

Garnet McDiarmid (ed.) *From Qualitative Change in Ontario Education*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1976. Pp. 190. \$10.50.

This book, a selection of readings, has three purposes: to honor Dr. R. W. B. Jackson, the founding director of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education on his retirement; to assess the first ten years of OISE's existence and to examine the general trend in Ontario education during this period; and finally to question the role of education in the future and to suggest some directions and/or remedies. Like most books of readings its success is uneven.

Dr. R. W. B. Jackson retired last year from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education after many years devoted to the service of education. As a teacher in a one-room school in Alberta, through his years as a leading figure in the development of educational policy, to his most recent post at OISE, Dr. Jackson has left a stamp on Ontario and Canadian education. Most of the readings in this *festschrift*, written by Dr. Jackson's colleagues at OISE, indicate that he did, indeed, play an active role in determining educational policy. George E. Flower in "Graduate Studies in Ontario Education at the Three Quarter Century Mark" credits the great growth in graduate education (faster than in any other field) — to Jackson's direction. John W. Holland in "Education, Public Policy and Personal Choice" claims that Jackson helped formulate the public policy that expanded educational opportunities would help Canada get and hold highly skilled, expensively educated workers. Because his forte was statistics he was able, according to Holland, to forge a link between data on existing and forecasted conditions and decisions on budget allocations. Alan M. Thomas in "Funny Things Happen on the Way to Parnassus" relates the director's role in balancing the social needs at the beginning of the decade with individual needs. This resulted, he says, in a large, wealthy, educational establishment based on what soon became outmoded constants—uniform participation in successive grades, identifiable institutions, and certification programs and processes. In "Trends in Society, Trends in Curriculum" Garnet McDiarmid points out that over its ten years of existence OISE under Jackson had been having an increasingly wider impact on Ontario education. (If the public is not happy with Ontario education maybe OISE should be the scapegoat.)

The second purpose, that of looking at both OISE and Ontario education during the ten year span, was more difficult to accomplish than the tribute to Dr. Jackson. Edward B. Harvey in "Dimensions of a Decade: Canadian Higher Education in the Sixties" describes the growth and diversification of the 1960's—more of everything—colleges, universities, institutes, teachers, programs, courses. He indicates that this expansion was an effort to achieve a greater measure of equality of educational opportunity. Along with this expansion went an increasing emphasis on the goal of social and cultural development rather than academic specialization. Harvey's assessment of the growth and changing emphasis is accurate, but is a trend away from academics and towards sociality "quality"? The "Quantity" from the books' title is obvious; the "Quality" is ambiguous.

Flower looks at the ten year period as one of growth in graduate studies in education, but he doesn't show an analysis of this growth. What purpose is accomplished by detailing graduate growth without indicating some reasons why educational growth should outstrip other disciplines or what this kind of development means to the educational establishment in Ontario. Did the graduate growth take place because OISE was liberally funded, or had education become respectable as a field of study, or had our school systems (elementary and secondary) reached gigantic size and produced gigantic problems. Flower suggests that the growth is somehow related to the establishment of OISE. He gives no reasons for this assumption. The effect on educational development in Ontario is not documented.

Alan M. Thomas indicates that during the 60s school systems lost their centrality, their unity and their sense of purpose. The custodial function of the school grew; at the same time preparation of the labor force changed as the country discovered a large number of adults with redundant skills; and the relationship between education of the young and economic development began to erode. "Shifting Ideologies Among Youth in Canada" by Jack Quarter attempts to show that the achievement orientation among youth is weakening and this has been caused by industrial development. One might agree with his hypothesis yet quarrel with his statistics. Surely arts and science students have always been undecided about careers. And hasn't youth forever been restless (e.g., modern day students in France and Japan; students at medieval universities). Another point he makes is that the strongest opposition to our society and the educational system comes from the successes, from the wealthy. Is this so surprising—the poor can't afford the luxury of dropping or stopping out.

