

Professional Legitimation for Education in Canadian Universities: The *Canadian Journal of Education*, 1976–1997

Donald Fisher
University of British Columbia

The history of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE) has been profoundly influenced by changes in the role of the Canadian State. The introduction of social welfare legislation based on Keynesian economics was paralleled in the social sciences as the state adopted first a supportive role, then an active, interventionist role with regard to funding social science research. The inclusion of education in the social science field is set within the broader structural trends in society toward professionalization and utilitarianism. The dominance of human capital theory and the strategic component of the developing national science policy during the 1960s typify the latter trend. As in other industrialized societies, the aristocratic ideal of civility has been overtaken by the professional ideal, which according to Perkin (1989) is “based on trained expertise and selection by merit...[emphasizing] human capital rather than passive or active property, highly skilled and differentiated labour rather than the simple labour theory of value, and selection by merit defined as trained and certified expertise” (p. 4). The predominance of

this ideal in modern society is clearly linked to the emergence of the interventionist state and its emphasis on the public good.

The immediate and most important contributing factor in the emergence of CSSE was the boundary work (Fisher, 1988, 1990, 1993) done by educationalists through institutions, research, and publication to create a distinct territory, education. The objective throughout the post-war period was to fashion education into a scholarly discipline. The ideology of science was dominant, and emphasis shifted from practice to research: instead of creating new territory for a study of education as a distinct discipline, educational researchers opted to follow the accepted route toward the achievement of social scientific disciplinary status. The pressure to increase research activity since the late 1930s, the creation of various professional associations representing the burgeoning number of university faculty, and gradual inclusion in the Learned Societies and the funding categories of the Canada Council and then Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) were all part of this struggle. These activities came to fruition within the phenomenal expansion of education during the 1960s and 1970s.

The 1960s and 1970s were a time of tremendous optimism and excitement in Canadian universities: the expansion of the system and of graduate study changed the nature of university education in Canada (Healy & Dion, 1978, p. 44). Between 1960 and 1975, 16 new universities were established and the number of universities offering graduate programs rose from 28 to 47. This period saw a dramatic expansion both in the number of graduate students and the scope of offerings.

Over the same 15-year period, the number of administrative units and the number of full-time faculty in education in anglophone universities rose from 25 to 120, and 290 to 1,869, respectively (Fisher & Edwards, 1999, p. 15, Table 3). Against the background of this phenomenal expansion, CSSE was created in 1972 as the first national organization claiming to represent all Canadian university researchers. In 1973, CSSE became a member of the Social Science Research Council of Canada (SSRCC) and thereby formally recognized as a Learned Society.

CSSE was created to integrate and coordinate the efforts of the national scholarly education organizations. The aim was to increase the amount of educational theory and research in the universities and to represent this scholarship to national external audiences. In May 1972, a Constitution Committee chaired by Jean-Marie Joly (Université d'Ottawa, secretary-treasurer, CSSE) was created to revise the initial draft Constitution.

In the version adopted at the Annual General Meeting of the CSSE at the 1973 Learned Societies meetings, the objectives were:

- To encourage and undertake scholarly study and research in education.
- To undertake professional activities which serve the purposes of the Society and the interests of its members.
- To provide for the membership a forum for the presentation and discussion of studies in education.
- To represent the interests of members to other bodies concerned with scholarly and policy issues in education.
- To encourage the publication of journals and of other studies in education.
- To represent members of the Society to other groups.¹

At the same meeting, a report—“The Research Role of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education”—was discussed and subsequently approved in principle. The report described appropriate research activities and essentially expanded the first objective in the Constitution. Five aims were listed:

1. CSSE should promote the cause of educational research through whatever means are available to it...
2. CSSE should seek fiscal support from governmental public and private sources for research activities initiated by the Society, the Constituent Associations and the membership...
3. CSSE should act as a liaison agency with national associations of other countries interested in international research and scholarly activity.
4. CSSE should serve as a national clearing house for research endeavour in education...
5. CSSE should exercise initiative in identifying areas of needed research...; improving the standard of research interchange at CSSE sponsored conferences... Establishing a balance among those substantive areas in which research is

¹ Constitution and Bylaws, May 30, 1973. File 2, CSSE Establishment, Box 1, Canadian Society for the Study of Education Papers (CSSEP), Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa.

reported; and encouraging an increased emphasis on Canadian content in research.²

The Canadian Journal of Education

A key component of the boundary work undertaken to consolidate CSSE's status as a legitimate professional organization and the cognitive authority of academic research undertaken by educational researchers was the establishment of a peer-reviewed journal. To achieve the constitutional objectives, CSSE took over publishing from the Canadian Council for Research in Education (CCRE) and during the first year concentrated mostly on the conference proceedings. The CSSE Publications Policy Committee was created in 1973 and it focused on the *Information Memo*, the *Bulletin*, which was designated as the journal of the Society, and the first Yearbook.³ The name *Bulletin* was chosen because it is a word *common* in French and English. It was agreed that "the content should consist of quality articles rather than ephemeral news items which might better appear in our Information Memos," and that "in preparing the manuscript for each issue consideration should be given to articles of general interest to CSSE members, articles in English and French, and articles originating from members of various cooperating associations and geographic regions."⁴

As a prelude to his later perspective on the *Journal*, Tom Greenfield (University of Alberta, president, 1974–1976) expressed his hope that the *Bulletin* would help build the Canadian education community. For Greenfield, the *Bulletin* should "above all else... speak to ideas and issues and about people and things that have an overwhelming relevance to the Canadian scene." According to Greenfield, because most Canadians tended to read American journals,

2 Report "The Research Role of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education," May 30, 1973, by A. Kratzman (University of Alberta, Regina Campus); F. Bessai (University of Alberta, Regina Campus); B. S. Randhawa (University of Saskatchewan) and various members of the CSSE and its constituent associations. File 11, CSSE Annual Meeting Materials and Reports 1972–1978, Box 1, CSSEP.

