should-not's."<sup>35</sup> This last category must be cooled-out. Carl Seashore, before the term cooling-out became well known used the term "sympathetic elimination" as he warned of the folly of making gold out of iron."<sup>36</sup>

There is always the assumption, usually not stated

but understood, that whatever a student accomplished in the way of grades in community college he would do that much worse in the higher standards at university. However, while not denying that course by course the first two years of senior college or university are more demanding than community college, some other points must be taken into consideration. Generally coming from a lower class than his university counterpart the community college student is less able to depend on parental support. He is more likely forced to work part-time to support himself. Although tuition is lower in junior college so are the corresponding loans and grants available to him, also. There are less private bursaries available to the community college student, too. On top of this his actual class time is considerably longer than at university and attendance requirements may be more stringent in certain courses.

Subsequently, it cannot always be assumed that the student would be doing more poorly in terms of grades if he were in a university or four year college.

The American Association of Junior Colleges state that although seventy-five to eighty percent of junior college students designate themselves as transfer students,

only twenty to twenty-five percent actually transfer to senior college."<sup>37</sup> Different sources written at different times give us a variety of percentages. But the only point that remains clear is the great majority of students entering junior college shun terminal vocational and technical courses for academic transfer courses. However, only a minority of these transfer students ever make it to senior college and fewer yet ever get even a B.A. degree.

The revealing fact is that although the majority of community college students are working class youth, the fifteen percent who transfer and eventually receive a B.A. are not working class at all. They are not the cream of the working class students as is commonly assumed and officially used to justify the expansion of the junior college system. Thomas B. Corcoran states that "the primary beneficiaries of the community college have been middle-class students of average ability."<sup>38</sup> These are students who normally could have been expected to apply directly to senior college and are not the usual candidates for the cooling out process.

From a strategic point of view a student who drops out is cooled-out. But from a tactical point of view he is not really cooled-out properly. He has not been

given his consolation prize or diploma from a terminal course and he may have become too dejected or 'turned off' to be of good use to an employer. Cooling-out by dropping out is rather crude and any sophisticated guidance counselor worth his salt would try hard to avoid this option. However, it has to be acknowledged that it is far better to have too many drop outs, as is presently the case, than too many successful transfer students at the senior college gates. The problem as junior colleges perceive it is that far too many students want to someday transfer. Parkain in Class, Inequality and Political Order has pointed out that in capitalist society, unlike socialist society, the position of the worker is fairly low in status. The capitalists do not feel that they exist at the expense of the worker. Indeed they feel they create jobs and there would be no workers without them.

Peter Newman in his book, The Canadian Establishment, continues to make the point that we could not exist economically without the somewhat eccentric economic elite. Certainly, he is right that capitalism could not exist without capitalists, but this is not exactly what he has in mind. He obviously feels that this elite has skills, without which, our industrial society would collapse.

He even stated on an interview show that if these multi-millionaires did not exist we would by necessity have to invent them.<sup>39</sup> I interject this point to demonstrate that a major ideological belief in our society is the belief in the supremacy of managerial, entrepreneurial, professional and related type positions. Blue collar, vocational and sub-profession technical work is not given high status. A glance at the Blishen socioeconomic index scale will quickly demonstrate this truth.<sup>40</sup> Consequently how could any one really expect a student to voluntarily accept a position of subordination? Why should counselors and school administrators be surprised when they find that others living in their culture believe the dominant ideology and want a share in the affluence. The question is not why the cooling out process is not more successful, the amazement is that it is successful at all.

In our society inequality is an accepted and of course desired (by some) fact. J. Paul Getty said in Time magazine, "I suffer no guilt complexes or conscience pangs about my wealth. The Lord may have been disproportionate but that is how He — or nature, if you like — operates."<sup>41</sup> There is no reason to believe that

community college students by being born into a pejorative position should be content with the inequality. The super-wealthy may feel that it is God's will that they be on top, but can any one expect the working and lower classes to believe in this claptrap? To study community colleges without referring to class structure and the dominant capitalist ideology of our society would lead to irrational and misleading results. One can not study this institution or any institution for that matter as if it existed in a vacuum and only fulfilled a narrowly defined function.

It has been demonstrated that although about eighty percent of community colleges students want to transfer, only about twenty percent do transfer. But how many get their B.A.'s from even a third-rate liberal arts college? The Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission in 1973 stated that not more than eight percent ever get a B.A., with only thirty percent of students at junior college even completing two years of any, including terminal, courses.<sup>42</sup> As for those completing two years, was it worth it? Recent census data in the United States suggest that the economic advantage of community college is hardly worth the effort.<sup>43</sup> There really is not that much of an incentive to finish junior

college for the terminal student. There is not much advantage to being a terminal student. Small wonder that people must be coerced into taking terminal programs. Interestingly, the advantages of having a B.A. are maintained. When one hears recently of the poor jobs being offered to B.A.'s, relatively speaking, no jobs go to high school graduates. That the B.A. has kept a substantial advantage over the high school graduate, adds substance to the effectiveness of the community college. The junior college is doing its job in keeping university education, elitist. It is sifting, sorting, screening and otherwise just plain blocking the admission to university of a massive number of students. This is its primary function and it has been successful. Universities are heavily state subsidized, therefore the working class is mainly footing a bill which gives this class the least benefit. The current move in Ontario to make the user pay more, that is to make the student or his parents pay more of the university cost, will not balance the situation at all. It will become more unbalanced. The working class youth will be even more pressed for funds to attend university and more likely opt for the shorter duration and somewhat less expensive community college. In other



words the universities will still be heavily subsidized and the working class representation in enrolment will diminish. The working class will end up by paying to support an institution that even fewer of them use.

## FOOTNOTES

- 1 Algo Henderson and Jean G. Henderson, Higher Education in America, Problems, Priorities and Prospects, Jessey-Bass Publishers 1975, 59.
- 2 L. Steven, Steven Zwerling, The Crisis of the Community College, Second Best, McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1976. XIV.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Edmund J. Gleazer Jr., American Junior Colleges, Sixth Edition, American Council on Education 1963, 3.
- 5 Gail M. Inlow, Education - Mirror of Change, Holt-Rinehart and Winston Inc. 1970, 360.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 L. Steven Zwerling, Seconda Best.
- 8 Ibid xxi.
- 9 Jerome Karabel, Community Colleges and Social Stratification in Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 42, Nov. 1972, 121.
- 10 Zwerling, Second Best 35.
- 11 Ibid, 42.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Ibid., 43.
- 14 A digest of Reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1974, 25.
- 15 Zwerling, Second Best 47.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Ibid., 56.
- 18 Ibid.
- 19 United States Congressional Record, Smith-Hughes Act 1917.
- 20 Burton Clark, The Open Door College: A Case Study, McGraw-Hill 1960.
- 21 Ibid., 85.

- 22 Ibid., 52.
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 Ibid., 56.
- 25 Jerome Karabel, 545.
- 26 Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, March 19, 1978.
- 27 L. Steven Zwerling, 69.
- 28 L. Steven Zwerling, 72.
- 29 Ibid.
- 30 Ibid., 310.
- 31 David R. Witmer, Is the Value at College Really Declining in Change Vol. 8 Number 11, Dec. 1976.
- 32 Jerome Karabel, 552.
- 33 L. Steven Zwerling, 74.
- 34 Ibid.
- 35 Ibid., 84.
- 36 Ibid., 85
- 37 Ibid., 94.
- 38 Thomas B. Corcoran, Community Colleges: The Coming Slums of Higher Education in Change, Vol. 4 Sept. 1972, 32.
- 39 Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Feb. 1976.
- 40 Bernard Blischen in Canadian Society, Sociological Perspectives, MacMillian of Canada 1971, 495-507.
- 41 Time Magazine Vol. 5, Number 24, 1941.
- 42 State of Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission Report 1973.
- 43 Jerome Karabel, 121.

### CHAPTER III

#### Protecting the Elite Nature of Higher Education

Realizing that only a minority of students graduate from the community college, let alone transfer to senior college; nevertheless, some do transfer. Perhaps twenty percent of the original freshmen class may transfer to a four year college or university. What is their experience? How does the supposedly cream of the junior college ranks fair in college or university? Hopefully having transferred with standing for his two years of junior college work the student will start at the third year level and be two years away from graduating with a B.A. This is the way it was supposed to happen, in theory at least. In actual fact things did not always go well for transfer graduates from a community college.

