

**Ann Denis
and
John Lipkin**

Quebec's Cegep: Promise and Reality

Since the first twelve *Collèges d'enseignement général et professionnel* (Cegeps) were opened in September, 1967, to accommodate all students proceeding beyond the secondary level, these institutions have been a source of intense interest, pride, criticism, and controversy. A considerable body of writing on the Cegep has been produced, primarily in the form of newspaper articles and official publications. While this has been of a high quality and doubtless informative, little by way of analysis, particularly in English, has appeared.¹ At present efforts are underway, including those of the authors, to gain a more substantial understanding of this institution, but, in the meantime, the Cegep is much too vital and significant an aspect of Quebec education to be excluded from any consideration of the contemporary Quebec educational scene.

Given the preliminary nature of our findings, the relative absence of a scholarly basis of analysis, and the recency of the Cegep's formation, the observations and conclusions in this paper are quite tentative and speculative. Nonetheless, we have attempted to furnish an answer to two fundamental questions: what is a Cegep? who is served by the Cegep?

purpose of the cegep

Our concern with this institution stems from its strategic position in the realisation of Quebec's educational goals. Indeed, its fundamental purpose can be equated with the overarching ideal espoused by the Parent Commission; namely, the provision of opportunity "for everyone to continue his studies in the field which best suits his abilities, his tastes, and

his interests, up to the most advanced level he has the capacity to reach.”² The breadth of this goal should be stressed. In fact, the Cegep could be said to occupy a key position in the Province’s pursuit of the twin aspirations of the modern era; economic development and social justice. Ultimately, we are concerned with the question of how successful the Cegep is in contributing to the goals of the society and the aspirations of its members. This, we believe, is a question which can not be postponed until the results are final or clear, but must be addressed to the Cegep’s process and product at every step in its development.

A more immediate and mundane reason for the creation of the Cegep was the provincial government’s desire to meet the demand of the French majority for the removal of the disparity between the French and the English educational ladders. As shown in Table 1 below, equivalence between the two systems was accomplished by the establishment of the Cegep, which represented a compromise alternative to the two existing structures.³

Table 1
Quebec Educational Structure (Pre and Post 1967)⁴

		Pre 1967				Total
		Elementary	Secondary	Higher		
French	■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ (7)	■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ (8)	■ ■ ■ ■ ■ (3)		18 yr.	
	<i>cours</i>	<i>cours</i>				
	<i>secondaire</i>	<i>collégial</i>				
English	■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ (7)	■ ■ ■ ■ ■ (4)	■ ■ ■ ■ ■ (4)		15 yr.	
		Post 1967				Total
		Elementary	Secondary	CEGEP	Higher	
French and English	■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ (6)	■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ (5)	■ ■ ■ ■ ■ (2)	■ ■ ■ ■ ■ (3)	16 yr.	
			■ ■ ■ ■ ■ (3) → work			

All students continuing their studies beyond the secondary level enter the Cegep upon completion of their eleventh year of schooling.⁵ Attendance is not compulsory but the tuition costs are met entirely by public funds. Students may choose to apply for either the general stream of two years’ duration which leads to the university, or the professional stream of

three years' duration which leads to employment in middle level technical, commercial, or para-professional occupations.

secondary or higher?

As can be seen in Table 1, above, the Cegep occupies a position midway between secondary and university education. For purposes of analysis it can be considered as a discrete institution, as a continuation of secondary education, or as the early years of higher education. The view held by Cegep officials stresses its discrete position. The Cegep curriculum is considered to be of a sufficiently more advanced and specialized nature to warrant special facilities and more highly qualified staff than the secondary school. Similarly, the Cegep student is felt to be of sufficiently greater maturity than the secondary student to warrant a separate institutional setting which would provide an atmosphere of greater freedom and opportunity to exercise personal judgment and responsibility than the more regimented high school does. At the same time, it is felt to be desirable that students receive a common general education before entering the world of work or embarking on specialized university studies. This view of the Cegep as a discrete institution highlights its unique character, for no other post-secondary institution in Canada, or the rest of the world for that matter, simultaneously provides the exclusive path to university and also terminal training.