3 CSSE Publications Policy Committee Meeting Minutes, October 4, 1974. File 23, 1974 Executive Meetings, Box 3, CSSEP.

4 Coutts to the Board of Directors, December 11, 1973. File 3, CSSE Membership and Promotion 1973–1977, Box 1, CSSEP.

Canadian academics seldom know what their colleagues are doing and thinking and they almost never see their world reflected in the problems discussed in the periodical literature. The consequence is that there is no forum for the discussion of issues among the academic community in Canadian education.⁵

When the *Journal* was created to replace the *Bulletin* in 1976, the purpose reported in the *News* was to provide “vital communication where none existed before” and to “create a forum for the exchange of ideas across the formidable distances—social, physical, and disciplinary—which separate the academic community in Canada.” The *Canadian Journal of Education* will be “unabashedly Canadian.”⁶

The launching of the *Journal* was a major turning point in the history of the Society. The *Journal* filled a publishing need that had existed since the *Canadian Education and Research Digest* changed its title (to *Education Canada*) and its focus in 1968. Ron Ragsdale (OISE) served as the first editor-in-chief (1976–1978) with Gilles Nadeau (Université de Moncton) as *rédacteur-associé*.⁷ The *Journal* outlined in the first volume two primary goals that would distinguish it from the other education journals of the mid-1970s: “to provide a national forum for the exchange of ideas between people involved in Canadian education and to provide a means of communication between the various associations of the CSSE/SCEE” (Ragsdale, 1976a). Without doubt, the main purpose of the *Journal* was the provision of a forum for scholarly discourse on Canadian education. In the first issue, Ragsdale (1976b, p. 1) outlined a set of selection criteria that would be used to identify the most appropriate articles:

1. Articles that are less likely to be accepted by non-Canadian journals because they deal with issues that are of lesser importance outside of Canada.
2. Articles on topics of interest in Canada and other countries but containing Canadian data, examples, etc.
3. Articles of general interest written by Canadian scholars (pp. 1–2).

5 Greenfield to Herbert Coutts (University of Alberta, president, 1972–1974), December 11, 1973. File 16, CSSE Correspondence, 1972–1978, Box 1, CSSEP

6 *CSSE News*, February 1975.

7 See Appendix 5 for a chronological listing of the *Journal*'s masthead staff, and Appendix 6 for a chronological listing of the Association representatives on the *Journal*'s Board in Fisher and Edwards (1999).

Preference for “Canadian content” became the defining feature of the *Journal*. A review of the institutional origins of the articles included over the first 20 years illustrates a Canada-wide response to calls for manuscripts. However, although authors have been employed in over 80 different institutions or organizations, several key research sites have contributed a disproportionate number of articles. Of the 495 articles published in the *Journal* between 1976 and 1995, 247 were contributed by authors from the Ontario Institute of Education (OISE) (42 articles), Simon Fraser University (40 articles), the University of British Columbia (38 articles), Université du Québec (31 articles), Université de Montréal (25 articles), the University of Alberta (24 articles), the University of Western Ontario (24 articles), and the University of Victoria (23 articles). In other words, authors in these eight universities (four in Western Canada, two in Ontario, and two in Quebec) contributed approximately 50% of all of the articles published by the *Journal* since 1976. Authors in the six universities in Western Canada contributed approximately 40% of the articles published, a proportion that rises dramatically to 64% between 1976 and 1980.

During the 1970s, the *Journal* experienced growing pains. As it would later, it wrestled with a variety of editorial issues relating to its role and identity. John Harker, who became editor-in-chief in 1979, highlighted the debate on Canadian content when he noted in an editorial (1979a) that

the mere fact of a manuscript being written by a Canadian and reporting Canadian data does not ensure scholarly quality. Hopefully, we have passed through that stage in our recent cultural history—if we ever were there—when being Canadian was enough. (p. 1)

In his discussion of issues confronting the field, Harker (1979b) alluded to a broader discussion of identity that affected the *Journal*, the tensions between quantitative and qualitative approaches:

Is the study of education best conceived strictly as science requiring the rigorous procedures of scientific method? Or should the study of education explore problems from a more phenomenological perspective, admitting a more interactive and integrative notion of educational events? (p. 3)

In 1978, SSHRC conducted the “first comprehensive evaluation of the Journal since it began to receive support.”⁸ Foreshadowing some issues outlined in the evaluation, Ragsdale (1976b) commented that the *Journal’s*

present definition of an “important article” is based on quantity as well as quality. Not only are we concerned with quality as measured in a peer review, but also with the quantity and quality of the people who will read the article with interest. (p. 2)

