

JOHN PORTER,
Carleton University,
Author of The Vertical Mosaic.

INEQUALITIES IN EDUCATION

An address given at a conference on Canada's Class Structure: Implications for Education, on March 1, 1968, at the University of British Columbia.

It is with some hesitation that one comes from Eastern Canada to talk about the democratization of education. If judgments are made in quantitative terms British Columbia in general and Vancouver in particular have superior educational systems to all the other provinces. In school retention rates, in the proportion of the higher age groups in school, and in the educational level of its labour force British Columbia does much better than the East. Moreover, there appears to be for these higher levels of educational qualifications a corresponding subjective counter-part or a cultural evaluation of education which is also higher in British Columbia than in other parts of the country.

From the recent career decisions project undertaken by the Federal Department of Manpower we can take a number of items which illustrate this cultural evaluation. For example, in response to the question, "Do you think you will leave school soon, leave later, or stay until finishing?" put to samples of high school students across the country 81 percent in British Columbia said they would definitely finish high school compared to 67 percent in Ontario and 61 percent in Quebec. In response to the question "Among your friends in school, how many are planning to finish high school?" 82 percent in British Columbia said all or most of them, compared to 74 percent in Ontario and 60 percent in Quebec. Moreover, there is a greater consistency between students' plans about education and parental wishes in British Columbia than elsewhere which might lead us to conclude something about child-rearing practices.

The career decisions project when the analysis is completed will tell us more about the state of education and its relationship to democracy on a comparative provincial basis than any other source. From the viewpoint of my own interests I look forward to much light being thrown on the relationship between social class position and educational experience. Even in British Columbia where the educational system has the highest outputs and therefore appears to be the most democratized some relationship between class and educational experience will be found. I do not have direct evidence to support this although it has been well established for Canada as a whole. If the relationship had disappeared British Columbia would be almost unique and whilst no doubt—and here I can speak as a native—it is very special—it cannot be all that different.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS IN TRANSITION

I want therefore to speak in more general terms drawing on a range of comparative data concerning the transitions in educational systems as societies become increasingly industrialized and as they try to make plans for

the post-industrial future. There are two impelling factors at work. One is the need for a more highly skilled and professionalized labour force, and the other is the increasingly widespread egalitarian values about educational opportunity. Fortunately these two factors—the exigencies of the post-industrial world and social values—are complementary rather than conflicting, although there would still seem to be a body of opinion which holds, incorrectly I am sure, that inevitably more means less because there is a fixed pool of ability, and so educational systems cannot be egalitarian.

The educational systems of all western industrial societies are undergoing close examination at the present time to see how they are coping with these two factors. The evidence so far emerging is depressing. All these societies are failing to produce the range of fully qualified manpower that they require and all of them show a shocking waste of human resources as judged by drop-outs, and all show a persistent inability to become democratic by eliminating the class factor from educational experience. It is interesting that the international federation of teachers unions made the relationship between class and education the theme of their 1966 congress. Moreover, there is another serious deficiency in these systems in that, in general terms, they are not teaching the right subjects sufficiently well and in sufficient quantity for the kind of society which is emerging. One only has to consider "the swing from science" which is now going on in the educational institutions of all western societies to understand the seriousness from the point of view of manpower. Moreover, all these conditions which can be considered dysfunctional to a post-modern industrialized society are most in evidence in the United States, which we always consider as having the most advanced and the most democratic of educational institutions.

But the U.S. system is failing to produce the highly qualified manpower that the United States labour force needs, and, at the same time, is experiencing a retreat from democratization or at least a failure to provide educational opportunities to its poor and to its non-white population. As one critic of the U.S. educational system said recently, "The good elementary and secondary schools that helped make American cities good places to live in are now in the suburbs where the middle classes and particularly the professional classes live." Every year the United States imports scientific and professional workers—chemists, physicists, physicians, teachers, engineers—because its own institutions do not produce enough for its needs.

