Une analyse plus raffinée permettra sûrement d’apporter des réponses nouvelles à ces aspects toujours passionnants d’équité, de démocratisation, et de mobilité inter-régionale. L’important ici est de prendre les choses pour ce qu’elles sont, i.e., une description très générale des caractéristiques de la population étudiante de niveau post secondaire. Il ne fait aucun doute que toute la richesse des renseignements recueillis reste encore à exploiter.

Simon Landry
Université d’Ottawa

Le ruban magnétique contenant les données de l’enquête des étudiants de niveau post-secondaire au Canada s’obtient de M.J.E. Wicks, Directeur adjoint, Sous-division de l’éducation, Direction de l’éducation, des sciences et de la culture, Statistique Canada, Ottawa, K1A 0T6. Exemplaires du rapport de recherche lui-même s’obtiennent de M. Bill Ahamad, responsable Recherche socio-économique, Direction de l’aide à l’éducation, Secrétariat d’état, Ottawa, K1A 0G6.


The question of accessibility to post-secondary education is admittedly complex and can only be properly studied from a number of perspectives. One such perspective is now available through the publication of very readable highlights of the Post-Secondary Student Survey, 1974-75. Written jointly by Bill Ahamad, David Zussman and Anne Bowen, this report examines the question of accessibility from the point of view of students already in the post-secondary sector, to determine the extent to which participation rates differ between various socio-economic groups in the general population. In addition, this well written and laid out report touches on many important issues directly related to the question of accessibility to post-secondary education, such as the importance of government sponsored loans in reducing the inequalities of participation, the extent to which students are economically self-sufficient, the factors affecting students’ choices to attend community college instead of university, an analysis of the profitability of private investment in higher education, and much, much more.

Unlike most government written statistical reports, the authors have shown that numerical information can be presented successfully without being dry or overwhelming. They have achieved this through the use of many colorful charts and very readable narratives which highlight the information conveyed in appended statistical tables. As an added bonus, the report although overly cautious in its conclusions, discusses freely policy implications of the survey’s findings in a manner not possible had this information been released through Statistics Canada.

Unfortunately, all these extras come at a price. In order to provide a timely release of as broad a view as possible of the results of the survey, the report entices and quickly frustrates the serious reader by merely scratching the surface of some significant issues which deserve much fuller treatment through in-depth analysis of this survey’s data. For example,
the major question of accessibility to post-secondary education by various socio-economic groups could have received greater attention. Of interest would have been an analysis of the proportionate representation of these various groups to their respective representation provincially and nationally. The treatment could also have been improved by comparing the findings to those of a similar previous exercise carried out in 1968-69. (See Post-Secondary Student Population Survey 1968-69. Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Queen’s Printer, Ottawa, 1970.) Such comparisons could indicate how the characteristics of post-secondary students and the participation of different groups of the population have changed since that time. This comparison could identify trends in the participation of students from low-income groups to provide indicators of the changing importance of student loans.

The choice of opting for a quick and comprehensive highlight report was, however, deliberate. One can only hope that the Department of the Secretary of State is equally deeply committed to publishing the same high quality of work in follow-up studies designed to explore in-depth some of the fundamental issues touched upon in this highlight report on the Post-Secondary Student Survey 1974-75.

Klaus P. Beltzner
Science Council of Canada

The Post-Secondary Student Survey data is available from Mr. J. E. Wicks, Assistant Director, Education, Science and Culture Division, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, K1A 0T6. Copies of the research report itself are available from Mr. Bill Ahamad, Chief, Socio-economic research, Education Support Branch, Department of the Secretary of State, Ottawa, K1A 0G6.


On October 10, 1975 the Ontario Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities jointly invited tenders for “The Secondary/Post-Secondary Interface Study.” The study was divided into three projects and the contracts for these awarded separately. Project I, “Roles and Responsibilities of the Secondary and Post-Secondary Institutions,” was awarded to a private company, Canadian Facts Company Limited. Project II, “The Nature of Students,” went to a group within OISE. Project III, “The Nature of the Programs,” was conducted by a group from Queen’s University. The contracts were awarded December 15, 1975 and were to be completed by November 18, 1976. Considering the intended scope of the study, not much time was available to the researchers. The study was completed on January 18, 1977 and consists of some 2000 pages. In addition, there are two summaries of the study, both of which have been jointly produced by the two Ministries. The first is entitled Secondary/Post-Secondary Interface Study: Summary Report (136 pp.) The second is called The Secondary-Postsecondary Interface Study: Summaries of the Research Reports (32 pp.), and is a summary of the summary.

The complete report consists of the three projects noted above plus a further project entitled “Inter-project Analysis” which combines the data in Projects II and III. It had be-