As the stress on education as a sure way for upward mobility became the official ideology of the fifties and sixties for educators and guidance counselors, many working class youths decided to go to college. Most ended up in community colleges. Senior colleges and universities, the educational

establishment and basically what constituted the dominant class in bourgeois society feared the situation of masses of working class students breaking the old barriers and going to the universities and then to professional and graduate schools. Hundreds of thousands of World War Two veterans were given free admission under the G.I. bill to go to college. Most ended up going to community college whatever their initial intention.

If excessive numbers of working class people really could be upwardly mobile would not this mean that great numbers of middle and upper class people would eventually be downwardly mobile? Since the elite by definition is a small privileged class who have expropriated a disproportionate share of the wealth, then how could the masses join the elite. The idea is absurd and impossible unless America was to become an egalitarian state. Of course, this would destroy the privileged class, so the threat was somewhat ominous. Simply telling the subordinate class that it could not go to university would cause anger, resentment, hostility and had the danger of bringing the same result of an egalitarian state about rather abruptly. Sophisticated methods of subterfuge and obfuscation of the truth of the socio-economic system

would work in providing the illusion of opportunity where none in fact existed. It had worked in the past and would continue to work. The community college would be made even more important as a pillar of support for the status quo. As university enrolment from 1950 would double community college enrolment would quadruple.<sup>1</sup> The feared teeming hordes would be mollified through a mystifying maze of confusion and doubt.

With the community college serving as a buffer zone, as it were, against the unwanted classes the senior colleges and universities could appear to be objective in their rejection of junior college students. The more senior and prestigious the university, the more exclusive and class serving it could remain. Some senior colleges would arbitrarily reduce all community college marks to C for the credit of the first two years or even make a transfer student begin with a zero grade point average.<sup>2</sup> Students were encouraged and found it easier and more profitable, in terms of credit awarded, to transfer to the poorest public four year liberal arts colleges. However, this sort of policy on the part of universities caused resentment and bitterness. Minority groups demanded equal access to colleges and universities. In other words this sort of policy was

causing open anger, the very thing that the cooling-out system hoped to avoid. Therefore, senior colleges and universities were eventually agreeable to accepting the A.A. degree from junior college as a passport to admission. They were agreeable as long as the quantity of students transferring was controllable.

Further supporting evidence to the hypothesis that community colleges do not primarily carry out a transfer function but protect the elite nature of higher education can be demonstrated by the fact that although California had in 1974 one-third of all junior college enrolment in the United States,<sup>3</sup> although eighty percent of all students in university or senior college, here, began in junior college, and although California boasts one of the highest college attendance figures in the entire world,<sup>4</sup> it actually has relatively few students achieving degrees in higher education at the B.A. level. Among nine census divisions in the United States, California shows the second lowest proportion of those completing four years of college.<sup>5</sup> The junior college system acts as a significant barrier to those desiring higher education.

#### California, Still the Innovator

Precisely because California has by far the highest per capita junior college attendance in the United States, let us look at Orange county, which has the

highest per capita enrolment in California. As the early junior college system in California proved to be a role model for the rest of the nation perhaps the developments of Coast Community College district may gradually spread across the land as social and economic conditions prove to be similar.

Coast Community College District is comprised of three separate colleges. Located in Orange County, just south of Los Angeles it is situated in the fastest growing county in the United States. KOCE - television reported recently that the average new house or condominium sells for \$107,000 and no end is yet in sight.<sup>6</sup> The newest college of the trinity, Coastline Community College, just opened in 1976. Faced with budget restrictions prevalent throughout the United States because of the sagging economy, Coastline nevertheless enjoys great success. They have followed a trend that has been pioneered increasingly throughout the country. No land or buildings were acquired. Administration offices are housed in a fairly run-down shopping plaza and appropriate college facilities have been leased, borrowed or shared on part-time use in the district. Using Madison Avenue tactics of saturation advertising and



administrators who were able to pull the right political strings the college started with over twenty thousand students signed up and eight hundred and fifty part-time faculty. Only two hundred and twenty-four were full time students although twenty-nine courses lead to A.A. degrees.<sup>7</sup> Using television courses as well as church basements, high schools, bowling alleys, the college also ran one philosophy course in the daily newspaper. Called the college beyond the campus concept, this college along with the other two community colleges in Orange County have almost one-third of the population over nineteen in the district taking at least one course at college. The district makes the claim of being the highest per-capita user of higher education in the entire world. James Real says, "they do not just offer education, they hustle it."<sup>8</sup> Bearing in mind that the concept being hustled is not indigenous to Orange County and remembering that the original community college concept came to Canada from the United States, it may well be worth looking more closely at this phenomenon. The same conditions, such as poor economic performance, rising land and building costs and budget restrictions, that gave birth to this

American concept also exists in Canada.

Broadly broken down, the curriculum has almost twenty-five hundred courses, with just over forty percent academic material. Human Sexuality proves an immensely popular course followed by introductory Marine Science and introductory Psychology. Psychology is required for the A.A. degree. Off campus students like Travel Agency, a course that requires students to spend five hours a week in volunteer work experience. Women are particularly fond of Assertiveness Training as well as Stained Glass. English (Freshman Composition) gets a lot of takers, also.<sup>10</sup>

Running the three Coast Community Colleges is big business. Expenses this year should be over fifty million. Who shares the tab? California pays 44.5 percent, Orange County 47.7 percent, the federal government 5.7 percent and 2.1 percent come from private funds.<sup>11</sup> The average age for all students has risen to over thirty-one years with thirty-seven years being average for the more open and avant-garde Coastline College.<sup>12</sup> Although more women, it would appear, are able to take advantage of the television course the overall mix of the sexes is generally fairly even. Economic conditions play an important part in enrolment and sex ratios.

Orange Coast college had a full enrolment of eighty-five hundred women and ten thousand men. The aero-space industry bounced back according to the chancellor of the school and spring enrolment stood at twelve thousand five hundred women and only seven thousand three hundred men.<sup>13</sup> Generally, defense industry cutbacks since Vietnam have meant that many formerly well paid professionals are enrolled in many courses like, small business management, travel agency, real estate and the like. Vocational training for youth in scores of occupational programs is a main function of the college system and it claims to be very successful in this field. Virtually no one is forgotten, as one seventy-year-old man reports he is taking tap dancing and secondary recovery of oil.<sup>14</sup> Incidentally there are no full-time instructors in the new Coastline college. Seventy percent come from industry and business or are local artisans, the other thirty percent are moonlighting full-time university, college or junior college teachers.<sup>15</sup>

#### Woes of the Community College Graduate

Once having transferred to the university, the community college graduates find that it costs much more money to attend university, especially since they must often leave home to attend the senior college. Financial aid is usually geared to academic performance and the junior college

student usually finds his grades dip somewhat as he commences to an often more difficult and demanding workload while encountering the usual adjustment problems of starting a new institution and competing with students who have been there for two years, already. This makes the receiving of financial aid even more difficult, causing him to spend more time on outside employment which could be further deleterious to his academic pursuits. Knoel and Medsker state that after transfer, financial problems were the main cause of junior college graduates withdrawing and not getting their degree.<sup>16</sup> Willingham and Findiley report that fewer than one senior institution in five has any aid set aside for transfer students.<sup>17</sup> Surprisingly or rather not surprisingly some schools have a policy to withhold any aid for a term to transfer students. Supposedly this is to give them extra incentive. The incentive obviously would be not to attend that particular school.