He noted that

the article by Pat Cranton [An Introduction to Criterion Referenced Measurement] is a revision of a previous manuscript which was judged by reviewers as “too technical.” The result is an introductory article which may be lower on the scale of “scholarly importance” (and therefore, in the view of some readers, inappropriate for this journal) but has greater “reader interest” as a compensatory factor. (p. 2)

One SSHRC assessor criticized the *Journal’s* lack of focus, claiming that “the heterogeneous nature of the content reflects the absence of a clear editorial policy.”⁹ Interestingly, the other assessor commented that the *Journal* appeared to have an identifiable focus in the area of teacher education. The assessors agreed that the research articles were “competently done” but the calibre of the authors “not distinguished.”¹⁰

In supporting the continued funding for the *Journal*, SSHRC commented that this journal, like its sponsoring organization, CSSE, has attempted to meet the challenge of unifying Canadian scholarship in a very fragmented discipline, in the face of a generally American orientation of much educational thought and research. There is a risk of becoming an outlet for material that cannot quite meet the standards of the more prestigious American publications. Moreover, the

8 Summary of the Council’s Conclusions. Attached to letter, Naomi Hersom (University of British Columbia, President, CSSE) to the Executive, CSSE, March 1, 1979, re. funding for the *Canadian Journal of Education*. Correspondence Files, CCSEP.

9 Assessor A comments, Summary of the Council’s Conclusions.

10 Assessor B Comments, Summary of the Council’s Conclusions.

journal faces the problems of appealing to a range of semi-isolated specialties, of identifying itself with Canadian issues, and of breaking the barriers between the two languages.¹¹

In recognition of these competing and often divergent interests, the Council concluded that

in the non-research areas, the journal appears to be on firmer ground. Scholars from a range of specialities are more likely to be interested in analytical, interpretive, and even polemic material than in research papers outside their specialty... the journal should prosper if it can develop a strong identity in publication of high quality items dealing with such issues.¹²

In 1977 the *Journal* published its first special issue, which focused on Canadian Studies. In his introduction, the guest editor George Tomkins (University of British Columbia) noted that “there is probably no more active area of curriculum development in Canada than Canadian studies” (Tomkins, 1977, p. 1). In 1986, the *Journal* published a special issue entitled “Education in Canada and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.” This was the first time that an entire journal had been devoted to a particular set of Canadian issues. This edition’s emphasis on women’s rights, children’s rights, private school funding, and religious alternative schools illustrated Ragsdale’s concern about the specificity of Canadian content first expressed in 1976. Two other special issues that highlighted this original emphasis on a uniquely Canadian educational identity were the special issues entitled “Culture and Education: Aboriginal Settings, Concerns, and Insights” (1994) and “Accountability in Education in Canada” (1995). The special issue “Accountability in Education in Canada” explored issues of accountability through various provincial frameworks. While the articles focused on British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, Quebec, and Newfoundland, the issues were clearly generalizable beyond these provincial boundaries and were of interest to a broad audience, including teachers, administrators, and policy makers.

11 Summary of the Council’s Conclusions. Attached to letter, Hersom to the Executive, CSSE, March 1, 1979, re. funding for the *Canadian Journal of Education*. Correspondence Files, CCSEP.

12 Summary of the Council’s Conclusions.

Another important editorial decision that began to take hold in the first four years was the promotion of a dialogue between authors, readers, and reviewers. The first such exchange was initiated by C. C. Anderson in his article “On ‘Behaviorism Is Also a Humanism,’ by John McLeish” (1976). This type of formalized exchange really gained momentum, and in his introduction to the *Journal*’s last volume of the 1970s, in which Geoffrey Mason and Ronald Marx debated criterion-versus norm-referenced measurement, Harker (1979c) noted that

what is being encouraged is not the development of acrimonious disputes in print among Canadian scholars in education, but rather an enlivened national dialogue in which issues in Canadian education can be aired and explored in the spirit of critical enquiry and scholarship. (p. 2)

From the beginning, a major function of CSSE had been the dissemination of research on Canadian education. By 1978, the executive was expressing some dissatisfaction with the content of the *Journal*, wishing it were more theoretical and more research-oriented. Further, the executive suggested special issues to meet members’ publication needs.¹³ The Ad Hoc Committee on Publications, chaired by John Calam (University of British Columbia), was asked to consider the publication of monographs. In 1979, it recommended such publications on the grounds that they could advance scholarly writing by young scholars new to the Society and by more seasoned scholars who might broaden the scope of their enquiries to recognize CSSE’s multidisciplinary nature. The Committee also suggested that the Society seek joint sponsorship.¹⁴ The first monograph, *Psychology and the Liberal Consensus* (1981), was published jointly with the Wilfrid Laurier University Press with a grant from the Aid to Scholarly Publications Program (ASPP). As anticipated, it was jointly authored by a seasoned scholar, Charles Anderson (University of Alberta), and a younger scholar, Roy Travis (University of British Columbia).