While the Cegep's perception of itself as a unique institution is, strictly speaking, a correct one, from a functional and comparative perspective these institutions can also be seen as either an upward extension of secondary education or, conversely, as the first years of higher education, albeit housed in separate facilities.

The European would recognize a close resemblance between the Cegep and the emerging pattern of education in his upper secondary school both from the standpoint of the age and academic qualifications of the clientele being served, and the dual purpose of providing entry to the university and to the world of work. Although exceptions may be noted, European secondary education has become increasingly differentiated along upper and lower lines. After an extended period of common, general education in the lower school, which corresponds to Quebec's comprehensive or *polyvalent* secondary school, the European student may pursue his studies in an

upper secondary school which frequently combines terminal and pre-university studies as in the manner of the Cegep.⁶

The view of the Cegep as an upward extension of secondary education lends credence to the argument that the effect of creating a separate institution, which imposes restrictive academic criteria for admission, has been to bar a substantial portion of the relevant age group from education beyond the eleventh grade. As we shall discuss later, this problem of accessibility is increasingly becoming a matter of concern on the part of Cegep educators, particularly those responsible for admission policies.

When a comparison with the United States' educational system is introduced, a plausible case can be made to the effect that Cegep level instruction is indistinguishable from the early years of higher education. In fact, the curriculum pursued in both the professional and general streams closely resembles that of the early years of the American college or the Bachelor's program in most Canadian universities outside Quebec. If, for example, we examine the curriculum designed to prepare technicians for the paper industry, we find not only a heavy infusion of science and mathematics, including organic chemistry and calculus, but also courses in language, literature and philosophy in addition to more applied studies such as the treatment of papers.⁷

The resemblance between the general stream of Cegep and the first years of the American college or university is more readily apparent. The curriculum of the general stream of the Cegep is considered to be the equivalent of the first year of the former four-year undergraduate program in Quebec and is credited as either one or two years for students transferring to Canadian universities outside of the Province.⁸ Successful completion of the general course has, effectively, guaranteed admission to a Quebec university. However this is undoubtedly a function of the availability of university places, and, if the general stream continues to expand at anywhere near the present rate, the universities will be hard pressed to accept all Cegep graduates, their own rate of expansion notwithstanding.

Whether one sees the Cegep as secondary or higher education or somewhere in between, the fundamentally academic nature of the institution should be recognized. Admission to the Cegep is based largely, if not exclusively, on the students' performance in basic academic subjects as determined by

teacher-assigned grades and, to a lessening extent, the results of a provincial examination.⁹

Within the Cegep, the prescribed curriculum, with its previously discussed academic emphasis, insures the continuation of an approach to learning which focuses on the content of specific courses and judges the learner in competition with his peers on the basis of fixed standards. This approach predominates in spite of the herculean efforts of many Cegep educators to personalize instruction, services, and the atmosphere of the Cegep generally.

who should go?

A major dilemma facing the Cegep educators and those charged with formulating policy at this level arises from the inevitable tension between the selective, academic character of the institution, on the one hand, and the generally accepted values embodied in the Parent Report, on the other. We have labelled this constellation of values, "humanitarian," appropriately defined, for our purposes, by Srinivas as, "an active concern for the welfare of all human beings irrespective of caste, economic position, religion, age and sex."¹⁰ Applying this value orientation which explicitly includes equalitarianism and secularism to the realm of education, the quality of education would be judged in terms of its appropriateness and efficacy for the individual, with due consideration for his particular social context, rather than in terms of standards attained in arbitrarily defined subject-matter disciplines.