Garnet McDiarmid argues that the 60s were a time of dilemma for education. The intuitive, egalitarian spirit of New World expansionism, i.e., every man is equal to every other man began to clash with the notions of elitism and assumptions of hierarchical authority derived from our European traditions. For example, a school system setting terminal examinations which are used for selection purposes is obviously imposing an authoritarian practise which limits equal access by age, by language, by ability to answer certain questions, at a certain time, for a specific purpose. Also during the 60s the hidden curriculum, the socialization

process, came out into the open. The idea that the school should quietly train conforming members of society began to weaken. Its outward manifestation, McDiarmid says, was such things as beards, pantsuits, short skirts, turtleneck sweaters, long hair, debates over corporal punishment, terminal examinations, and behavior codes. What it did do was to make more people aware of the idea that "the climate of a school is a functional part of its curriculum" (p. 158).

The main idea the majority of authors are emphasizing is that the 60s started out with exuberance and optimism, only to have this turn into confusion, no-growth, and the upsetting of many of the old traditional values and attitudes toward public policy and individuals. OISE's role and accomplishments during this rapid growth period and subsequent slowing down are not well documented in this text. However, the authors do assume that change in Ontario educational thinking in this era is a direct result of OISE's work. Without necessarily undermining the work at the Institute one would have to at least question this assumption. Alberta, for example, has gone through much the same kind of change, and there is no "OISE" in Alberta.

That we have reached the mid 1970s with a public, a policy and educational system that have a much different purpose and viewpoint is a problem for educators. This relates to the third purpose of the text: to question the future role of education and to suggest some directions or remedies. The authors agree on the problems and suggest solutions. The equal access problem, the individual choice trend, the need for flexibility and life long learning, the restlessness of youth, the move toward and interest in value education and humanistic education indicate changes for the future. Harvey believes that the two traditional criteria—money and intelligence—must be removed from even the discussion of equal access. McDiarmid sees a role for the curriculum in achieving equal access and believes universities and secondary schools together need to deal with equality of access, with retention and with curricula pre-requisites. Holland is concerned with personal choice and the notion that in the future people will no longer be willing to forego liberties to achieve progress. He sees the necessity for some compromise. Jack Quarter obviously believes the students have become active in this area and they are the ones insisting on an education related to their needs and desires. Life long learning and the removal of the association of education with only the young has already begun. Alan Thomas suggests getting rid of the pyramidal structure, so that admission to one level is not dependent upon admission to another. He would define the two systems in terms of skills and levels of knowledge. He wants to reconsider in detail the form of formal education—"What structures will serve greater freedom for both young and old in making broad career choices" (p. 116). Clive Beck in "Education and Basic Human Values" plugs the introduction of value education. He believes that the goal to help students in general to live life well (shades of D. J. Goggin) can be accomplished through basic human values. Beck says that "the notion that schools may foster a reflective, non-indoctrinated morality that is of considerable value to students but is not necessarily tied to a particular sectarian religion" (p. 144) has come of age. This attitude toward moral or value education sounds like Horace Mann's solution for the common school! What makes Beck believe it will work any better today than 125 years ago? McDiarmid argues that in an age of personal autonomy the humanities should play an important part. Indeed if he is correct, a wider range of satisfying, prestigious occupations, outside the commercial, industrial base, would arise. McDiarmid proposes participation at all levels in the authority hierarchy—an idea which has far reaching consequences for the traditional school. However he must know that the success of this at the university level over the last few years has been singularly weak. Why should participation be more effective in the future and at lower levels? Does McDiarmid know something that has escaped the rest of us? In order to assess whether ideas have any value, whether they are in fact accomplishing what they set out to do, William E. Alexander in "Policy Research and the Concept of Goal" has devised a new research design for policy researchers to identify goals and to test for success or failure of these goals. He is concerned not only about the articulation and criteria of goal selection but also how to accomplish any goals that are determined.

"From Quantitative to Qualitative Change in Ontario Education" is an interesting attempt at evaluating change in Ontario education in the 60s and 70s. It has caught some of the turmoil and frustrations of the time period as the economy slowed down, the populace grew more conservative in thought, and personal autonomy began to take precedence over public policy. However, to indicate that because the boom days of expansion are over and educators generally must be more careful of budget allocations and in turn program offerings that therefore Ontario has gone from 'Quantitative to Qualitative change' is a rather sweeping generalization. Does a concern for and a questioning of one's terms of reference and direction necessarily imply that quality will follow?

NANCY M. SHEEHAN
The University of Calgary