In 1980, Ted Holdaway (University of Alberta) and David Friesen (University of Alberta) submitted a history of the Society’s first years to the *Journal*. After extensive

13 Minutes of the Executive Meeting, May 30, 1978. File 19, 1978 Executive Meetings, Box 3, CSSEP.

14 “Report of the CSSE Ad Hoc Committee on Publications,” June 5, 1979. File 19, Ad Hoc Committee on Publications [1980], Box 1, CSSEP.

review, it was rejected as unsuitable, bringing into focus the problem of the purpose of the *Journal* and its contents. The refusal itself was embarrassing to the Board of Directors, but it also raised the issue as to whether the *Journal* should be used to record the history of the Society. After conferring with Friesen and Graham Kelsey (secretary/treasurer, CSSE), Naomi Hersom as president approached Gerry Kysela (University of Alberta) the editor of the 1980 yearbook, *The Exceptional Child in Canadian Education*, to have the piece included under a heading “Society Material.” Kysela objected and asked for a policy ruling by the executive. The president’s recommendation was overruled by majority vote. The executive apologized to the authors, and the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta published the history as a monograph (Holdaway & Friesen, 1980).¹⁵

In 1989, helped by William Bruneau, editor-in-chief (1988–1992) of the *Journal*, CSSE and Athabasca University co-published *Post-Secondary Distance Education in Canada: Policies, Practices and Priorities*, “a collection of articles originally intended for a special issue.” In his introduction, the editor, Robert Sweet, noted that

it is difficult to determine the forces that shape distance-education policies and practices in a particular country. Technological advances and a desire to create innovative learning systems have been cited as underlying the emergence of distance education in Canada.... The social policy concerns of government and educators were apparent in the recent National Forum on Post-Secondary Education (1988) and in the Annual Provincial Premiers’ Conferences (1988). Both groups recognized the need for change in the postsecondary system if Canada is to meet successfully the challenges of an economy driven by technological innovation, a dramatically altered social structure due principally to an aging population and workforce, and a significant shift in the ethnic and cultural composition of the country. Central to this view of change is the ideal of lifelong learning and the derivative concepts of accessibility and openness. (1989, p. 3)

This collection is particularly interesting as it crossed the invisible line demarcating CSSE from both adult education and higher education.

15 Hersom to Holdaway, April 30, 1980. File 16, Ottawa Secretariat Correspondence, Box 2, CSSEP. Also Minutes of the Executive Meeting, June 2, 1980. File 17, 1980 Executive Meetings, Box 3, CSSEP.

The financial crisis in the early 1980s resulted in the Society stopping publication of the yearbook. The cost of publishing the *Journal* had also been a constant pressure on the Society. Matters had not been helped by the almost continuous reduction, or threats of withdrawal, of subsidies from the SSHRC for journals and scholarly publication. Strategically, as a means of improving the Society's application to SSHRC, the Board agreed in 1979 to increase the share of the membership fee going to the *Journal* in the 1981 budget.¹⁶ In 1982, Hersom (vice-president, SSFC) reported to the Society, under the heading "Publication Crisis," that the grants for learned journals and scholarly publications had been substantially reduced.¹⁷ Hersom, who as president of the CSSE (1978–1980) had a place on the Social Science Federation of Canada (SSFC) Board, was the chair of the SSFC Publication Advisory Committee and hence at the forefront of the campaign to reverse the SSHRC policy shift.

In 1982, SSFC appointed a committee to prepare a response to the SSHRC's Park Committee Report on Aid to Scholarly Communication (Paul Park, Dean of Education, University of Western Ontario), which had recommended that SSHRC make drastic cuts in contributions to the publication of scholarly books and journals—\$1 million and \$1.4 million, respectively—in favour of an instant and massive commitment to new publishing technologies. When SSHRC reduced its grant to the ASPP and the support it was offering to learned journals, SSFC mounted a strong protest against "SSHRC's retreat from support of publishing." Hersom (chair of the ASPP Committee) and Kelsey (first vice-president, CSSE) produced a strong brief recommending that SSHRC proceed with caution before implementing the report. In 1983, SSHRC did make some supplementary grants to ASPP to restore granting levels and to clear its deficit.

Internally, the CSSE Board established a task force on the *Journal* which was chaired by Ragsdale. The task force was "to review a variety of matters-relating largely to costs, production, readership, and the bilingual nature of CJE—and to submit recommendations."¹⁸ The *Journal's* approved grants ended in 1983, as did the former method of funding, and Kelsey's advice was clear and forthright:

16 Minutes of the Executive Meeting, November 2–3, 1979. File 18, 1979 Executive Meetings, Box 3, CSSEP.

17 Minutes of the Annual General Meeting, June 11, 1982, University of Ottawa. File 37, 1982 10th Annual General Meeting, Box 3, CSSEP.

18 Farquhar to Ragsdale, June 25, 1982. File 3, CSSE Task Force on the CJE/RCE, Box 2, CSSEP.

While high quality and self-help are necessary conditions for renewed funding, they are no longer sufficient ones. My bet would be that some attempts to innovate in modes of production or distribution, or both, is going to be what will ensure Council's approval.