One untypical community college student of exceptional ability found that in spite of the liberal ideology the universities often just did not want even the best from junior college. This student had an excellent 3.7 average with all A's, while taking more

than the required number of courses. He designed and built an enormous radio telescope winning a Ford Foundation Scholarship which would pay up to half of his senior college expenses when he transferred. He was also a mature student having become a master tool and die maker before entering community college. He was clearly no slouch. But when he applied to Brown University after graduating from Staten Island Community College, he was flatly told that community colleges students should aspire to lesser colleges and was abruptly rejected.<sup>18</sup> Just an example to show the reality from the rhetoric. Brown University, incidently, has been considered as one of the most progressive among the ivy league set. It can be noted that in 1969, Brown University revamped its curriculum, making grades optional and dropping nearly all course requirements. Robert Reinhold reports that in spite of student protest the administration is more recently reversing the trend.<sup>19</sup> The writing on the wall throughout Canada and the United States, it would seem to suggest, is that the current economic crisis will be used to justify the reversal of gains won in the late sixties and the movement back towards the elitist tradition in these institutions. This is not to suggest that they were recently open to

all classes equally; of course, they were not. But the trend is too make them as class exclusive as they traditionally were meant to be in our hierarchical society. For example, in order to enroll in the City College of New York, a senior four year institute, a city high school graduate needed eighty-five percent. Then in May 1969 dissident Black and Puerto Rican students took over the south campus at City College of New York and demanded an open admissions policy be adopted; without any alternatives open to them, the administrators gave in and for several years the senior college had a policy of admission on a par with community colleges. Today the equilibrium has been restored. It now requires eighty percent for a New York high school graduate to be admitted into City College of New York.<sup>20</sup> Even when the environment of a university could be liberalized by enlightened faculty and progressive students, there were subtle and not so subtle ways to force the graduates back in line. Graduate schools and professional schools such as law and medicine would put pressures on undergraduate students within the newly liberalized school to acquire high grades and take the traditional courses or face bleak prospects upon graduation. The necessity of private donations upon the economic structure of a university would

readily keep the administration along conservative lines, also. Throughout all of this one point becomes apparent; the class serving structure of college and university will not, indeed can not, change unless first the structure of society changes.

The American Dream Unfolding?

The official attitude towards education is often radically different to the reality. Joseph Ben-David in the book Trends in American Higher Education writes glowingly of what he calls the United States system. Claiming that socio-economic status has much less effect on educational success than anywhere else in the world; he finds egalitarianism a major feature of the American system and charges of social injustice, to be without foundation in higher education. He states "every applicant for higher education finds a place in college and once he has entered the system even if only a junior college there are numerous possibilities of transfer. Transfers depend on academic aptitude, socio-economic status has little effect on the chances of graduation."<sup>23</sup> These views have won him the sponsorship of the Carnegie Commission of Higher Education and basically his statements are correct if one accepts an important assumption. The assumption is that the junior college

really constitutes higher education in the true sense of the word. The open door policy does allow any high school graduate admittance. That is the law at junior colleges. All classes are well represented in higher education as he implies. However, the working class representation is mainly at the community college level. Academic marks do officially constitute the grounds for transfer but only about one in seven of the junior college students will eventually transfer and receive a B.A. He says socio-economic status has little effect but states academic aptitude is the great divisor. The fact that relatively few of the working class get even an A.A. degree is easily explained by Ben-David. "A great part of this difference is however, due to differences in the academic aptitude of the different socio-economic groups."<sup>22</sup> Therefore, any discrepancy has been explained if one accepts the assumption that intelligence is a product of social class. In other words, he is saying that in America everyone with brains has a fairly equal chance in higher education. Subsequently those who fail to make it must have less academic aptitude. Once again, failure is a responsibility of the individual, not the social system.



On first blush, the United States does appear to have a great many more students, a greater percent of the population, in higher education than other countries. But, this is precisely because of the high numbers in community colleges. The junior colleges give the illusion of educational equality and egalitarianism while in actual fact upholding the class structure. As education became more instrumental in social mobility the community college stood like the great wall of China in keeping class structure discreet. Therefore, only when several unwarranted assumptions are made can the American experience appear to have any equality inherent in it. Of course, the onus is on the one making these assumptions to prove them.

Junior colleges do play a very important role in the educational establishment; but not the role they profess. William Birenbaun states that junior colleges "segregate by economic class, social status and life aspirations because of the limited objectives they frame for their students."<sup>23</sup> This limiting of objectives is the cooling-out process.

#### Canadian Development

When Ontario set up their community college system, they not only had the American experience to draw on but

they had the opportunity of studying similar Canadian junior colleges outside of Ontario. Organization and growth in British Columbia of a junior college system was both haphazard and uneven under the supervision of the Bennett Government. In 1951 Notre Dame University College became affiliated as a small two year junior college with Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington. It never had more than a handful of students; then in 1961, affiliating with St. Francis Xavier University in Antigonish in Nova Scotia, it added a third and fourth year course.<sup>24</sup> Prince George College in Prince George British Columbia, opened in 1962 with sixteen students.<sup>25</sup> Very modest beginning when compared to the Ontario experience.

A district college was opened in Vancouver in 1965 and a college began in Castlegar in 1966. By 1971 there were nine junior colleges in British Columbia.<sup>26</sup>

Therefore, not a great deal could be learned from the British Columbia experience as Ontario's plan was ready to go by 1966. But Ontario chose to go along a different road than British Columbia. In Ontario the system was centralized and state controlled. The British Columbia legislature allowed local school

districts to run the school. Indeed, Ontario created their college system partly in order to avoid the local districts from starting community colleges and controlling them. Ontario, unlike British Columbia looked towards centralized control of education.

Probably the most important early junior college to start in Canada was the one at Lethbridge Alberta in 1957. It was primarily a transfer school in the American mould. The Public Junior Colleges Act (1958) of Alberta permitted school districts, alone or together to establish junior colleges if they could affiliate with a university.<sup>27</sup>

One major reason rarely mentioned that influenced Ontario with this decision of incorporating a community college from existing institutes of technical and trade schools was the fact that federal money was available under the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act for occupationally oriented facilities, but not for general education.<sup>28</sup>

In 1967, Quebec started a junior college transfer system that numbered thirty schools by 1969. They had two year courses for university preparation and three year trade courses.<sup>29</sup> This is known as the CEGEP system or college d'enseignement general et professionnel or in English it is "general and vocational college."

The data available to reasearchers in Ontario in the early sixties, who were studying the problems that would come in education, all told basically the same story. These government employees who had to draft reports on the course of higher education knew the problem. In 1963 a Carnegie Institute paper pointed out that in a study of grade seven and eight pupils, forty-eight percent of the boys and twenty-six percent of the girls said they hoped to go to university. Another twenty-two percent of boys and thirty-three percent of girls hoped to enter other post-secondary institutions, such as technical schools, nursing or teachers college. But the Carnegie research stated that by the time these students were old enough to go to university, room would only allow thirteen percent of them to enter.<sup>30</sup> Obviously either universities would have to open their doors wide or a lot of cooling out would have to be attempted. Ontario chose the later course.

Joseph Katz, Chairman of the Department of Curriculum at the University of British Columbia has his own views on the community college. He says these colleges have attracted many students who feel university is academically or economically beyond them

or who want to stay closer to home. Then he mentions that they can function as a transfer medium also.<sup>31</sup> But to whom? Not to the student who university is "academically beyond", and not to the student who had to go to community college because for various reasons he had to live at home. In other words, he describes community college as a place mainly for those who can not go to university, then as an afterthought mentions that they can later transfer, if they wish. Of course, the whole idea is to discourage most students from transferring. The students usually want to transfer and see the junior college as a stepping stone to higher education. But the purpose of the junior college is terminal education and the desire is to lower the expectations of this majority. That only a minority transfer, attests to the success of the institution not to its failure. It has successfully cooled-out most students.