Canada is very much the same. The great industrial expansion which has followed the second world war would have been impossible without the importation of large quantities of skilled and professional workers. Canada imported capital to make its contemporary industrial system, but it also imported the skills. In many respects it can be said that industrialization was in Canada, but not of it. It is not only that we were, as someone said, one generation off the farm. From the point of view of the realization of our educational needs we were very much still on the farm in the 1950's when over half the male labour force had less than eight years of schooling—totally inadequate standards for industrialization. Since that time school retention rates have improved, our universities have expanded greatly and there have been introduced in many provinces new and more appropriate forms of non-university post-secondary education. But no education minister

can sit back. The labour force requirements are being constantly upgraded and more and more young people must be trained and must acquire the motivations for training to constantly improved levels where disciplines become more exacting. Canada still imports large quantities of trained people. Our universities send recruiting teams to the United Kingdom. Toronto next year is bringing a plane load of teachers from Australia and staffs its hospitals with nurses from Britain.

One could go on indefinitely to demonstrate these inadequacies. I have indicated them briefly because to a great extent they can be traced to the inequalities which I want to deal with, and the solution lies in policies of further democratization. One might say that a system is reaching a measure of efficiency when it is meeting its labour force needs and when it is giving the appropriate kinds of education for the ranges of talent that exist. If I appear to overemphasise the labour force requirements as opposed to the other purposes of education such as the development of personality or the meaningful use of leisure, it is because I think the labour force problem in all industrial societies is serious and also because I believe there are no incompatibilities in these various educational aims.

SOURCES OF INEQUALITY

Inequalities are not all financial or economic although there is no doubt that economic conditions continue to be substantial barriers. Other sources of inequality which I would identify, in addition to the financial, are those arising from structural factors within educational systems and processes themselves, and those arising from cultural factors which are detrimental to high educational aspirations. I would like to deal with each of these sources of inequality. To some extent it will be necessary to draw on evidence from outside Canada if only because research has gone much further and concern is much greater in other countries. Also, elsewhere there have been attempts to develop coherent educational policies on the national level and to view the question of the development of human resources as a national goal. In Canada we steadfastly maintain the fiction that education is not a national problem and does not require national planning. There was a time when a great deal of sophistry went into distinguishing between something called technical education in which the federal government was allowed to participate, and pure education, from which it has always been excluded.

At the present time there is a parallel sophistry developing about education and research. Another reason for drawing on materials from elsewhere, apart from the general lack of Canadian data, is that comparative analysis is fruitful in both social research and in policy-making. If other industrial societies are coping with the same problems then it is instructive to see what they are doing and the mistakes they have made—and these are plenty. Thus I am going to say something about comparative perspectives on inequality in education.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL INEQUALITIES

First, let us look at inequalities which arise from economic and financial considerations. The relationship between social class and educational experience has been demonstrated for every major industrial society. Usually

the method is to show that the higher the social class position of the family the greater is the likelihood of young people staying in the educational stream. Consequently the upper years of the academic high school in North America, the grammar school in the United Kingdom or the lycée in France, and the universities everywhere, become class biased institutions. I have tried to show in some publications how this relationship applies in Canada. One might simply cite 1961 census data. In families where the male wage earner earned more than \$7,000 a year, half the children 19 to 24 years old were in school, but where the male wage earner's income was less than \$4,000, less than one-eighth were in school. In the last survey of university student income and expenditure in Canada in 1965 just under half the students in the sample had fathers in the top two categories of proprietors and managers and professional occupations.