Advice he reiterated in a position paper "The *Canadian Journal of Education*: Beyond 1983," the following year in June 1983.¹⁹ Yet the question of technology remained troublesome. For Ragsdale and his task force, the key issue to be resolved was the purpose of the *Journal*; and only then could they explore how technology could be used to achieve its aims.²⁰

As the *Journal* approached its 10th anniversary, the debate over its present and future role began to heat up again. In 1984, Donald Cochrane (University of Saskatchewan) submitted "A Proposal Concerning the Future Direction of the *Canadian Journal of Education*" that outlined a number of concerns and potential remedies. He asserted that the content of the *Journal*

appears diffuse, remote, and even on occasion arcane...meanwhile, the crises and challenges in education multiply...throughout it all, the level of inquiry and discussion at a national level—where it exists—is atrocious and, if my thumbing through back issues is any gauge, CJE remains silent.²¹

For Cochrane, dramatic changes were needed if the *Journal* was going to move into the upper echelons of publications. He outlined four key suggestions:

1. Make the national focus of the journal more prominent
2. Define a new identity for CJE which establishes it as a relevant and provocative vehicle for informed debate about important issues of national concern in education

19 Kelsey to Farquhar, June 28, 1982. Attached "The Canadian Journal of Education: Beyond 1983," a position paper by J. G. T. Kelsey, June 1983. File 3, CSSE Task Force on the CJE/RCE, Box 2, CSSEP.

20 Minutes of the Executive Meeting, November 3, 1983. File 14, 1983 Executive Meetings, Box 3, CSSEP.

21 Donald Cochrane, "A Proposal Concerning the Future Direction of the Canadian Journal of Education" attached to letter Shapiro to CSSE Executive and Dr. J. Sanders, re: CJE Editorial Policy, February 2, 1984. File CJE Correspondence, CSSEP.

3. Redefine the editor's mandate so that it is less reactive (a sorter, refiner, and publisher of the best that is submitted by individuals) and, in its stead, more proactive (in which the editor is encouraged to take the initiative in defining some issues as worthy of attention and insuring that they are addressed)
4. Be prepared to delegate considerable discretion to the editor to "invite" papers, assemble occasional theme issues, seek conference papers and introduce new features (including, for example, the reprinting of relevant and important judicial judgements).²²

Michael Jackson (Memorial University; editor-in-chief, 1985–1987), in a report for the CSSE executive, attempted to summarize some of the debate that developed in part as a response to the issues raised by Cochrane. Jackson believed the *Journal* was

essentially a successful, respected and healthy journal, and that this is a remarkable achievement in fewer than ten years and a tribute to the work of the three previous editors...[however] not everyone shares this view of our Journal: at our May meeting in Guelph, CJE was being described by some as "everyone's journal of second choice," that no one read it first, and no one turned to it first as a place to publish.²³

He proceeded to name a number of issues, including doubts about the legitimacy of the claims of Canadian focus, the lack of quality of the articles published, and the need for greater emphasis on educational policy issues.

Chris Nash, the associate editor for the journal of the Canadian Association of Curriculum Studies (CACS), agreed with the concerns about the credibility of the *Journal*: "Canadian academics who are respected nationally and internationally rarely consider CJE as the place to publish." Nash went on to highlight

steps which must be taken if the CJE is to develop into a major educational journal. First we must come to a consensus as to what the journal is meant to be; what is its function; what needs should it fulfil; how does it differ from other journals

22 Donald Cochrane, "A Proposal Concerning the Future Direction of the Canadian Journal of Education."

23 Report by Michael Jackson, "Editorial Policies and Directions for CJE/RCE" attached to letter, Jackson to Esbensen, October 2, 1984. File CJE Correspondence, CSSEP.

our members read and publish in? Then we must identify, with evidence, the problems with the journal in the light of our image of what the journal should be.²⁴

Throughout the 1980s, the *Journal* tried to become more attractive to both authors and readers. In 1983, it began publishing abstracts in Spanish and German in addition to English and French, a practice abandoned in 1989 to reduce costs. Under Jackson and Genevieve Racette (Université du Québec à Montréal, *rédatrice adjointe*, 1986–1988, *rédatrice*, 1989–1991), the Editorial Board assumed an advisory role concerned with policy and orientation in addition to its earlier essentially consultative role of recommending reviewers for manuscripts. They also tried to make the *Journal* a supportive setting: seeking out constructive supportive reviewers and working with authors was their objective. Michel Allard (UQAM), Tom McQuire (University of Alberta), and Robert Crocker (Memorial University) had completed a series of workshops across the country on how to write a grant proposal that would be successful. Jackson and Racette in turn obtained, through the Society, a SSHRC grant to conduct a series of workshops, “Reporting Research in Education: The Scholarly Article.” Three workshops were offered in 1987 and 1988. The first, at McMaster, attracted more than 30 colleagues from 15 universities. The other two, at Université Laval and Université du Québec à Montréal, were particularly well received, in part because of the efforts of Claude Dublois (Université Laval), a former rédacteur-associé of the Journal (1979–1982), and Allard, as president. Allard deserves credit for the spirit of openness and inclusiveness, promoting greater access to research funding and publication in the interests of all. One result of this openness was a backlog of articles, which was dealt with by gaining the financial support of two deans to publish enlarged issues in 1986 and 1987.²⁵ Bruneau devoted much of his term as editor-in-chief trying to reduce the time between the submission and publication of the articles. At the time of his appointment, authors were waiting almost three years.