Officially the ideology has stated that unlike the United States and the rest of Canada, Ontario's community colleges are really entirely different in character. They are actually not that different regardless of what some would like people to believe. Junior college has always stressed terminal education. Reports from committee after

committee bemoan the fact that about eighty percent of students register as transfer student and only twenty percent as terminal students. How much easier and more suited to their true purpose it would be if colleges could reverse this percentage. Indeed, the various committees often ask for just this option. The schools would like most students to register in terminal courses because the problem of cooling them out would be accomplished voluntarily by the students themselves. It is the students not the administration who originally demanded transfer education. Ontario tried to end this problem by making all courses appear to be terminal. But the pressure to transfer or at least the dream of being able to transfer was too great. It is documented in this paper that Ontario CAAT students can very easily transfer now to universities in Canada often with advanced standing. The universities faced with declining enrolments are very willing to take them and are becoming more liberal in their admittance requirement, almost daily. As more community college students become aware of the ease of this option there is always the everpresent fear that too many of the 'wrong kind', i.e. working class, may suddenly demand this option. That is why many universities still put

the phrase in their calendar "case looked at individually", whereby they can arbitrarily refuse CAAT graduates without fear of appeal. That is why college calendars do not stress the transfer nature but rather the terminal nature of the school. In the eyes of the university, the community college could effectively act as a reserve army of students which in time of need (unexpectedly dropping enrolments) they could make up the slack. As long as the flow can be controlled, speeded up or slowed down, as the need arises, then community college will be functioning as desired and required.

Expansion of Canadian university in the decade before the CAAT system was staggering. As an example; Capital expenditures for facilities and buildings on campuses throughout the nation rose from twelve million in 1955 to two hundred million by 1965.<sup>32</sup> Unless a system of junior colleges were quickly established the university trend threatened to expand to the point of a universal open door university. Clearly for reasons stated this could not be allowed to occur nor could the state risk the alienation of a majority of the youth by expressly denying them access to higher facilities. The community college was an idea whose time had come in Canada, especially if the status quo was to be

maintained. F. Henry Johnson of the University of British Columbia expounds on this theme by pointing out that university admission requirements were raised and fees were also increased "but neither of these expedients presented a real solution to the problem of how to provide higher or post-secondary education for so many."<sup>33</sup> The answer, of course, was pseudo-higher education for the masses. The boom in junior colleges was startling. For example by 1967 Quebec had established twelve and Ontario seventeen community colleges, and this was not on the small enrolment scale which many of the independent western colleges commenced. No, this was a massive undertaking. The very fact that so many thousands of students quickly filled the large number of colleges demonstrates the desire for higher education latent in Ontario, at this period. Unlike the doubts of today, higher education in the mid-sixties was truly the panacea of social ills in the prevalent ideology.

#### Pipe Dream?

O.I.S.E's, W. G. Fleming laments that even by 1974 CAAT students only chose the practical education of terminal courses in community college in Ontario as secondary choice, one of the problems he asserts to "academic snobbery."<sup>34</sup> He concludes "the major hope of changing this perception of status lies in the



possibility of employment advantages swinging decisively in favour of the college graduate."<sup>35</sup>

If the community college students got the jobs while the university graduates floundered in the economic abyss then the CAAT graduate would have the status, he postulates. But let us look more closely at the implications. The majority of community college students are working class as opposed to the middle and upper class students of university. Therefore, what he actually states is this. If the working class had the employment and economic advantage over the middle and upper class they would have more status. Of course, the absurdity of the proposal marks it immediately. The upper and middle class by definition have the economic advantage. Such a proposal would mean a shifting and restructuring of the distribution of wealth in our society with the resultant destruction of the bourgeois classes. Of course, he does not mean this at all. He is just examining the change of status of the institutions that would occur if the technical college graduate was economically advantaged over the university graduate because of practical industrial necessity. Then it is true that the college would have more status and importance than the university. It is also true that

the middle and upper classes would then go to college and the working class would be regulated to the low opportunity university. It is so simple in hierarchical society; the privileged classes have the advantages throughout the society. You can not change class structure by reworking one institution and any hopeful discussion of this fantasy quickly becomes convoluted in its logic and facetious in its outcome.

In Ontario, by 1972-73 the full time enrolment in university was 133,400 and the full time enrolment in community college was about 40,000.<sup>36</sup> Clearly the educational establishment were not getting what they had hoped for. Far too many students were only going to CAAT's at last resort and even then many had the hope of eventually transferring. Difficult economic times and the slow withdrawal of government financing to needy university students give indications that this unbalance will gradually change. Perhaps eventually the community colleges will openly stress the transfer nature of the institution, as is done in the United States and some parts of Canada such as Alberta. By stressing the transfer function many more students can be attracted if the American experience is any guide.

The problem of actual transfers becoming too numerous could threaten to become a problem but sophisticated cooling-out techniques as used in American schools should be sufficient to handle that circumstance.

By 1971 there were one hundred and nineteen members of the new Association of Canadian Community Colleges in Canada; consisting of ten institutes and colleges of technology and agriculture in the Maritimes, thirty-six CEGEP's in Quebec as well as twenty-four private colleges, twenty CAAT's in Ontario, three community colleges in Manitoba, two institutes of technology in Saskatchewan, fourteen community colleges and technical institutes in Alberta, and ten regional and vocational colleges in British Columbia.<sup>37</sup>

#### Cooling-out Requirement Less Urgent in Canada

One cannot study the American educational system without quickly noticing somewhat of a difference in attitude towards higher education as compared to Canada. The myth of the American dream is much more firmly established in the United States and the belief that everyone has a right of higher education is a demand more urgently felt. Americans on the whole believe education to be a right whereas Canadians often still see it as a privilege. In other words, the working class in Canada seems somewhat more mindful of their position

in society. The Americans have sold the idea of a classless meritocratic society more fully and must face the consequences at this lie. For every B.A. granted in Canada, twenty were granted in the United States, by 1973. For every doctorate in Canada, thirty-three were granted in the United States.<sup>38</sup> These figures are out of proportion to the population differences between the two countries. The Americans can not as easily say to the working class that there is no room for them in university without arousing their hostility and wrath. Therefore, the cooling-out function has played a much larger and more important role in the United States experiences than in Canada. Canadians are more willing to recognize class structure, at least covertly, or act as if they recognize it. Arbitrary authority from above is more often seen as legitimate and more passively accepted. Canadian youth, therefore, do not have to be cooled-out to the same extent. They can be more bluntly refused access to the top. However, Canadians are increasingly digesting American cultural values and the need for cooling-out in Canada should increase in importance as the demands of Canadian youth gradually become more apparent.

The British Columbia junior college system is modeled after the United States system and allows students

to register their options. In 1970 about seventy percent were enrolled in the transfer section. Unlike Ontario it has already been stated that British Columbia allowed the local boards to develop the junior colleges. However, A. E. Soles points out that the facilities, even years after their inception, often were woefully inadequate. He states that with one exception local districts were not prepared to vote money for needed facilities.<sup>39</sup>

But the fight in Ontario was really over control, not funding as appears to be the battle in British Columbia. Local boards wanted to control the schools but very few local boards were able, and none were desirerous, of financing the whole affair. Obviously, no matter who controlled the institution, financing had to come from provincial and federal, not local sources. While the Bennett government in British Columbia allowed the local boards to set up the junior college system they purposely withheld sufficient funding to ensure proper facilities. Ontario funded their system lavishly, but only after they had complete control of the colleges. Through the economic reality the provincial government in British Columbia actually exercised a good deal of control. That the transfer function of British Columbia junior colleges must be

controlled so that only a minority actually transfer, can be inferred from Soles', Journal of Education article. He states "a large percentage of students entering university and an even larger percentage entering college are the mediocre academic ability."<sup>40</sup> Since this attitude is echoed over and over by educational authorities then certain assumptions must be made. First, since it is felt that so many entering college are academically inferior, then the seventy percent of students who hope to transfer will obviously never be allowed to, especially considering the fact that authorities feel that too many already in university are poor calibre students. Although it is rarely acknowledged openly, the big problem is to convince the transfer students to give up their goal. Jean-Marie Joly at the fortieth Conference of the Canadian Educational Association warned about destroying the present elite nature of education. She called it "the free enterprise concept of education". Allowing free access to all social classes which she said will "socialize education" would, according to Joly, mean the establishment of quotas for admission."<sup>41</sup> But who would the quotas hurt; obviously not the working class, who for all intents and purposes are already mainly excluded from universities in comparison to the middle and upper class. Certainly the fear is that with a meritocratic system too many

---

middle and upper class would be denied access to higher education.