Although Canada fits into the pattern of other modern industrial societies in this respect it has done much less than other countries about it. It is true that costs attaching to secondary education are gradually being eliminated. The changes in Quebec have been radical and the progressive elimination of text book costs in Ontario have been helpful. But we still lack any system of grants paid to parents to encourage them to keep their children in school. For many lower class families children automatically go into the labour force at the school leaving age. In some countries it is recognized that some compensation is necessary for the foregone family income when older children stay in school. Moreover, as the educational content of occupations increases it may be more necessary to consider family subsidization if we are really serious about the problem of inequality. (One might add parenthetically here that such universal welfare measures as the family allowance and allowances on income tax do not help the lower classes. The family allowances are not enough and lower income groups do not pay income tax. Thus some measure of selective welfare seems to be called for in respect to family educational grants.)

It is, of course, at the tertiary level of educational systems that the class character is most marked. As far as costs to the student are concerned, I suspect Canada has one of the least democratic educational systems to be found in advanced societies. In most European countries this aspect of the problem has been dealt with boldly by having an entirely free system right up to the most specialized and prestigious institutions of higher learning. Moreover, grants are paid to students for living and other expenses associated with remaining in the educational stream. In Canada, in the survey of student income and expenditure which I mentioned earlier, no more than 9 percent of all student income came from fellowships, bursaries, or grants, while 17 percent came from loans, 21 percent from the parental family, and 25 percent from summer savings. In Canada the costs of post-secondary education continue to be abnormally high for an advanced industrial society.

Education thus becomes a commodity valued differently at different social levels. Because of its cost, the educational horizons of low income families are near rather than far-off. Higher education is not a realistic choice and thus there are repercussions back into the lower levels of the system where children become committed to particular educational streams because they are viewed as less expensive or a reasonably quick route to the

labour market. Even at the university level, the relationship between the degree programme selected, say education or arts programmes as opposed to medicine or law, where there are differentials in cost and the time involved, and the class background of the students has been shown in a number of surveys. Education has not been democratized when the middle and upper classes are over-represented at the upper levels of the system, and when there are significant class variations between those doing the cheaper degrees and those doing the more expensive ones.

These objective facts of the class character of the educational system also have their subjective counterpart in the way in which the system is viewed by the students in it. In the career choice study of high school students in response to the statement, "If my family were of a different social class, I would have a better chance of getting ahead in life," 26 percent indicated agreement. For Grade 8 boys it was 49 percent, but was reduced to 28 percent at Grade 12 and 27 percent at Grade 13. These falling proportions of high school boys who feel they would have a better chance if they belonged to a different social class is to be expected because of the dropping out of lower class students before the higher grades are reached, although there are still a large proportion who feel the effect of class on their chances. Girls feel the effect of class much less (39 percent at Grade 8 falling to 16 percent at Grades 12 and 13). As some explanation of this fact we have the Hall and MacFarlane study of the transition from school to work where, for the Ontario town which they studied, they were able to show a much more reasonable fit between educational programmes and the occupational world for girls than for boys. Of course we could surmise that the class requirements would be viewed by boys as greater because it is still the male who as family head determines the class position and life chances of family members. Women suffer other kinds of inequalities in the educational systems to which we can return later.

It is surely only a matter of time before these financial impediments are removed either by the abolition of fees or by an award system which makes higher education a genuine possibility for the children of lower income families. We must have something better than, for example, the Canadian student loan scheme which is perhaps one of the most inadequate elements of an educational policy yet seen. It appears to be increasingly popular, not because students like it, but because there is little else. Most provinces are increasing the amounts of money available for grants and bursaries, but the student populations are increasing greatly, both in the university and in other tertiary institutions. Not only does this, or any other loan scheme, create a class of white collar debtors, but it has little or no appeal to lower classes, who often are so much in debt in any case simply to acquire the minimal cultural standards, in, say, housing and health, that more debts for higher education would scarcely be thought of. Indebtedness for higher education can be a class penalty, for the need to go into debt increases as the family's resources are less or as the family members to be educated are more. Some students cannot face up to such indebtedness and leave university, but for the more able who do graduate I suspect that the debts built up as an undergraduate become a considerable impediment to going on to graduate work. Thus by forcing good students out in this way from the manpower point of

view a loan scheme can be regressive. However, an adequate grant or award system for university students—however desirable—may not be enough or even have the highest priority. I am increasingly convinced of the need to subsidize low income families to keep their children in school at the secondary level.