In one respect, the *Journal* was perceived to be less than welcoming. At the urging of the Canadian Association of Foundations of Education (CAFE), and in particular the historians, the Editorial Board finally agreed in 1986 to publish articles using the *Chicago Manual of Style*. Initially, the Board had agreed to accept for review articles

24 Nash to Jackson, June 26, 1984. File CJE Correspondence, CSSEP.

25 Report on the Activities of the Society. File 17, Ottawa Secretariat Correspondence, Box 2, CSSEP.

written in the *Chicago* style and to then convert them to APA (American Psychological Association) style if they were accepted for publication. The response from the historian Nancy Sheehan (president, CAFE), to Jackson, the philosopher, was to point out that both philosophers and historians were unhappy with APA. Continuing the current policy risked “alienating” the historians, giving them the message they were neither wanted nor needed, whereas, as Sheehan pointed out, “Surely history has a role to play in educational research.”²⁶ It was somewhat ironic that during the same year, CAFE agreed to begin providing financial support for the Canadian History of Education Association (CHEA), which held biennial meetings separately from the Learned Societies; in 1989, the CHEA began its own journal, *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d’histoire de l’éducation*. In 1987, the philosophers began publishing their own journal, *Paideusis*.

Maintaining a stable budget for the *Journal* has been a major problem for the Society. A key area of interest of the Editorial Board in the 1990s was on the efficiency of the *Journal*’s publishing process. Under Bruneau (editor-in-chief, 1988–1992), changing the production process to reduce costs consumed a great deal of the *Journal* staff’s time and resulted in an “entirely computerized” publication (Annual Report to the Board of Directors, 1991/92). SSHRC’s evaluation of the *Journal* in 1994 produced a first-class rating, which led to an increased transfer of funds in 1996.

The Changing Content of the *Journal*

The CSSE had its beginnings in the West, and during the 1970s was dominated by English-speaking academics. At the same time the Society had consistently, and often enthusiastically, been committed to bilingualism and biculturalism. The isolation of the few francophones in the early years is illustrated by the almost total use of English when the CSSE’s Constitution was being drawn up. Even though Jean-Marie Joly was the chair of the Constitution Committee, it was taken for granted that the discussions would take place in English. As one contemporary described the situation, francophones could be speaking to each other in French, but with “one anglophone in the room the common language inevitably became English.”²⁷ Michel Allard, who became the first

26 Sheehan to Jackson (n.d.) in *CAFE Newsletter*, April 1986. File 7, CAFE, Box 5, CSSEP.

27 Interview, June 1996.

francophone president of the CSSE in 1986, tells what it was like to be a francophone member of the Society in the late 1970s. His joining the Society came about because he complained to the Society about the quality of the translations of abstracts in the *Journal*. Even though the second vice-presidency had been occupied by very active francophones since 1976, few francophones attended the 7th CSSE Conference, held at the University of Saskatchewan. Robin Farquhar, the incoming president, had invited Allard, as *Directeur du Département des sciences de l'éducation* at the Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM), the location of the next CSSE conference, to a meeting. Allard knew none of the people gathered in Farquhar's office, though he had seen most of them at breakfast in the hotel. He simply was not part of the community.

While the University of Alberta was very much a unilingual, anglophone institution, the doctoral program in educational administration did purposefully include francophones. This provided contacts for efforts during the 1980s to include more francophones like Claude Dublois, former *rédacteur-associé* of the *Journal* and later the second vice-president (1989–1991). The decade began well for francophones in the CSSE, and through the 1980s their participation increased and the use of French became more acceptable. Allard was a presence throughout the 1980s. He took up the challenge left by Nadeau, became second vice-president (1982–1984), a member of the Standing Committee on Promotion of Research (SCOPR) (1983–1986), and then president (1986–1988).

Allard, with such a large faculty at UQAM, was in a powerful position to influence not only the participation of his own group but also francophones at other Quebec institutions. According to one contemporary, Allard was a “powerhouse,” enormously influential in increasing francophone participation in CSSE and changing the Society. In the style of an earlier generation of Quebec social scientists, he was determined to separate science and politics on the pragmatic grounds that even if Quebec achieved independence, educational researchers across the two language groups would still have to work together. He was helped in these efforts by his colleague at UQAM, Louise Depuy-Walker, who was *rédactrice adjointe* of the *Journal* (1982–1986) and succeeded him as second vice-president (1985–1987).

A measure of success in achieving bilingualism was achieved at the *Journal*. From its inception in 1976, abstracts were published in the alternate language, either French or English. An earlier concern about the quality of French was dealt with when all galley proofs in French were sent to Dublois and subsequent associate editors for

correction. Still, the issue of French articles in the *Journal* gained particular prominence in the early 1980s. During the first five years (1976–1980), the *Journal* published 15 articles (11.9%) in French. In 1980, Dublois as *rédacteur-associé*, frustrated with the *Journal's* approach, wrote to John Harker, then the editor-in-chief, to ask whether “the time [has] not come to show a certain commitment to publish French articles on a more regular basis?” noting that he was “confronted with the criticism that we are committed to tokenism in this matter.”²⁸ Harker acknowledged the disproportionately low representation of French articles, but asserted that “as a matter of policy, I am not prepared to publish, for example, one French manuscript per issue...because this would represent the most demeaning kind of tokenism imaginable.”²⁹ In a subsequent letter to Harker, Dublois reiterated his concerns about the feasibility of continuing to publish a successful bilingual journal:

If we publish one article every second issue, we are going to receive less and less papers and only the crummy ones. To keep attracting good papers we need to publish one or two articles per issue (20–25%). Many scholars have indicated to me that this is an important criterion in their decision to submit an article or not in a bilingual journal (the space allotted is an indicator of the interest among the readers and the quality of the material published).³⁰