The problem of the kind and amount of education members of any society ought to receive is, of course, a perennial one. No one would deny a child an elementary education. The fundamental goal of literacy has become universal, although in many areas of the world it is far from being achieved. In the more developed nations, the necessity for and right to an education beyond the primary stage has become recognized as evidenced by compulsory education laws requiring school attendance into adolescence. Now education beyond the age of 16, or at least the opportunity for such an education, is increasingly being advocated as a requisite for participation in the modern, technologically oriented society of today and tomorrow, but its provision is fraught with obstacles and difficulties, as the case of Quebec illustrates.

Particularly in the first years of the Cegep's operation, it was not anticipated that there would be universal post-secondary attendance. Nonetheless, it would not be inconsistent with the ideals espoused by the Parent Commission, as we interpret them, to consider the increase in the proportion of the relevant age group in attendance as an important criterion in assessing the Cegep's attainments, particularly in the French sector where the Report envisaged that a significantly greater proportion of the population would continue their studies beyond the secondary level.¹¹ In addition, more refined measurements could be derived from an analysis of the extent to which such variables as language, place of residence, sex, socio-economic status, and for that matter, intelligence, influence one's chances for advancing beyond the secondary level.

In assessing the influence of the Cegep, we would hypothesize that the expansion of enrolment at the post-secondary level would result in the provision of a more humanitarian education. Evidence of this humanitarianism would include a more open or egalitarian approach to admissions, a more secular or functional approach to curriculum in terms of the political, economic and social conditions of the province, and a more individualized approach to instruction in terms of the abilities, aspirations, and needs of the individual student. Of these dimensions, our present discussion is primarily restricted to a consideration of the question of admissions.

Prior to the creation of the Cegep, Quebec had one of the lowest university attendance ratios in all of Canada. In 1965-66, 12.2% of the age group, 18-21, were at university. Only three of the Maritime provinces had a lower rate of attendance.¹² Approximately 30% of the Quebec university students were English, although this was the mother tongue of less than 20% of the Province's total population.¹³

Although appropriate statistics detailing the rise in enrolment rates were not available, the magnitude of the increase is suggested by the growth in the Cegeps alone. In 1967, the year in which the original twelve Cegeps were established, their enrolment totalled 10,000 students. Latest available figures for the academic year 1971-72, show an enrolment of 75,590 students in thirty-eight Cegeps.¹⁴ This growth in enrolment has clearly resulted in the achievement of a balance between the French and English. Students in the French Cegeps, who are almost exclusively French-Canadian residents of Quebec, make up 93% of the total Cegep population.¹⁵ In

addition, approximately 5% of the students in the English Cegeps are French-Canadians. When the total Cegep level population, including students in the Cegep equivalent programs of the English universities and French private colleges is considered, approximately 80% of this population is French, corresponding to the French proportion of the total population. Furthermore, this shift is now being reflected in the universities where 77% of the total undergraduate enrolment in 1970-71 was in French universities.¹⁶

influence of geography

Many cultural factors apart from, yet related to, the fundamental linguistic division of Quebec need to be taken into account when considering the problem of accessibility to post-secondary education. Three, in particular, which we have considered are place of residence, sex, and economic background.

The higher proportion of English students in attendance beyond the compulsory school leaving age prior to the establishment of the Cegeps can be attributed in part to the concentration of the anglophone population in greater Montreal and the Eastern Townships where English universities are situated. On the other hand, the three francophone universities were serving a population which was dispersed throughout the province. This problem of geographical access applied to the *cours collégial* also, for in many instances, it was not available locally, especially for women.

In designing the Cegeps, the Planning Committee for Pre-University and Vocational Education gave particular attention to location so that, within reasonable limits, post-secondary education would be physically accessible to residents in all regions of the province. The extent to which the Cegep has brought about increased opportunities for students from non-metropolitan areas is illustrated in Table 2 below.

In order for the francophone Cegep graduates to have greater access to university education, the University of Quebec was established in 1969, with campuses in Chicoutimi, Rimouski and Trois-Rivières in addition to the Montreal campus. The establishment of regional Cegep and university campuses represented a direct attack on the problem of regional disparities and, simultaneously, a further effort to overcome

the disadvantaged educational position of the French population.