By the early seventies CAAT's in Ontario were put on a type of formula grant system. In essence they competed with universities for educational funds. The universities did not need the CAAT's then for a source of enrolment as Ontario universities were turning away thousands of applicants for admission, yearly. Small wonder then that the university discouraged the transfer nature of community college. However, with enrolments in university suddenly starting to drop, the university is more and more welcoming, often with advanced credits, CAAT graduates. Subsequently the CAAT's, whose enrolment potential hoped for at their inception never materialized, can be expected to welcome this transfer role. The major part of the growth of community colleges in the United States can be traced to the schools stressing of the transfer function to incoming pupils. By stressing their transfer nature and institutionalizing this function openly, by allowing students to register as transfer students, the CAAT's would certainly increase enrolment. This would of course increase their financial resources. This development seems inevitable and can already be

observed to some extent. Of course, the university wants only a limited and select number of CAAT graduates, therefore, one could anticipate the cooling out function becoming more important as it is internalized into the Ontario CAAT system. Experience would dictate that the majority of CAAT graduates could never transfer, regardless of their desire.

It is significant to note the thinking behind the setting up of the Regional College for Vancouver Island, British Columbia's first true community college. Leonard Marsh's study on the topic points out that the initiators of the college used the American experience as a model for direction and curriculum. "Technical (so-called terminal study)... will be a small proportion of the total college enrolment. United States experience amply demonstrates this."<sup>42</sup> They also felt that if they tried to duplicate the freshman year of university, "only one half or one third of the students who take this year will actually continue into even a second year let alone a university."<sup>43</sup> The academic transfer program that was designed was according to Marsh, 'of university standard' but not of university specifications."<sup>44</sup> Supposedly there is a



semantical difference to Marsh.

### The Importance of Guidance

Under the heading of Counselling in what University of British Columbia Dean, Neville Scarfe calls this "classis report" a very telling and true statement is made. Discussing the counselling needs of students, March writes, "it is the ability of a college to cater for some of these needs sometimes in a way which no other institution can match, that is the true genius of the community college."<sup>45</sup> Indeed, the counselling department must administer the cooling-out of the main student body. It is certainly true that no other institution could match this function or the college would be largely redundant.

Guidance is paramount in importance in the junior college system. The Carnegie Commission recommends that the expansion of the guidance function encompass the entire faculty.<sup>46</sup> Fifteen years ago, D. A. Canar pointed out the increasing importance of that department in the community college. "Guidance centered junior colleges will maintain large counselling staffs to help guide youth into proper vocational choices and to help them adjust to an unstable culture."<sup>47</sup> What the student must really adjust to is his

unadvantageous class position in western society.

The terms junior college and community college have become synonymous. However, junior college originally meant no terminal work and all two year transfer programs. This limited original meaning would mean almost every school in the Junior College Directory is misnamed.<sup>48</sup> Terminal programs are the very system that schools generally strive for, held back only by the very resistance of the student body. Breaking this resistance is the responsibility of the institution but it is mainly the direct responsibility of the guidance department. As James Thornton Jr. says many students enter junior college with "exaggerated ideas of their intellectual stature."<sup>49</sup> Thornton begs the question of why these 'pseudo-intellectuals' chose a junior college in the first place, of course.

The guidance department functions as an intelligence unit gathering information on the student from public and high school records, aptitude tests, college teachers, application forms and subjective observation, and college marks. With the mantle of authority of his position in the college and complete knowledge of the interviewed subject, the student can usually be intimidated into accepting the guidance counselor's

interpretation of the situation. Often when a student is doing rather poorly just the thought of being confronted with damaging evidence by his guidance counselor may produce the same type of fear reaction that most pupils felt when being confronted by their high school principal over some minor misdemeanor. Nobody wants to be brought on the carpet, as it were, and many drop out or change their course rather than go through any humiliation.

Dropping out is of course a cooling out function and as such is certainly not discouraged.

A handbook for the guidance department states that:

An important function of the advising and counselling offices in carrying out their responsibilities towards the maintenance of standards is sympathetic but firm work with the student who does not belong in college, helping that student to leave without bitterness...These students should feel as free to leave as to enter. 50

G. J. Maslach, the Dean at Berkeley is not troubled by the fact that the majority of students quit before completing their two year course. He somehow rationalizes that this is an asset of the junior college. "Liberal withdrawal privileges offered to students at community colleges aids in their search for a career without penalizing them with failing grades."51

Changing their course from transfer to terminal education certainly reduces the pressure on the student. In terminal education there is not the need to cool-out the student as he is no longer a threat to the elitist university system. Higher marks may be given by instructors as there is no quota or pressure 'to keep up standards' and fail a certain number. No longer will the student be told to work harder or face sure failure later in university. The surprising thing is that in spite of the college-inspired incentives, most students simply refuse terminal education in America and choose to drop out rather than change their major to a terminal vocational course. The truth is that these students have dreams of social mobility and asking them to take a vocational course is asking them to study in order to stay in the working class. This notion just does not fit in with the prevalent bourgeois ideology that people in our culture inherit or are indoctrinated into believing. Old ideas whether true or not, often die hard and that goes for the myth of equal opportunity.

How much easier it would be to drop the myth and have the college assign students to each course. But as Thornton states, while the college could choose

successfully, the procedure would not work. They must honour the cultural concept of individual responsibility and personal freedom, but the educators fear the choice. Indeed the students choose to get higher degrees. Thornton laments "insistence on student choice is a travesty of freedom, unless the student has adequate information... The provision of this information is the task of the guidance program."<sup>52</sup> The importance and function of the guidance department becomes quite apparent. Leland L. Medsker in his book The Junior College expresses the desire of educators again, "The task would be easier if American philosophy condoned the arbitrary channeling of students into educational programs."<sup>53</sup> Call it American philosophy or bourgeois ideology, the fact is that students have to be indirectly pushed or coerced into the directions desired by their superiors. The cooling-out function becomes imperative under the existing socio-economic system.

#### FOOTNOTES

- 1 L. Steven Zwerling, The Crisis of the Community College, Second Best, McGraw Hill Book Co. 1976, 231.
- 2 Ibid., 232.
- 3 Alain Touraine, The Academic System in American Society, McGraw Hill Book Co. 1974, 103.
- 4 Jerome Karabel, Community College and Social Stratification in Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 42, Nov. 1972, 521.
- 5 Ibid., 535.
- 6 L. Jones Real, The Learning Society, California Style, Coast Community College in Changes, Vol. 10, March 1978, 23.
- 7 Ibid., 24.
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 Ibid.
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 Ibid., 25.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 Ibid., 27.
- 16 L. Steven Zwerling, 246.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Ibid., 247.
- 19 Ibid., 343.
- 20 P. J. Rondinone, Open Admissions and the Inward "I" as in Change, Vol. 9, May 1977, 47.
- 21 Joseph Ben-David, Trends in American Higher Education, University of Chicago Press, 1972, 3.

22 Ibid.

23 William M. Birenbaum, *Overlive, Power, Poverty and the University*, Delta Pub. Co., 1969, 159.

24 John B. Macdonald, *Higher Education in British Columbia and a plan for the future*, University of British Columbia 1962.

25 F. Henry Johnston, *A History of Public Education in B. C.*, Morris Printing Co. Ltd. 1964.

26 W. G. Fleming, *Educational Opportunity, the Pursuit of Equality*, Prentice-Hall of Canada Lt. 1974, 83.

27 J. D. Wilson, R. M. Stamp, L. P. Audet, *Canadian Education: A History* Prentice-Hall, 1970, 424.

28 Ibid., 425.

29 Ibid.

30 Gill Mohindra *Carnegie Study of Identification and utilization of Talent in High School and College* 1963, 25.

31 Joseph Katz, *Education in Canada*, Archan Books, 1974, 73.

32 *Financing Higher Education in Canada* Association of Universities and colleges of Canada, 1965, 23.