SOCIAL CLASS BIASES

When the financial barriers are removed at all levels of the educational system the process of democratization has just begun. The most striking and perhaps the most disappointing impression that we get when looking at systems where financial barriers have been removed, is that educational institutions are still class biased. In the United Kingdom, for example, the educational reforms which followed the second world war and which removed the costs of grammar school and university education resulted in greater lower class participation in these institutions, but they by no means achieved the degree of representativeness that was their purpose.

It is important to know why they failed so that we might look at our own society to see to what extent we are making the same mistakes. I think these mistakes could be grouped into the remaining two categories of inequalities—those stemming from structural factors and those stemming from cultural factors. Let me deal first with the structural factors. By structural I mean different types of schools, streams, and programmes which are thought to cater to different educational tastes and capacities. I would also include, as structural, the governing and financing of educational institutions.

Like all elements of social structure, those pertaining to education harden into a set of practices which become very difficult to change. Perhaps because changes are difficult to implement and have been won only with great difficulty, it takes a long time to bring about the next change. Yet, considering the rapidity of social change in modern life, experiment and flexibility are important, and there is great scope for experimentation in education.

Let us take as an important feature of most educational systems the differences in programmes and streaming or tracking. In Europe, these have meant systems of the early selection of the more able pupils and the less able and their early commitment to particular educational programmes which for the most part take place in separate schools. Systems of early selection always favour children from the middle and upper social classes. There are really no true culture-free techniques of selection. Lower class children live in environments which are restrictive of their intellectual development. Middle class children are exposed at an earlier age and in greater intensity to a range of cultural items which have become important in the measuring of intelligence and aptitudes. Their parents, moreover, have a better knowledge of the system and can prepare them for it. Middle class parents can turn failure in being selected into success by dealing with teachers and school administrators as social equals or superiors rather than social inferiors which is very frequently the experience of the lower class parent. Some lower and working class children are able to compete in this selection system, but they tend to be the exceptionally able.

Once selection has taken place, there is a commitment to an educational

stream which is practically irreversible. There is an accumulation of evidence that the system of selection for grammar schools in England and the lycée in France is both inefficient, because the selection is not one based on true ability, and undemocratic, because it places working class children at a disadvantage. Consequently, the pressures for reform have been great; those which are gradually being introduced involve the postponement of choices until a later age (for example, the abandonment of the discredited "eleven plus" in England), combined with cycles of orientation during which the child is exposed to a greater range of subjects. Moreover, there is an abandonment of the selective school in favour of the comprehensive school. Although everyone concerned will deny it, there is, in both Britain and France, a drift toward the North American comprehensive high school system.

If, in the present movement from elitism to egalitarianism in education in Europe the traditional systems are changing in the direction of the North American model, what can North American systems learn from watching the European changes and listening to the debates which they generate? I would think there is much to be learned, particularly of the kinds of problems which impede the construction of a thoroughly democratic system and how research might throw light on them. I wonder if we are aware of the selective processes we have in our educational systems and how these might operate differently for different social classes? Within the elementary schools, what are the social background characteristics of children who are selected for special treatment in accelerated or enriched classes? What are the long-term educational effects of this selection on those who are set at a slower pace so very early because they have not had the advantage of a middle class childhood?

At the point of entrance to secondary school, where the most crucial educational decisions are taken, to what extent is the teacher's, principal's, or any school official's advice about an appropriate programme based on a stereotyped view of class or ethnic differences in the capacity to perform well? We place enormous responsibility on guidance departments in operating our systems of selection. I wonder if these selectors have purged themselves of the stereotyped view that working class children are limited in their ability because of their father's occupational status. Of those who have rid themselves of such distortions of reality, how many choose to advise on the reality principle? That is, to advise a lower or working class child out of an academic programme because they know the system is weighted against such a child going the whole distance, given the costs and the psychic strains.