Table 2

Residential Background of Quebec Population in Comparison to Cegep and University Students

	17 Province as a whole %	18 Cegep %	18 University %
Rural (farm and <1,000).....	26.4	12.4	6.7
Urban (1,000 — 999,999).....	33.9	71.5	53.4
Metropolitan (> 1,000,000)....	39.7	16.1	39.9

The effect of this policy of regionalization is exemplified by the Saguenay region where residents can choose among Cegeps in Jonquière, Chicoutimi, Alma, or St. Félicien (all within a radius of 100 miles) depending, among other considerations, on proximity, program offered, and facilities. Upon completion of their studies, assuming they have enrolled in the general stream, they can continue their education at the University of Quebec at Chicoutimi or any of the other universities in the province.

influence of sex

The Cegep's contribution to expanding educational opportunities and reducing inequalities of access is perhaps most graphically illustrated by the increasing proportion of women in post-secondary education. Relative to their proportion in the Province, women have been under-represented in all Quebec universities, although there had been a gradual increase in their proportion at both French and English universities during the 1960s. Whereas 21.8% of the young men aged 18-21 were attending university in 1966, only 9.9% of the women were. Within the francophone sector, 27.7% of the students were female, while the corresponding figure for the English sector was 34.6%.¹⁹ The dramatic increase in female attendance since the advent of the Cegep is illustrated by the figures in Table 3 below, which refers almost wholly to French students, since English students did not graduate from the Cegep until 1971.

Table 3

Female Enrolment in Cegep by Stream and Year of Graduation

		²⁰ 1969	²⁰ 1970	²⁰ 1971	²¹ 1972
General	% female	32.7	37.4	40.4	38.8
	Total enrolment	1,724	11,146	15,599	15,828
Professional	% female	17.7	23.4	47.4	48.7
	Total enrolment	2,476	3,512	5,711	7,157
Total Cegep Enrolment	% female	25.1	34.0	42.3	41.8
	Total enrolment	4,200	14,658	21,310	22,965

The significant increase in the rate of female enrolment suggests that when access to higher education is facilitated by the provision of free, regional, or local opportunities for continued studies, attendance rates tend to be similar for males and females. While this general tendency is confirmed by the data, it is not an inevitable or necessary consequence, as evidenced by the fact that the proportion of females in attendance at different Cegeps ranged from 30% to 60%. The under-representation of women was more marked in the general stream, and in Cegeps in the eastern regions of the province. The latter can be at least partially explained by the lack of opportunities there for women to follow the academic secondary curriculum, particularly in locations where secondary feeder institutions traditionally have been segregated on the basis of sex.

The specific programs available in Cegeps also influence the female enrolment. The inclusion of nursing programs, for example, helps account for the relatively high proportion of women in the professional sector. Although sex differences are most apparent in the professional stream which leads directly to employment, itself sex-linked, preliminary evidence from our studies suggests that this phenomenon operates on a more subtle basis in the general stream where, for example, the study of physics or commerce attracts a predominance of males.

Since we have not compared the qualifications of males and females for Cegep entry, the evidence can not be considered

complete. Nonetheless the increase in equality of educational opportunity brought about by the formation of the Cegep is clearly demonstrated by the enrolment figures. The finding that greater equality between the sexes was most marked in the more economically developed regions of the province, would confirm the hypothesis that as a society or region becomes more highly developed economically, its educational offerings become more equitable for both sexes.

influence of social class

Just as a society's economic development is reflected in the extent of its educational offerings, so is the economic standing of the family reflected in the educational chances of its members. Studies by Baby, Denis, and Lipkin all point to the positive correlation between higher socio-economic status and the likelihood of Cegep attendance. Table 4, based on these studies, illustrates this correlation.