33 F. Henry Johnson, *A Brief History of Canadian Education*, McGraw-Hill Co. of Canada Ltd., 1968.

34 W. G. Fleming, *Educational Opportunity*, 34.

35 Ibid.

36 Ontario Ministry of College and Universities, 1972-73, *Statistical Summary*.

37 David A. Stager, *Some Policy Problems in the Financing of Colleges Across Canada*, July-August 1971, 34.

38 D. A. Lawr and H. D. Gianey eds, *Educating Canadians - A Documentary History of Public Education*, 1973, 239.

- 39 A. E. Soles, Journal of Education, University of British Columbia, Vol 61, April 1970.
- 40 A. E. Soles, The Role of the Two Year College in Creating a New Design for Post-Secondary Education in British Columbia in The Best of Times - The Worst of Times, Holt, Rinehart & Winston 1972, 293.
- 41 Jean Marie Joly, CEGEP's, A Major Innovation in The Best of Times-The Worst of Times 1972, 298.
- 42 Leonard Marsh, A Regional College for Vancouver Island, Best-Printer Co. Ltd. 1966.
- 43 Ibid., 74.
- 44 Ibid.
- 45 Ibid., 32.
- 46 A digest of Reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1974, 25.
- 47 D. A. Conar, An Analysis of Ten Significant Forces Related to the Development & Organization of Junior Colleges, unpublished dissertation, Northwestern University 1963.
- 48 James Thornton Jr., The Community Junior College, John Wiley and Sones Inc. 1966, 73.
- 49 Ibid., 32.
- 50 A. F. Decker, R. Jody E. Brings, A Handbook on Open Admissions, Success, Failure, Potentials, Westview Press 1976.
- 51 G. J. Maslach, Educational Articulation., The Transfer Process and the Transfer Student in Public Higher Education in California, 1974, 247.
- 52 James W. Thornton, The Community Junior College, John Wiley & Son Inc. 1966, 39.
- 53 Leland L. Medsker. The Junior College, McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc. 1960, 142.



## CHAPTER IV

### Neutral College, Ontario

A comprehensive and in-depth series of interviews was carried out at one of the relatively typical Ontario community colleges. At the request of some of the interviewees, it was agreed not to name the college involved; therefore, it will simply be called Neutral College. Meetings were arranged with those whom it was assumed would be able to provide the best information on aspects especially involving transfer students, class backgrounds, the cooling-out function and graduate placements. Instructors or Masters especially in the Social Sciences, counselors, student activity directors, manpower liason officers, relevant secretaries, various registrar officers, information officers and those with administrative decision making powers were all interviewed and virtually all contacts resulted in fairly lengthy and usually informative conversations.

#### Pursuing the Drop Out Rate

The people approached often reported that they had never met anyone doing a study on the school before and usually, after a short initial period of slight defensiveness or bewilderment, those questioned proved to be quite friendly and helpful, sometimes

even suggesting additional source material to aid this study. This is not to say that I received complete co-operation in gathering pertinent statistics, as such was not the case. Information on drop-out rates, for example, resulted in obfuscation, a change of subject or when pressed, polite refusals. However, this most important information proved available eventually from a high-placed source in the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, in Toronto, thanks to a tip from a worker in the registrar's department at Neutral. This information proved to be so pejorative in nature that several instructors remarked that they had no idea the drop out rate was nearly so high. The president of the school after quoting a much better success rate was taken aback by these statistics. Smiling he remarked "You're very well informed, aren't you." He then admitted that his statistics were doctored, somewhat. That is instead of taking a cohort group and following them through two or three years, depending on the program, to a true picture of those who left school, he instead used other means. The college, he said, in order to improve the statistics, took a one year sample of students and merely multiplied by two

for a two year course or three for a three year course. Naturally, this bogus method provided a much more pleasing picture of the success of the community college. The true success rate which will shortly be discussed shows the community college system in Ontario to be virtually the same as the junior college system in the United States when it comes to the dismal drop-out phenomenon.

American critics have pointed to the high drop out rate as a direct result of the cooling out function. It is the contention of this paper that the Ontario CAAT system experiences the same drop out rate because it performs the same cooling-out function on Canadian working class youth as it accomplished on their American counterparts. Even though the American junior colleges profess to be transfer media and the Ontario community colleges officially claim to no part in this function, the facts are that both systems have a transfer function. Only a minority of students transfer in the American system and an even smaller minority transfer in Ontario. But both systems effectively cool-out their working class clientele. It has already been demonstrated that of the fifteen percent who do get B.A.'s after transferring from junior college in the United States, virtually all are middle class youth. Instructor after instructor

has remarked that the CAAT system is slowly changing to that of a middle class college as contrasted to the working class nature of a decade ago. It is ironic that as more students transfer from CAAT to university, as universities encourage this process, those transferring will likely be the same middle-class students that one normally would expect in university. The sobering fact remains that the majority of students in both the American and the Ontario systems never make it through to graduation and pick up any kind of diploma. In the United States many of those who make it through to graduate, pick up terminal A.A. degrees that lead nowhere. In Canada many of those who make it through end up with marks too low to transfer or have a record of one or even more years of failure as will shortly be shown.

#### Visiting Neutral

Upon entering the campus of Neutral College several things became evident. There is a great deal of unused open space for future expansion, and budget restrictions have forced the school to charge for parking and look for revenue producing schemes. One way they have found to make money is to rent out parts of a giant air bubble sports complex to area groups and clubs. Monetary restrictions have brought most new construction to a

standstill although enrolment continues to grow, albeit at a reduced rate from several years ago. The administrators constantly bemoaned monetary restrictions. Very little income comes from a per capita formula like the universities enjoyed, therefore, the community college faces the prospect in 1978 of increased enrolment, nine percent inflation, teachers wanting a substantial increase or threatening strike action as they are presently working without a contract, and a revenue increase from the Ontario government of approximately 5.6 percent. Since eighty percent of the budget goes for wages and salaries, teachers are already being fired. Although the dismissals are usually done on a seniority basis, many senior instructors say they fear for their jobs and are more mindful to do as they are told.

Although the college is spread out over several campuses in the metropolitan region the main campus houses the vast majority of full time day students. Gazing at the school from a distance one is immediately struck by the massive fortress type nature of what at first glance appears to be a dark huge almost windowless armory. Upon entering, most prominent is a booth, manned by several security guards, containing various electronic controls. The halls are large with

skinny lockers lining the walls. On every locker is the name of the student user, his number and his program. The bulletin boards are sparsely used and each notice has a large black stamp on it, "Approved for posting student activities department.". Unlike American junior colleges where the guidance department acts as a policing system for discipline problems and acts to convince students that they do not possess the academic ability to transfer to university; the guidance department in this Ontario community college even bristles at the name "guidance". Such a concept of guidance suggests a little coercion, they maintain, and this is the last thing they would ever attempt. They are right. The counselling department at Neutral handles psychological and psychiatric problems as well as problems of adjustment and various social problems. They discuss vocation choices and academic problems as well, but they are definitely soft-sell. The tough approach at Neutral and other CAAT's is handled by the chairman of student activities or student services and the program director. Indeed, early in this century the job of director of student services was aptly named warden.<sup>1</sup> He told me that

the community college has a different type of student than the university. A younger student (many only seventeen) who is apathetic to politics. "Eighty percent never read a newspaper", he lamented and suggested that they are easy for those in authority, such as the state, to push around. He should know.

Walking through the building, something seems odd, yet at once reminiscent of high school in the sixties. Although school is in session and a couple thousand students must be in this huge building, the halls remain relatively deserted. Attendance is compulsory and students are in class. The contrast with the university atmosphere is at once striking and evident. Whereas at the university students are always wandering, milling and meandering around, often with heavy coats on, the college student like the high school student appears coatless and moving briskly toward some destination. The mood is much more formal and conversations overheard, often concern future job prospects or talk about school work.