EDUCATIONAL GATEKEEPERS

How much do we know about the people who control the various gates through which children must pass in the school system? In a course which I teach, one of my favourite discussion topics is, "Should political leaders be examined by psychiatrists?" I would not suggest that the selectors or "gatekeepers" of our educational systems be submitted to such examination, but I do think some research on their attitudes and values might be revealing.

Once again we can expect some important data to come out of the career decisions project mentioned earlier. The guidance processes in schools are one of its major interests. For example, it found that of all the teachers

or counsellors involved in guidance almost seven-tenths held no certificate, diploma, or degree in guidance. Moreover, 63 percent of them, and 79 percent of the principals, felt there were insufficient guidance personnel in the school. We should expect properly trained guidance teachers to be particularly sensitive to the cultural loading of many of the instruments of selection, of the very considerable therapy that may be necessary with children from inhospitable environments, and, as well they must know a great deal of the occupational world and the post-secondary systems. Another question from the career decisions study is illustrative of the kind of problem which we have. When asked "When do you feel a student knows enough about his interests and abilities to choose his programme or course of study in high school?" 67 percent of the teachers and counsellors said after two years or more, and 58 percent said that it took two years or more for a teacher to know the best programme for a student. One wonders just how much over-commitment there is in the first two years. In any case this cycle of indeterminacy should be one of maximum flexibility and maximum exposure to variety. I suspect there are important class variations here. One would hypothesize that the lower the social class the more selector mistakes would be made.

I have suggested that many of our educational gate-keepers operate with stereotyped views of student suitability for educational programmes. Nowhere is this more evident than with the education of women. We know how poorly represented women are in the professions and other occupations requiring high levels of training and ability. In the United States for example only 8 percent of the registered scientific manpower are women. The selectivity which results from this kind of distribution results from a believed-in labour market situation, but it can also be traced to a set of cultural values. One would also find, I am sure, sex and class operating together in the sense that the gate keepers will make different judgments about girls of different social background even though they may be equal in other respects.

We need, then, to know how the selective elements in our own educational systems operate differentially against those of different class backgrounds and lead, for example, to the present distribution of students by social class in the various streams of the secondary system. I would suspect that, the financial problems set aside, the class bias that we find in the universities has its origins in the way in which pupils get put into the different streams, and, in particular, the way in which lower class children are under-represented in the college preparatory courses. All these questions have been thoroughly explored in other countries, but in Canada there seems to be a reluctance to admit social class as a relevant background variable in any kind of social analysis.

The most recent of several great inquiries into the English educational system was published early in 1967. This was the Plowden Commission report on primary schools. Important among its findings was the identification of educationally deprived areas where the physical condition of elementary schools was poor and the environment generally undesirable. As well, classes were large, and there were special pedagogical problems associated with teaching children from depressed lower class neighbourhoods. The Commission recommended what they called educational priority areas where there

should be a national policy of "positive discrimination" aimed at giving disproportionate financial resources to the more deprived areas and schools. To what extent ought *we* to examine *our* prevailing financial arrangements, our taxing and grant systems, to discover whether we also need policies of positive discrimination to overcome regional and neighbourhood deprivations. I suspect that as our urban areas expand, there are emerging class and ethnic and immigrant neighbourhoods where educational resource needs are quite different. There would be a need for teachers with the special skills required to teach lower class children. As Patricia Sexton has said in her examination of educationally deprived areas in American cities, the achievement gap between the classes becomes noticeable at an early age, and the gap increases as the effects of the environment are felt over time.