In his final report as the *rédacteur-associé*, Dublois restated his concerns in presuming that the Association (CSSE) is committed to representing in its work and publication the bilingual nature of this country. One day, this commitment will have to be translated into a clear policy with regard to the space available for French articles in the *Journal*... [A] *Journal* seriously committed to bilingualism would reserve for the minority culture (and recognized language) a space proportionate to its population (that is, roughly 25%). [Should] this policy be adopted the rate of French publication would be two per issue.³¹

28 Dublois to Harker, March 4, 1980. File CJE Correspondence, CSSEP.

29 Harker to Dublois, March 17, 1980. File CJE Correspondence, CSSEP.

30 Dublois to Harker, June 26, 1980. File CJE Correspondence, CSSEP.

31 Final Report of Associate Editor of the CJE, Claude Dublois, September 1981, pp. 3–4. File CJE Correspondence, CSSEP.

In response to Harker's position on the French content of the *Journal*, Dublois had written to Hersom, as president, that he was "far from convinced" by Harker's initial response "that he is committed to providing a meaningful place [for French] articles in the *Journal*"³² and that he wanted the Board of Directors of CSSE to discuss the issue at their next meeting. The matter was duly raised on behalf of Dublois at the October executive meeting, the concern about "tokenism" was discussed, and the executive opted for the status quo, affirming current practice in the *Journal*.³³ Kelsey, as vice-president, was often called on to mediate. Depuy-Walker, as *rédacteur adjoint*, raised similar concerns in 1984 and asked the executive for some clearly defined policy on both French content and the duties of the associate editor.³⁴

The number and the proportion of French articles published in the *Journal* during the 1980s increased dramatically, partly as a result of Dublois's vocal campaign regarding a more equitable representation of the work of francophone scholars. The breakthrough came during the period when Jackson was editor-in-chief and Racette was *rédactrice adjointe*. As noted earlier, this team was proactive in attempting to encourage more submissions from French-speaking Quebec. With the active encouragement of Allard and as part of the "spirit of openness" referred to earlier, Jackson and Racette established a practice of publishing at least one article from each official language in each issue of the *Journal*. Two lists were established for articles, a general list and the French list. All articles were judged at the same time, but if the top five were in either English or French, then the fifth one would be dropped and replaced by the top article in the other list. This practice has continued since and has certainly helped to improve both the reception and the reputation of the *Journal* among French-speaking academics. During the period 1981 to 1990, the *Journal* published a total of 68 articles in French, which represented 27.8%. This trend continued to gain strength in the 1990s. Between 1991 and 1995, 42 articles (33.6%) were French, compared with 15 articles (12%) during the first five years (1976 to 1980) of the *Journal*'s existence. The overall orientation of the *Journal* has been directed at schooling.

32 Dublois to Hersom, May 5, 1980. File CJE Correspondence, CSSEP.

33 Minutes of the Executive Meeting, October 30–31, 1980. File 17, 1980 Executive Meetings, Box 3, CSSEP.

34 Minutes of the executive Meeting, May 31, 1984. File 13, 1984 Executive Meetings, Box 3, CSSEP.

Another concern Dublois raised in this final report was the heavy concentration of French submissions originating in Quebec and, more specifically, within the province's larger universities. During the first five years of the *Journal* (1976 to 1980), he noted, 80% of the French articles published (12 articles) originated in the three largest universities (Université de Montréal, Université du Québec, Université Laval). Over the last 20 years, approximately 70% of the French articles published have come from Université Laval (35 articles, 28%), the Université du Québec (29 articles, 23%), and the Université de Montréal (24 articles, 19.2%).

Over the years, the title of the French editor of the *Journal* has changed a number of times. What began as *rédacteur-associé* in 1976 became *rédacteur adjoint* in 1981, *rédactrice adjointe* in 1985, and *rédactrice* in 1989. The changes were intended to give the position more equal status and to respect the women's movement. The title "*rédactrice*" showed that the French editor had complete editorial authority over the French content. In 1989, the *Journal* began the practice of listing the titles *editor-in-chief* and *rédactrice* without any translations, on the assumption that the readership was widely bilingual and that this change would merely respect the then-current cultural and political realities.

The issue of gender equity was also being addressed in the *Journal* in the 1990s. Between 1991 and 1995, 53.6% (67 articles) of the articles published were by female first authors compared with 19% (24 articles) in the first five years (1976 to 1980). Particularly important were two special issues of the *Journal*, "Feminist Pedagogy" (1992) and "Against the Grain: Narratives of Resistance" (1993). Almost all of the articles (12) in these two issues were by women.

The shift in methodological approach also occurred in the content of the *Journal*. In the 20 years between 1976 and 1995, the *Journal* published 261 primary research articles. Of these, 177 (67.8%) used quantitative methods, 71 (27.2%) used qualitative methods, and 13 (5.2%) could not be classified. Yet comparing the first five years of the *Journal's* history (1976–1980) with the five year period of 1991 to 1995, the change is striking. In the earlier period, 50 articles (78.1%) used quantitative methods, 13 articles (20.3%) used qualitative methods, and one article (1.6 %) could not be classified. For the latter period, the respective numbers and percentages were 31 (47%), 27 (40.9%), and, eight (12.1%).