#### Interpreting the Skilled Manpower Shortage

In the basement of Neutral College, Canada Manpower has a group of small offices whose purpose is devoted to placing graduates of Neutral in some sort of paying job. This is what is commonly referred

to as "success rate" around Neutral. Graduates of the college who originally register as looking for work with the placement office are checked on one year after graduation. Those gainfully employed are considered a success for the college. These are the figures that the school system routinely pass to the newspapers to justify their existence. These success rate figures are incredible--Business, ninety-eight percent; technology, ninety-six percent and applied arts, seventy-two percent. When questioned on the failure of the CAAT system to supply the needed skilled manpower for industry, manpower placement officials had this to say: "Canadian Industry is responsible for the skilled manpower shortage. Canadian industry will not train apprentices in needed skills." Indeed they are correct, Germany has over four hundred thousand apprentices...to Canada's twenty-five thousand although the German population is only about three times as large as Canadas. The corporate state has relied on immigration mainly from Europe to try to fill the skilled manpower shortage. A large percent of our industry is foreign owned or controlled and



just as they are not interested in doing research and development in the Canadian branch plants, they are also not interested in training skill manpower for the future. CAAT colleges were not set up to fill the skilled worker shortage nor is there a concerted attempt to get them to fit this role. Only a minority of students are in the technical section of the colleges. Indeed, if the state had wanted to meet the need for skilled manpower it would not have brought in the community college system. Rather, the enormous expenditure of resources used to operate the CAAT's could have been used to greatly expand the institutes of technology and have been used to promote apprenticeship training in cooperation with industry. The very fact that the corporate state did not carry out this program, which is obviously needed by the corporate state, shows greater urgency and necessity felt by those in power to accomodate and pacify what was perceived as a more damaging threat to the status quo. The corporate state needed skilled manpower, of course. But, they feared something that would be far more damaging than a skilled manpower shortage. They feared the

reaction of a working class who had expectations of upward mobility which existed only in myth. The elite knew that the expectations could only be met at the ultimate expense of the elite. In other words, those few who held most of the wealth feared they would lose it unless a way could be found to preserve the status quo. The working class would have to accept their subordinate position and lower their expectations or 'tighten their belts.' The junior community college system had proved successful in cooling out this class in the United States and the Ontario elite felt the same need. Keeping control of the means of production was the overriding need. Only when this is understood can the confusion and obvious waste in the CAAT system even begin to be comprehended.

The concerted publicity in the media over the last year or two questioning the value of a degree and touting the value of community college has had an effect in these economically pressed times. Students with university degrees are increasingly applying to community college. Neutral's registrar informs us that two to five percent, depending on programs, have some university experience. He admits that a Phd. has

applied for a computer science program. "This", exclaims the president, "is a waste of resources and taxpayers money". However, the usually controlled president momentarily bristled with anger when it was earlier suggested that the huge drop out rate at college was a waste of resources. He quickly rationalized that even a short time at community college could be of lasting lifetime benefit to the student even though he never graduated.

Some of the instructors felt that the CAAT system used to cool-out the working class more effectively, but the increasing middle class nature of the school meant that the working class was not as likely to remain in the school system. This they felt would produce a working class which could not be so easily pacified in the future. Other instructors felt that universities were going back to their traditional elite function and this was a good thing as too many working class youths were already attempting to go to university. "The working class must be cooled-out and trained for jobs", was the way one senior instructor put it.

Unlike the United States where most instructors in junior college have Masters degrees and many

have Phd's, the situation in Ontario is quite a bit different. Many, especially in the business and technical divisions, in Ontario, have no formal academic qualifications. In the social science section, which is as close to an academic division as Neutral has, the instructors may be divided into three fairly even categories. There are those with plenty of experience in their respective field, but no formal degree; there are those with a B.A. degree or its equivalent and there are those with an M.A. or equivalent degree. No requirements to publish are made on the instructors nor is there generally any pressure to upgrade their formal education.

There is some internal pressure to upgrade the community college system to that of a degree-granting institution. Indeed, in 1972 a committee on post-secondary education had a proposal number thirty-two, which would allow colleges to grant degrees. The presidents were asked to discuss this proposal with various faculty and administrators in their respective schools and the Neutral president said that as it turned out, nineteen out of twenty colleges finally opposed this proposition.

Nevertheless the schools are kept on a tight rein by the ministry. All curriculum changes must be passed by the ministry and the ministry decides how many students each school must take in each specific course.

#### The Transfer Nature

Finding out about the actual transfer nature of Ontario's CAAT's proves to be a frustrating and ultimately impossible task. For, actually no one even in the Ministry of Education, knows the numbers that transfer to university with at least some community college. Universities in Ontario surprisingly refused or did not send in a record to the ministry on well over a quarter of all new students in the 1977 fall term. Of the information that was released about five percent had community college or Ryerson backgrounds. Even this would appear to be a jump over the available figures for other years. The government statistics for previous years are only released on first year entrants from CAAT's or Ryerson. Unfortunately, many enter into the second year as is reflected in the 1977, five percent figure. However, just taking entrants into year one of university of those schools reporting, a

figure is obtained of 3.3 percent for fall 1977. This compares to released figures of 1.9 percent CAAT background in 1972, 2.1 percent CAAT background 1973, and 2.2 percent including Ryerson background in 1974, and 2.8 percent in 1975 also including Ryerson background. Unfortunately, the Ryerson statistics cloud the CAAT background somewhat but for reasons of their own, starting in 1974 the ministry decided to lump Ryerson in with the CAAT students for these background statistics. What can be extrapolated is this: more students are transferring from the CAAT system. Perhaps so many that over a quarter of universities will no longer report the background of their new students. We can assume that the figures for transfer would be greater, if all schools reported as previously appeared to be the case. It is tempting to believe that those now refusing to report this figure may be hiding increasing numbers of transfer students accepted because of the adverse reaction this may cause. Universities are in a competition for students to increase their per capita grants. They have greatly lowered standards recently to CAAT graduates. This lends supporting evidence to the suggestion that the CAAT system is a transfer system similar in nature to the rest of North

American colleges.

Dismal Drop Out Rate

Finally examining the statistics that are so carefully kept from the public—the drop out rate or real success rate of Ontario community colleges—we find the same startling failure and quitting rate that is so often lamented south of the border. Taking an appropriate cohort group we find that by 1977 graduation, only forty-seven percent of two year program students were getting their diplomas and only thirty-four percent of three year program students put on their gowns! Not to say that all the rest dropped out; many failed a year and were still registered and others changed their programs, perhaps because of poor marks and guidance from the director of student services.<sup>2</sup>

## FOOTNOTES

1 Graduate Committee, department of Education, Wayne State University, 1974, 9.

2 Students in 1977 from two year program (1975 cohort group), graduates, 9,517 or 47 percent; withdrawals, 1961 or 39% and 2584 still active (failed or changed programs or otherwise not withdrawals).

Students in 1977 from three year program (74 cohort group) graduates, 3280 or 34%; withdrawals, 5014 or 51%; still active, 1319 (failed, changed program or otherwise not withdrawals).



## CONCLUSION

Looking forward to the future, it can not automatically be assumed that junior college will continue to expand and flourish. The cooling out process through the medium of the junior or community college system, is taking ever greater resources to maintain and presents an increasing burden on a weakened North American economy. It is precisely because the working class have rising expectations that do not subscribe to their status in the class structure that they must be cooled-out. Therefore, a concerted attack, by the dominant class, on the ideology of upward mobility and rising expectations may be necessary as a last desperate effort to maintain the status quo. The goal would be to keep university elitist and to get the working class to accept their role and willingly take terminal vocation education or willingly seek working class jobs after high school. The ultimate danger to the dominant class is that if the working class is encouraged to give up the dominant ideology which encompasses the American dream of upward mobility and which is a false ideology

for them in reality anyway, then they will be pushed further along in developing a class consciousness of their own. However, the corporate-state elite would appear to be now forced into taking this perilous journey. Already a steady ideological campaign aimed at the subordinate class questions the monetary value of a university education and stresses the untold benefits of technical or vocational education. Voting with their feet the working class have steadfastly refused to support terminal technical education. Indeed, even in Ontario where there is officially no real transfer function to the community colleges and technical training is heavily stressed we find that students have ideas of their own. Looking at the latest statistics for graduates (1975-76) released in February 1978, we find technical education in fourth place in the number enrolled in the CAAT system, solidly behind health, applied arts and business.

The truth still remains that even in the United States where the B.A. is much more common and may be obtained from some questionable liberal arts colleges it has already been exhibited in this thesis that the value of a B.A. has maintained a significant monetary advantage, even taking into account the non-earning years spend in university. Conversely,

the value of a community college or junior college diploma, in the United States at least, as has already been mentioned previously, is almost negligible and there is little reason to expect a change.