DIFFERENTIATED POST-SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

There is one final structural factor which I want to mention. That is, the differentiated systems of post-secondary education, which are now emerging with community colleges and colleges of applied arts and technology as an alternative to the university. There is no doubt that from the point of view of manpower needs—that is, the rapidly expanding sub-professional occupations, and from the point of view of aptitudes—that is, some have a greater capacity to master difficult material than others—the lower level college is an important advance. I suspect, however, that the class base of this new selective system will become marked. For one thing, fee structures will be different, but those factors which I reviewed earlier making for class differentiation early in the educational process will have had their full effect. Socio-economic factors will then operate to vitiate a sound educational policy. This has certainly happened in many parts of the United States. For example, in the city of San Jose, California, in the late 1950's the representation of working class youth in four nearby colleges is striking. At Stanford it was 6 percent, at the University of California, 17 percent, at San Jose College, 45 percent, and at San Jose Junior College, 62 percent.

CULTURAL FACTORS

I want to now consider the cultural factors which make for inequalities in education. Foremost among these is the evaluation which different classes place on education. I have elsewhere suggested that Canadians generally place a low evaluation on education—low, that is, for the kind of occupational structure which Canada now has. I do not know of any studies in Canada that explore in depth the working class sub-culture with the peculiar attitudes and values which mark it from the middle class sub-culture. The bundle of motives which the middle class child acquires in the process of being socialized to his culture includes the desire to achieve and the desire to move up or at least maintain a middle class position. It has often been suggested that it is the middle class family that has managed to transmit these motives to a sufficient number of its young people to fill the occupational roles of industrial societies up to a particular point in the development of these societies. After all, it takes some degree of determination to put up with the irksomeness of learning and some degree of commitment to educational values. Our occupational structures are evolving to the point, however, where such atti-

tudes and values must reach down into the working class sub-culture where they are less widespread and less firmly held. Where, as in Canada, ethnic and religious sub-cultures tend to reinforce class sub-culture, differences in the evaluation of education will be more marked.

Along with all the evidence about school and university attendance and social class is the complementary evidence of how educational attitudes of parents, and mobility and occupational aspirations of children vary by social class. This is only now becoming available for Canada, but it has existed for some time for other industrial societies. Educational policy-makers have too readily assumed that it is sufficient to provide educational plant free, or almost free, to all takers and throughout the society all young people and families will respond in the middle class fashion. This does not happen, of course, and there are many reasons why. It is wrong to assume that aspirations to move up in the occupational system are strong in the lower or working classes. Some studies indicate that in the lower classes the search and desire for security are more important than the desire to move up, while education serves the need of the middle class person to move up and is seen as being important for that reason, it tends not to be appreciated in such a way by working class young people, nor is it particularly seen as serving their prime need for security. Working class parents in the main have low levels of education themselves and, therefore, cannot adequately transmit the appropriate values about education to their children. Moreover, it is not easy for children to set themselves on a route which will take them out of the working class culture. Kinship links are strong as are sentiments about neighbourhood and community. There are elements in the working class culture which put a high evaluation on the dignity of manual work. Working class political movements and labour organizations have emphasized the worthiness of the working class way of life, and our major religions have endowed it with a theme of the blessedness of poverty. The working class sub-culture which has developed with the growth of industrialization may have been appropriate in an earlier period, but seems out of date in the more advanced industrial system, at least as far as it has a detrimental effect on educational aspirations.

The democratization of education means that a person's social class background is no longer a relevant factor in the amount of education he receives or the kind of educational programme he pursues. Undoubtedly, the removal of financial barriers is an important step in the process of democratization, but as I have tried to indicate, there are substantial structural and cultural impediments that remain. Policy-makers decide how and to what extent they are going to intrude into these culture areas where education is not highly valued. They may prefer not to intrude at all for fear of violating principles of freedom. We have seen something of this dilemma when dealing with ethnic or cultural groups who resist the education of their children. The working class culture is not, of course, *coherently or solidly against education*. Rather, there is simply a low evaluation of it. Often it is considered that parents have a right to choose the amount and kind of education for their children. That, at least, is the position of the traditionalists and the conservatives in Europe in their efforts to protect the highly selective systems that exist there. But education is also a social right belonging to growing and maturing

children and there may be grounds for policy makers dealing much more vigorously than formerly with all these factors standing in the way of the equal distribution of these rights. When the discussion shifts to the need for highly qualified manpower in the advanced industrial society based on science and technology, the arguments for overcoming cultural resistances to educational values are equally strong. As is often the case, the rights of individuals and the needs of society are complementary rather than inimical.