Table 4
Social Class Distribution for Quebec and Five Cegeps

Social Class	Province as a whole	²² Cegep A	²³ Cegep B	²³ Cegep C	²⁴ Cegep D	²⁴ Cegep E	²⁵
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Upper.....	8	32	18	26	34	18	
Middle.....	28	36	41	28	40	37	
Lower.....	65	23	32	46	25	34	
Unclassified.....		9	9	—	—	11	
(Total Number)		(617)	(523)	(151)	(152)	(122)	

The disadvantaged position of the lower class students is reflected in the discrepancy between their percentage of the total population and that found in the Cegeps under investigation. While approximately two-thirds of Quebec's total population is considered to be in the lower class category, the proportion in our samples ranges from under one-quarter to approximately one-half of the respective Cegep populations. Since education is formally universal up to the Cegep level, this discrepancy could presumably be attributed to the selection process of the Cegeps. Of course, variations by social

class in the rate of high school failure, drop-out in the high school and Cegep, and the decision to apply to the Cegep would also need to be considered for a more complete analysis.

The variations in social class composition from one Cegep to another, observable in Table 4, should also be noted. These variations result from such circumstances as differences in the social class composition of the area being served, the kind of programs offered, and the nature of the institutions from which the Cegep was formed. By way of illustration, Cegep C, situated in a metropolitan area, had an extensive professional stream which was found to attract a greater proportion of working class students than the general stream did, thus accounting for the relatively high (46%) overall lower class representation. We would suggest as an extension from this that the high proportion of the middle class among the English Quebecers could help account for the predominance of the general stream in the anglophone Cegeps. Latest estimates indicate that approximately 25% of the English speaking students are enrolled in the professional stream, contrasted with approximately 53% of the French students.²⁶

The overall social class composition of the Cegep reflects a considerable degree of heterogeneity, particularly when contrasted with the class composition of entrants to universities and classical colleges. The evidence presented by Porter in *The Vertical Mosaic*²⁷ based on census material from the 1950s has been the main source of national data on the extreme overrepresentation of children of professionals, executives, and owners of large firms and the corresponding underrepresentation of lower class children. Extrapolating from this and the British and American experience, Pike hypothesized that insofar as the children of semi-skilled and unskilled workers are concerned, the élitist nature of the university has not lessened significantly during the 1960s.²⁸ However, until the recent publication of data in the *Post-Secondary Student Population Survey, 1968-9*, there was no up-to-date national information on the social class composition of post-secondary students. Baby's study comparing Quebec City students in two classical colleges with those at two Cegeps, coupled with the P.S.S.P. data, provide a basis for comparing the social class composition of post-secondary students in Quebec in 1968.

The data presented in Table 5 provide evidence in support of the Cegep's having a more egalitarian social composition than either the university or the classical college. Although

the lower class is underrepresented, it is probably less so than the British and American experience had led Pike to predict for post-secondary education throughout the 1960s. Since early evidence suggests that almost all Cegep graduates from the general stream gain admission to the university,²⁹ we may expect a shift in the class composition of the universities as well.

Table 5

Social Class Composition of Post-Secondary Students in Quebec

	30	31	32
	Quebec Universities %	Classical Colleges %	Cegeps %
Upper Class.....	41.5	35.4	35.1
Middle Class.....	26.9	37.1	19.6
Lower Class.....	24.9	19.3	38.3
Other.....	6.7	8.3	7.0
(Total Number).....	(1082)	(228)	(316)

The expansion of post-secondary education brought about with the establishment of the Cegep has resulted in greater educational opportunities for disadvantaged sectors of the population; specifically, francophones, women, residents of non-metropolitan regions and lower class representatives, thus providing at least the basis for increased social mobility. However, these elements of the population and others outside of the purview of the present study such as various ethnic minority groups, continue to operate at an educational disadvantage.

liberalizing admissions

Short of becoming a universal institution designed to enable everyone to reach his full potential, the Cegep can not be expected to offset radically the educational advantages enjoyed by those who occupy positions of higher status in the society.