Finally, the only noticeable foci in the substantive content of the *Journal* was an orientation to schooling. Among the 495 articles published between 1976 and 1995, the

most prevalent research field or theme was curriculum, which accounted for 318 articles (64.2%). The other main categories were school and society (83 articles, 16.8%) and educational administration (46 articles, 9.3%). Within curriculum, the most common topics were teaching strategies (102 articles, 32.1%), teacher education (37 articles, 11.6%), special education (17 articles, 5.3%), and testing (16 articles, 5.0%). Other topics included literacy, curriculum development, second-language teaching, and moral education.

Conclusion

The legitimacy and cognitive authority of education in academic and national research circles increased dramatically over the period covered in this article. As one former president of the CSSE has noted, “Faculties of education are now better integrated within the scholarly view of university campuses...our people became better scholars, more academically oriented...the younger people were in the social sciences and humanities.”³⁵ The CSSE can justly claim much of the credit for these changes, directly at the national level and indirectly in universities. According to one long-time member, CSSE has been an indispensable part of the field, “the primary reference point for maintaining scholarship.” The push to make educational research academically respectable and the subsequent increase in funding through SSHRC has been driven by the Canadian Education Association and government ministries. Holding office in CSSE has often led members into university administration. Five members (Farquhar, Hersom, Myer Horowitz, George Ivany, and Bernard Shapiro), three of whom were former presidents of CSSE, have held presidencies at Canadian universities since the early 1980s. Further, educationalists in other leadership positions in the central administrations of universities became much more common in the 1980s than in earlier decades. Education was no longer “despised”³⁶ by the rest of the academic community as it was in the 1970s. CSSE has, according to one researcher,

35 Interview, August 1996.

36 This is how one long-serving member of the CSSE described the experience of working in education in the 1970s. Since then, it has become a professional social science field with disciplines.

given us a sense of our own importance and significance. We have a Learned Society, we have a granting committee, we have a publication, we do all the things that our supposedly superior pure academic colleagues used to pretend we were not able to do. You do not apologize any longer for being in education whereas you certainly did, not that long ago.³⁷

Education had become a professional social science field with subdisciplines. According to one former president of CSSE,

Education is a field of study... We recognize that we need much more complex ways of looking at the world to understand the kinds of things that are going on along group lines and individual lines. In that sense there are disciplinary things about educational research that would lead to the conclusion that yes this is a separate discipline, a separate science; and, there are all kinds of other parts where you would argue that this is a branch of psychology, or a branch of history or a branch of anthropology.³⁸

Whether or not we define education as an academic discipline, a professional field of study, or some mixture of the two, there can be little doubt that the *Canadian Journal of Education* has played a major role in increasing its cognitive authority and legitimacy. The *Journal* became the place where Canadian educationalists could share their academic research, the place that confirmed their right to a chair at the university table. The *Journal* was an essential part of the boundary work undertaken by educationalists through their universities and funding agencies, through their research, and specifically through their publications, to create a distinct territory for education.

37 Interview, June 1996.

38 Interview, June 1996.

References

- Anderson, C. C. (1977). On “Behaviorism is also a humanism,” by John McLeish. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 2(3), 75–80.
- Fisher, D. (1988). Boundary work: Toward a model of the relation knowledge/power. *Knowledge*, 10, 156–176.
- Fisher, D. (1990). Boundary and science: The relation between power and knowledge. In S. E. Cozzens & T. F. Gieryn (Eds.), *Theories of science in society* (pp. 98–119). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Fisher, D. (1991). *The social sciences in Canada: Fifty years of national activity by the Social Science Federation of Canada*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Fisher, D. (1993). *Fundamental development of the social sciences: Rockefeller philanthropy and the United States Social Science Research Council*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Fisher, D., & Edwards, G. (1999). The legitimation of education in Canadian universities: A social history of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education. In M. Allard, J. Covert, C. Dufresne-Tassé, A. Hildyard, & M. Jackson (Eds.), *A challenge met/ Un défi relevé* (pp. 7–117). Ottawa, ON: Canadian Society for the Study of Education.
- Harker, W. (1979a). Editorial: Another three years. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 4(1), 1–2.
- Harker, W. (1979b). Editorial: The people in Education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 4(3), 1–2.
- Harker, W. (1979c). Editorial: An invitation. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 4(4), 1–2.
- Healy, D., & Dion, L. (1978). *Report of the Commission on Graduate Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences* [Healy Commission] (Vol. 1). Ottawa, ON: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

- Holdaway, E., & Friesen, D. (1980). *Canadian Society for the Study of Education: Development and challenges*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta, Department of Educational Administration.
- McLeish, J. (1976). Behaviorism is also a humanism. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 1(4), 69–81.
- Perkin, H. (1989). *The rise of professional society: England since 1880*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ragsdale, R. (1976a). Editorial: Another education journal? *Canadian Journal of Education*, 1(1), 1–2.
- Ragsdale, R. (1976b). Editorial. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 1(4), 1–2.
- Sweet, R. (Ed.). (1989). Introduction. *Post-secondary distance education in Canada: Policies, practices and priorities* (pp. 1–3). Athabasca, AB: Athabasca University Press, and Ottawa: CSSE.
- Tomkins, G. (1977). Editorial. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 2(1), 1–3.