INEQUALITY IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

There is one further aspect of inequality in education which is increasingly demanding our attention and that is the inequality of the educational process itself. The old authoritarian methods of instruction and hierarchical organization have come under attack at all levels. University students want to govern their colleges and if we researched the problem we would probably find the four year olds about ready to take over their nursery schools. I was struck the other day when a student prepared a paper for a seminar on the topic "Can our educational systems ever be made democratic?" In my naivete I had assumed that the term democratic would have been applied to the overall structure of society and the paper would have dealt with some of the problems which I have tried here to review. It was not about that at all. Rather it was a critique of the methods of instruction in schools and universities, methods which paid no attention to the needs of students, which allowed students no say in what they should do or study, which forced examinations on students without their consent, and which demanded standards of performance from an old and decaying world which was alien to modern youth. You are all familiar with this kind of criticism. The models which are put forward as replacements contain such things as "free learning experience," and "sensitivity training" in schools where children cafeteria style could pretty much learn what they wanted, when they wanted, and at the pace they wanted. There would be no "productive activity" in the traditional sense because that is what makes our present schools factories with assembly lines producing human epsilons for a technological labour market. If the Brave New World is to be avoided, classrooms must be run like Quaker meetings or going to school must mean spending the day barefoot with guitar at "information and activity centres."

This present criticism of authoritarianism in education raises two questions. How much democracy can the transmission and acquisition of knowledge allow before it breaks down, and the second is whether a new democracy within schools will aid or hinder the inequalities of education which exist because of the class structure of society. In the first question I think there are very great limitations on the degree to which democratization can take place. Contemporary occupational structures require the assimilation of more complex subject matter, particularly in science and engineering, but also in almost all fields which are a part of our highly industrialized society. These disciplines cannot be learned without concentration, application and hard work, and a conscious desire for excellence. There is nothing easy about learning. One cannot master contemporary mathematics or nuclear physics or become a ballet dancer or a violinist without work that is both irksome

and tiring. (Perhaps that is why the guitar is so popular. There are no standards and everyone can learn it.)

If large numbers of young people feel alien in the emerging culture of science and technology they should feel free to reject it as long as they realize that if their position were universalized we would also be rejecting the benefits and potential benefits of this culture. In some respects such young people can be regarded as casualties of our child-rearing and school systems, and so we might have to devise therapeutic institutions—and that is what the free learning movement seems to be about. But it should be remembered that education is learning and not therapy. Education in the sense of the transmission of complex knowledge must always have a strong element of the authoritarian and it can never be made easy and carefree however much we might long for such idyllic conditions. The free learning movement is, I suspect, a middle class phenomenon, and so is unrelated to the wider problem of democratic education. But very often the schools have been alien also to the lower class child and have become for both teacher and pupil custodial rather than educational. The school culture has been middle class, the teachers have been middle class or have been in the process of being upwardly mobile into the middle class, and the models have been middle class. My point is not that the middle class standards and models have been wrong—some, but not all, may be—but that they are often meaningless to those below the middle class and this incongruence contributes to the under-representation of lower classes in the educational system. It seems to me that with both the middle class student in therapy and the lower class student in custody there are great needs for research and experiment in educational processes. We obviously have no grounds for being complacent.

L'article de Porter ne se résume pas facilement. Nous espérons vous présenter une traduction complète de "Inequalities in Education" dans la prochaine édition du *Conseiller Canadien*.