Therefore, to sum up the point being made: if the working class lower their collective expectations they will not have to be cooled out or pacified. If they believe that university has no value, they will not have to be cooled out. If they voluntarily choose terminal technical education, they will not have to be cooled-out. If they do not have to be cooled out then the necessity of community college as a bulwark of the class structure would be negated. As they now exist community colleges only serve to help reproduce the present social order.

## APPENDIX

### The Mohawk College Board of Governors in 1968

J. A. Charlton - Nominee of Brant County - veterinary surgeon. Former (Conservative) M.P. was parliamentary secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Past president of Ontario Federation of Agriculture.

C. Clemons - Secretary - manager of Holstein Friesian Association. Connected with agricultural associations.

J. W. Hodgins - Dean of Engineering at McMaster.

W. T. Lisson - Appointee of City of Hamilton. International staff representative of United Steelworkers of America.

Mrs. G. C. McAuley - Chairman of Personnel Committee of Hamilton and Wentworth Childrens Aid Society and Senate member of the Ontario Educational Association.

J. E. Milne - Vice-president of Chambers and Company Limited. - past president of Hamilton Junior Chamber of Commerce and Hamilton Advertising and Sales Club as well as member of urban renewal and area planning board committees.

J. A. Moor - Economic Development Commissioner for Hamilton. Was manager of the Education and Public Relations Department of Canadian Manufacturers Association; general manager of Hamilton Chamber of Commerce., director of industrial commission, former Senate member of McMaster.

J. G. Smith - President of Mohawk-Mill Limited in Hamilton. Past president of Chamber of Commerce.

J. Stowe - Urban Renewal Commissioner, past president of Hamilton and District Labour Council.

W. K. Warrender - Chairman - had been Minister of Planning and Development, Minister of Municipal Affairs; Minister of Labour in Ontario. Served on County and District Court Bench.

-134-

H. L. Waterous - A Governor of the Canadian Corps  
of Commissionaires.

B. F. Wood - Deputy reeve of North Grimsby Township.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Digest of Reports to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962.
- Ben-David, Joseph, Trends in American Higher Education Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Birenbaum, William M., Overlive, Power, Poverty and the University, New York: Delta Publishing Co., 1969.
- Blishen, B. R., Jones, F. E., Naegele, K. D. Porter S. Canadian Society, Sociological Perspectives, Toronto: MacMillian of Canada, 1971.
- Byrne, N. Quarter, J. eds., Must Schools Fail, The Growing Debate in Canadian Education Toronto: McClland and Steward Ltd., 1973.
- Canar D. A., An Analysis of Ten Significant Forces Related to the Development and Organization of Junior College, unpublished dissertation, North-Western University, 1963.
- Clark, Burton, The Open Door College: A Case Study New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Corcoran, Thomas, Community Colleges: The Coming Slums of Higher Education, in Change, The Magazine of Learning Vol. 4, No. 7, Sept. 1972.
- Decker, A. F., Jody R., Brings E., A Handbook on Open Admissions, Success, Failure, Potential, Boulder Col.: Westview Press, 1976.
- Financing Higher Education in Canada, Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1965.
- Fleming, W. G., Educational Opportunity, the Pursuit of Equality, Scarborough: Prentice Hall of Canada Ltd., 1974.
- Fleming, W. G., Post-Secondary and Adult Education, Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1971.
- Folger, J. Astin, H., Bayer A. Human Resources and Higher Education New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.

From the Sixties to the Seventies, Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario, June 1966, prepared by Presidents Research Committee University of Toronto, 1967.

Gleazer, E. J. Jr., American Junior Colleges Sixth Edition, Washington D.C.: Council on Education, 1963.

Graduate Committee, Department of Education, Wayne State University, New Dimension in Student Personnel Services, Detroit: 1974.

Grant, Venn, Man, Education and Work: Post-Secondary Vocational and Technical Education, Washington: American Council on Education 1964.

Harris, Robin, Changing Patterns of Higher Education in Canada, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

Harris, Robin, Quiet Evolution, A Study of the Educational System of Ontario, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Harvey, Edward, Lennar, Joseph, Key Issues in Higher Education, Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1973.

Henderson, Algo, Glidden Jean, Higher Education in America, Priorities and Prospects, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Inlow, Gail, M., Education - Mirror and Agent of Change, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1970.

Johnson, F. H., A Brief History of Canadian Education, Toronto: McGraw-Hill Co. of Canada Ltd., 1968.

Johnson, F. H., A History of Public Education in B.C. Victoria: Morris Printing Co. Ltd., 1964.

Joly, J.M., CEGEP's, A Major Innovation in The Best of Times, The Worst of Times, Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Junior College Personnel Programs: What They Are and What They Should Be, Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

- Karabel, J., Community Colleges and Social Stratification, in Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 42, November 1972, President and Fellows of Harvard College, 1972.
- Katz, Joseph, Education in Canada, Conneticut: Archon Books, 1974.
- Katz, Joseph, Society, Schools and Progress in Canada, Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1969.
- Knoel, D., Medsker, L., From Junior to Senior College Washington D. C.: Council on Education, 1965.
- Lawr D. A., Gianey, R. eds, Educating Canadians, A Documentary History of Canadian Education, Toronto, Van Nostrand Reinhold Ltd. 1973.
- Macdonald, John, Higher Education in British Columbia, A Plan for the Future, Vancouver: University of B.C. Press, 1962.
- Marsh, Leonard, A Regional College for Vancouver Island, Vancouver: Best Printer Co. Ltd. 1966.
- McConnell, T. R., A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1962.
- Medsker L., The Junior College, Progress and Prospect, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Mohindra, Gill, Carnegie Study of Identification and Utilization of Talent in High School and College, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963.
- Ministry of Colleges and Universities Statistical Summary 1975-76, Ontario: 1978, Statistical Summary 1970-71; 1971-72; 1972-73; 1973-74.
- Ontario Council of Regents for Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, Second Annual Report, April 1, 1976 to March 31, 1977.
- Ontario Statutes, 13 and 14, Elizabeth II 1965-66. An Act to Amend the Department of Education Act, Toronto.



- Parkin Frank, Class, Inequality and Political Order, Social Stratification in Capitalist and Communist Societies, St. Albans: Granadia Publishing Ltd., 1972.
- Participatory Planning, Council of Ontario Universities, Sixth Annual Report, 1971-1972, Toronto.
- Real, James, Coast Community College, the Learning Society, California Style in Change, the Magazine of Learning, Vol. 10, No. 3, March, 1978.
- Rondiuone, P. J., Open Admissions and the Inward "I" in Change, the Magazine of Learning, Vol. 9, No. 5, May 1977.
- Smelser, Neil, Almond Gabriel eds., Public Higher Education in California, California: University of California Press, 1974.
- Soles, A. E., The Role of the Two-Year College in Creating a New Design for Post-Secondary Education in British Columbia in The Best of Times, The Worst of Times, Toronto-Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.
- Stager, David, Some Policy Problems in the Financing of Colleges Across Canada in Canadian University and College, July-August, 1971.
- Stevenson, H., Stamp, R., Wilson, J., Eds., The Best of Times - The Worst of Times, Contemporary Issues in Canadian Education, Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada Ltd., 1972.
- Stimulus and Response, Council of Ontario Universities, Sixth Annual Review, 1971-72, Don Mills: T. H. Best Print Co. Ltd., 1972.
- Thorton, James Jr., The Community Junior College The Philosophical basis of the Community College, New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc. 1966.
- Touraine, Alain, The Academic System in American Society, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1974.
- Towards 2000, The Future of Post-Secondary Education in Ontario, Sub-committee on Research and Planning, Committee of Presidents, Toronto, 1970.

Useem, Elizabeth and Michael, The Educational Establishment, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1974.

Variations on a Theme, Fourth Annual Review Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario 1969-70, Toronto.

Vermilye, D. W. ed, Learner Centered Reform, Current Issues in Higher Education, Washington: Josey-Bass Publishing, 1975.

Wagner, Geoffrey, The End of Education, New Jersey: A. S. Barnes & Company 1976.

Wilson, L. ed., Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.

Witmer, David, Is the Value of College Really Declining, in Change, The Magazine of Higher Learning Vol. 8, No. 11, Dec. 1976.

Zwerling, L., Steven, The Crisis of the Community College, Second Best, United States: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1976.