Up to the present time, the argument that a free, public institution which represents the sole educational opportunity beyond the eleventh year of schooling, should be open to all has not gained widespread support throughout the province generally, and in the Cegeps specifically. When, for example,

the disproportionately low enrolment figures for working class students, or students from certain ethnic minority groups such as Greeks or Ukrainians, or the virtual absence of "mature" students whom the Cegep was also intended to serve, is pointed out, the usual response is that this is inevitable or unavoidable.

Fortunately, however, there are signs of a growing recognition that disadvantages whether social, economic, linguistic, or ethnic, need to be compensated for and overcome, and the Cegep is beginning to realize that it has the dual obligation of attracting or recruiting students with such handicaps and providing them with an appropriate form of education. Two of the Cegeps, in particular, have attempted to liberalize their admission policies. In one of the francophone Cegeps, a program has been established whereby a prescribed number of students who fall below the minimum admission requirements are granted conditional acceptance. These so-called "high risk" students spend the first term in a remedial program and upon successful completion are admitted into a regular Cegep program. A second departure from the usual admission procedures, adopted by one of the anglophone Cegeps, gives preference to applicants from high schools with a high concentration of low-income families and to Blacks and Canadian Indians, in particular.

These two exceptional attempts to increase educational opportunities for students who otherwise would be unable to proceed with their education reflect an awareness of the limitations of existing policies, but are, at best, partial solutions and could very well create more problems than they solve. The francophone example of dipping slightly further into the barrel highlights the lack of validity in any arbitrary, fixed admission criteria, but it begs the question of how far we can safely go. Both schemes are justifiably subject to the charge that they discriminate against the qualified students whose places are being taken by the "high risk" or disadvantaged students. A further problem which applies in the anglophone instance, is that the disadvantaged students, once admitted, are forced to compete with more highly qualified students. Such conundrums resulting from superficial and partial remedies being applied to a complex problem, can only be resolved by a radical transformation of the Cegep.

The first step in such a transformation would be to pursue the spirit and letter of the Parent Commission relevant to post-secondary education, to wit, "That the state encourage attendance through the thirteenth year for the greatest pos-

sible number of students and adopt the necessary measures to give these young adults an appropriate education of high quality.”³³

This is not an easy step. Bearing the cost of universal Cegep education would require considerable effort and sacrifice. The provision of an appropriate, quality education would present even greater difficulties. Consider the congeries of masters, each with differing perceptions of what is appropriate, which the Cegep must serve: the government, the university, the high school, business and industry, professional and occupation organizations, taxpayers, parents, Cegep staff and students. That the Cegep has emerged as a viable institution after five rapid years of existence is a tribute to these masters and, most especially, Cegep educators.

On reflection, it would seem that of all of the demands placed on the Cegep, those which emanate from the university pose the greatest obstacle to the Cegep's fulfilling its intended purpose. Perhaps what is needed is a renewed emphasis on the distinctive roles of the Cegep and university, respectively, with the former stressing the overall training and development of the individual and the latter placing greater emphasis on the rigorous pursuit of more advanced knowledge.

With the creation of a comprehensive, post-secondary institution, Quebec has embarked on a noble educational experiment. Based on our study of the Cegep to date, we must conclude that the realities have not lived up to the promises. At least, not yet.

footnotes

1. For the best general discussion of the Cegep in English, see Gordon Campbell, *Community Colleges in Canada*, Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1971.
2. Quebec, *Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education*, Vol. 4, Queen's Printer, 1966, pp. 3-4.
3. Interview, Jean-Marie Joly, Director, Quebec Institute of Research in Education, July 18, 1969.
4. Adapted from *Le nouveau Système Scolaire du Québec*, pamphlet, Quebec Ministry of Education, 1968.
5. In the interest of accuracy, it should be noted that the Cegep is not as yet the only path to the university in Quebec. Traces of the former system remain in the form of approximately twenty private or classical colleges on the francophone side and a Cegep equivalent program operating in the anglophone universities. However, the latter are to be phased out by 1973, and the private colleges are

- dwindling in numbers and influence as a result of their disadvantaged financial status *vis-à-vis* the Cegep.
6. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, *Development of Secondary Education; Trends and Implications*, Paris: 1969.
 7. Quebec, *Enseignement collégial, 1967-70, Cahier 2, Programmes de Formation Professionnelle*, Québec: Ministère de l'Éducation, pp. 134-43.
 8. Universities outside of Quebec have not arrived at a common decision as to whether to credit Cegep graduates with one or two years toward the Bachelor's degree. The present tendency to award two years' credit undoubtedly reflects the current "buyers market" being enjoyed by students.
 9. John Lipkin, "The Selection and Allocation of Students in Two Montreal Cegeps," paper delivered to Canadian Educational Researchers Association Annual Conference, Memorial University, Newfoundland, 1971.
 10. M. N. Srinivas, *Social Change in Modern India*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969, p. 48.
 11. It is often claimed that the Cegep admits all "qualified" high school graduates. This overlooks the fact that in order to be qualified, a student must pass a vast array of academic subjects. As a result students who pursue other than the general academic program at the secondary level are not admissible. As this evidence suggests, the *polyvalent* form of secondary education advocated by the Parent Commission has not been established. Instead, general or academic and vocational streams have been perpetuated. An additional limitation on admission is the existence of quotas, limiting the number of students admitted to particular programs. Thus a 'qualified' student may be refused admission or offered a place in another program.
 12. Calculated from D.B.S., *Survey of Higher Education, 1966-7*, Cat. 81-204, Table 3 and D.B.S., *Census of Canada*, "Population by Single Years of Age," 1966, Cat. 92-611, Vol. 1 (1-11), Table 25, for the percentage of population aged 18-21 enrolled in undergraduate programs beyond the level of senior matriculation.
 13. Quebec, *Quebec Yearbook*, 1970, Table 1, p. 268.
 14. Calculated from *Cegep-ACQ Annuaire*, 1971-2.
 15. *Ibid.*
 16. D.B.S., *Canadian Community Colleges and Related Institutions, 1969-70*, Cat. 81-222, Table 2 and Statistics Canada, *Fall Enrolment in Universities and Colleges, 1970-1*, Cat. 81-204, Table 6A.
 17. *Census of Canada, 1961*, Vol. 1, Part 1, Tables 10 and 14.
 18. Special Tabulation from D.B.S. *Post-Secondary Student Population Survey, 1968-9*. This study will be referred to as P.S.S.P. in this article.
 19. Quebec, *Quebec Yearbook*, 1970, Table 22, p. 382.
 20. D.B.S., *Community Colleges and Related Institutions, 1969-70*, Cat. 81-222, Table 2.
 21. Calculated from *Cegep-ACQ, Annuaire*, 1971-72. This is an incomplete listing since not all Cegeps provide statistics on stream by sex.

22. A. Baby, P. Bélanger, R. Ouellet, Y. Pépin, "Nouveaux aspects du problème de la démocratisation de l'enseignement dans les Cegep," *L'Orientation Professionnelle*, 5, 2, printemps 1969, p. 120.
23. A. Baby, P. Bélanger, R. Ouellet, "L'Orientation vers l'enseignement et les étudiants de l'enseignement collégial", unpublished manuscript, 1969, p. 30.
24. Lipkin, *op. cit.*
25. Ann Denis, "Social Characteristics and Academic Performance of Cegep Students," unpublished research paper.
26. Interview, André Leblanc, Secretary General, Vanier College, September 26, 1972, and *Annuaire*, *op. cit.*
27. J. Porter, *The Vertical Mosaic*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965, pp. 183-189, especially Table 23, p. 186.
28. R. Pike, *Who Doesn't Get to University and Why*, A.U.C.C., 1970, p. 58.
29. Denis, *op. cit.*
30. P.S.S.P., Special tabulation of data.
31. Baby *et al.*, "Nouveaux aspects", p. 120.
32. P.S.S.P. Special tabulation.
33. Quebec, *Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education*, Vol. 2, p. 190.